OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FOURTH SESSION—THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT

10-11 GEORGE V, 1920

IN FIVE VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1034 Volume II: Pages 1035-2002
Volume III: Pages 2003-3078 Volume IV: Pages 3079-4017
Volume V: Pages 4019-4591

VOLUME CXLIII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FIFTH DAY OF MAY TO THE FIRST DAY OF JUNE, 1920, INCLUSIVE.

OTTAWA
THOMAS MULVEY
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1920

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Wednesday, May 5, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Rt. Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 108, to amend the Exchequer Court Act.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will the right hon. gentleman please explain?

Mr. DOHERTY: The first purpose of the Bill is to make provision for the constitution of the Exchequer Court so as to bring it into correspondence with a provision that was passed the session before last as an amendment to the Judges Act. The Exchequer Court as constituted under the Exchequer Court Act is composed of the judge of the Exchequer Court and an assistant judge. When the amendment to the Judges Act was passed in the first session of 1919, there was in contemplation a modification of the constitution of the court, and in making provision for salaries, provisions were made to correspond with that contemplated modification. Salaries were provided for the president of the court and for two judges, whereas the Act constituting the court created only a judge of the court and an assistant judge. The purpose of the present Bill is to meet, I might say half way, that provision in the Judges Act, which in itself will have to be modified by substituting in the Exchequer Court Act for the provision that the court shall consist of a judge and an assistant judge, a provision that the court shall consist of a president of the court and one puisne judge. The provision in the Salaries Act will have to be made to correspond to that, the number of judges being cut down from two to one. Then, there is a modification of the existing provision with regard to the possible provision of a deputy judge in cases where one may be required.

The next provision is in regard to the office of registrar.

Mr. HOCKEN: Louder.

Mr. BUREAU: The Orange Sentinel cannot hear.

Mr. DOHERTY: I certainly am most anxious that all vigilant "sentinels" shall be aware of what I am doing. The second purpose of the Bill is to make provision enabling the registrar of the court, with the authority of the president or the judge, to deal with certain practice matters, and in that connection provision is made for the appointment and the salary of the registrar.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a first time.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Rt. Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 109, to amend the Supreme Court Act.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Explain.

Mr. DOHERTY: The purpose of the proposed change is to bring about a simplification and uniformity in the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and also to prevent appeals being brought to it in matters of trifling importance on the plea that title to land or future rights are involved. To accomplish the purposes intended, it is proposed that appeals as of right to the Supreme Court should be restricted to cases in which the amount or value of the matter in controversy in the appeal, whatever its nature, exceeds the sum of $2,000 exclusive of costs and that in all other cases an appeal shall lie ordinarily only by special leave of the highest court of last resort in the province. Provision is made for appeals per saltum, that is, for appeals from courts other than the final court of last resort in the province. But such appeals are subject to leave by the court of final resort in the province concerned.

Provision is also made for appeals that arise under section 232 of the Railway Act, where the Supreme Court or High Court has concurrent jurisdiction with the Court of Appeal, and there is no appeal from the former to the latter, and, therefore, under

the law as it now stands, no appeal to the Supreme Court under the existing jurisdiction.

As the law now stands, in all the provinces of Canada, except Quebec and except in the special cases with regard to titles to real estate and so forth, the right to appeal now depends upon a sum exceeding $1,000, or property of equivalent value, being involved in the appeal. In Quebec, on the other hand, the corresponding restriction on the right to appeal is to cases in which the matter in controversy in the action, that is, demanded in the action, amounts to at least $2,000. Thus a judgment for $100 damages recovered in Quebec, if upheld in the Court of Appeals, is now appealable de plano to the Supreme Court, if the plaintiff's original demand was not less than $2,000 It is felt that an appeal actually involving a matter of comparatively small value should not be permitted as of right merely because the plaintiff had been advised to claim a comparatively large sum in the first instance. These cases are provided for by extending to the province of Quebec the power to grant leave now existing in the other provinces, but as modified in section 41 of the present Bill. The Bill substantially involves giving to the provincial courts in all the provinces exclusive rights to grant leave to appeal in cases not now appealable de plano.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that to mean that the judgment must be for over $2,000 in Quebec now?

Mr. DOHERTY: In order that there should be an appeal de plano, the judgment itself, the amount in issue on the appeal to the Supreme Court, must be $2,000, and the same provision will hold good as regards all the provinces. But to afford a recourse to those parties who had, because of the original amount of their demands, a right to appeal, and who may consider that they are being deprived of some substantial right, there will be provision whereby in cases of that kind, upon leave from the court of last resort in the province, an appeal may be had to the Supreme Court, although the amount at issue on the appeal is not $2,000. That provision also will be common to all the provinces.

The principal purpose of the Bill is to bring about uniformity in the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, doing away with the present existing distinctions in that jurisdiction, depending upon the province from which the appeal comes.

To summarize the Bill, under it, in order to be appealable to the Supreme Court, a judgment must be rendered in a judicial proceeding as defined. The Bill contains a definition of a judicial proceeding, really adopting, I think, the present accepted view, but it is put in in order to clear up difficulties and differences. The judgment must not be discretionary, except in equitable proceedings in provinces other than Quebec. It must be a final judgment, as defined in the Bill, unless it directs a new trial or grants or refuses a non-suit, and finally, it must not be rendered in a criminal cause or in habeas corpus, certiorari or prohibition arising out of a criminal charge, or in habeas corpus on extradition. To be appealable as of right, the judgment must involve matter amounting to or having a value exceeding $2,000 exclusive of costs and must be rendered by the highest court of final resort in the province. Appeals from any other court require the leave of the highest court of final resort in the province, or if $2,000 be involved, the consent of the parties. If the judgment be rendered in a proceeding originating before any court, board or commission, of which the judges or presiding officers are not appointed by the Dominion Government, or if it involves less than $1,000 (except in the special cases; that is, the special cases covered by clauses (a) to (e), that is to say, cases having to do with titles to land and so forth) leave of the highest court of final resort in the province to appeal from it is required.

If an amount between $1,000 and $2,000 is involved, and the proceeding originated in a court of which the judges are appointed by the Dominion Government and in the special cases mentioned, that is cases with regard to title to land, future rights, validity of statutes and patents and so forth, leave to appeal may be given by the Supreme Court if refused by the highest court of final resort in the province.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a first time.

FIRST READING.

SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 105 (from the Senate), to incorporate United Canada Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Blake.

Bill No. 106 (from the Senate), for the relief of Arthur Jones.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 107 (from the Senate), for the relief of Eva Mary Moss.—Mr. Sheard.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

PAROLED PRISONERS.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. How many prisoners were released under ticket of leave during last year?
2. Is it true that one W. H. Tapley, convicted of rape against his daughter, and sentenced to penitentiary, was released recently under the ticket of leave?
3. If so, why and at whose request?

Rt. Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. 824.
2. Yes.
3. By order of His Excellency the Governor General on petitions by his sons and daughter (the victim of the crime), and others, after he had served, with remission, seven years and three months.

WINNIPEG GRAIN EXCHANGE.

*Mr. PECK:

1. Is the Government aware of any combination of vessel brokers in the Winnipeg Grain Exchange formed since the year 1914?
2. Was this combination in the nature of pooling their interests?
3. Was such pool recognized by the Canadian Wheat Board and did such board authorize its continuance and recognize it as a proper and reasonable organization for such a purpose?
4. Did the Government aid such pool?
5. Who were the members of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange who compose this combination or pool?
6. Was the present chairman of the Canadian Wheat Board or his immediate business associates connected with the combination?
7. Who were the vessel brokers who were members of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange at the time of the outbreak of the war?
8. Among these, who enlisted for overseas service and in what capacity?
9. Are any of these overseas men still members of the Exchange, and who are they?
10. Did any of these men apply for admission to the pool mentioned above after returning from the war, and if so, with what result?
11. Does the Government or Canadian Wheat Board purpose the allowance of the continuation of such a pool, and if so, will members of the Exchange who performed overseas service be permitted to become associated with and enjoy the benefits derived from such organization?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: These questions refer to matters entirely within the competence of the non-governmental agencies and agents therein mentioned, with the organization and operation of which the Government has nothing to do and of which it has no records.

THE CALENDAR OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Why is the calendar on the Table of the Clerk of the House of Commons in English only?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to have also on this table a French calendar?
3. If so, when?
4. If not, why?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My reply to the question asked by my honourable friend the member for Charlevoix and Montmorency, is this:

In placing that calendar on the Table of the House of Commons, traditions of former years since the origin of Confederation until our days have been observed. Under these circumstances, I do not deem it necessary either to replace it with another one or to put another one on the Clerk's desk. What was sufficient for the fathers of Confederation should surely satisfy us, for we are not less intelligent nor more patriotic than our predecessors.

PRINTING BUREAU EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. How many French-Canadians were employed, in every branch of the Printing Bureau, on the 1st of March, 1920?
2. How many English-Canadians were employed, in every branch of the Printing Bureau, on the 1st of March, 1920?
3. At the same date, what was the number of employees of other origin?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON: 1, 2, 3. No record.

ST. ROMUALD POSTMASTER.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. What is the name of the postmaster at St. Romuald, Levis County?
2. When was he appointed?
3. What are the names of the persons who recommended the appointment of this postmaster?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. Henri Dutil.
2. April 19, 1920.
3. The Post Office Inspector, S. Tanner Green, Quebec; by the Mayor and the Curé of the place and by petition signed by over 60 citizens using the post office.

TUBERCULAR RETURNED SOLDIERS.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie):

1. What is the total number of returned soldiers adjudged tubercular subjects now under treatment in our sanatoria in the different provinces throughout the Dominion?
2. What percentage have been discharged from the sanatoria considered cured?
3. What is found to be the time required to treat the above patients in the sanatoria before cure is effected?
4. What percentage are considered incurable?
5. What is the percentage of deaths while undergoing treatment?
6. What is the total number treated in each province respectively?
7. What is the cost per capita per month?
8. Have any investigations been made to show that soldiers who have been gassed develop tuberculosis as a result thereof?

Mr. HUGH CLARK (Parliamentary Secretary):

1. 1,715.

2. 30.4 per cent.

3. The average period for sanatorium treatment is 6-7 months. This figure is taken from a return based on all admissions to sanatoria and include certain non-tuberculous and observation cases. Therefore, it may be assumed that the stay of the average tuberculous case is of longer duration.

4. 15.6 per cent.

5. 6.23 per cent.

6. The total number of ex-soldiers treated in sanatoria in each province is as follows:

Ontario	3,404
Quebec	1,350
Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia	1,126
Manitoba	687
Saskatchewan	445
Alberta	275
British Columbia	735
New Brunswick	272

7. $77.10 for maintenance, treatment, etc., not including capital expenditure.

8. A Board of Consultants, consisting of five of the most competent tuberculosis specialists in Canada, is investigating the whole question of the treatment of tuberculosis occurring amongst ex-members of the forces. The board has been requested to make special inquiries in each sanatorium with reference to patients who are shown on their medical documents to have been exposed to gas, in order that the connection of gassing with pulmonary tuberculosis may be definitely established.

CANADIAN NORTHERN SECURITIES.

Mr. JOHNSTON:

1. What Canadian Northern securities matured during 1919, and during the present year?

2. What was the individual amount of these securities, at what price were they sold, and what rate of interest did they carry?

3. Were payments made in Canadian funds? If not, what did the adverse rate of exchange cost Canada?

4. What was the yield to the investor in each case?

5. Were new securities issued to retire them? If so, at what price were they sold, and what rate of interest did they bear?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. January 10, 1919, $1,250,000 Canadian Northern Railway 6 per cent Secured Gold Notes, dated January 10, 1917; February 1, 1919. $2,000,000 Canadian Northern Railway 4 per cent Land Grant Bonds, dated February 1, 1899. June 12, 1919, £450,000 Canadian Northern Railway 5 per cent Secured Notes to Bearer, dated December 12, 1913. No securities matured in 1920.

2. Canadian Northern Railway 6 per cent Secured Notes, $1,250,000, sold at 100; interest at 6 per cent per annum. Canadian Northern Railway 4 per cent Land Grant Bonds, $2,000,000, sold at 100; interest at 4 per cent per annum. Canadian Northern Railway 5 per cent Secured Notes, £450,000, or $2,190,000, sold at 95; interest at 5 per cent per annum.

3. Six per cent Secured Notes paid in New York funds exchange cost $27,312.50; 4 per cent Land Grant Bonds paid in Canadian funds; 5 per cent Secured Notes paid in sterling funds. See answer to No. 5.

4. Six per cent Secured Notes yielded to investor 6 per cent; 4 per cent Grant Bonds yielded to investor 4 per cent; 5 per cent Secured Notes yielded to investor 6.05 per cent.

5. Six per cent Secured Gold Notes retired by loan from Dominion Government; 4 per cent Land Grant Bonds retired by funds received from sale of lands under mortgage agreement; 5 per cent Secured Notes retired by issue in England of Canadian Northern 3-year 5 per cent Secured Notes guaranteed as to principal and interest by the Dominion of Canada, sold at 97¼.

DOMINION LAND SURVEYS.

Mr. FAFARD:

1. May the Civil Service Commission refuse the reappointment of a Dominion Land Surveyor employed for several years consecutively without any reason being shown for such refusal and when his services are satisfactory to the head of the department?

2. Is Order in Council, P.C. 1479, considered to be applicable to the appointment of employees requiring special technical qualifications?

3. Must men in a technical service be promoted in lists prepared by the Civil Service Commission rather than on merit, as decided by the head of the branch under whom they serve?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. The regulation governing Season appointments which has been approved by the Governor in Council, promulgated by Order in Council of July 17, 1919, (P.C. 1479), is as follows:

"All positions in the Civil Service where the nature of service is such that it is not continuous through the year but recurs in each successive year, shall be designated as "Season Positions," and shall be subject to the provisions of the regulations applicable generally to positions to be filled by open competition, including preference to returned soldiers if such are qualified and available. Provided that when a department feels that a former seasonal employee is indispensable, and so writes the commission, giving the grounds on which

they reach that conclusion, and provided also that such seasonal employee has filed in the office of the commission in such form as may be prescribed, an application for reappointment endorsed by the deputy head of the department, at least one month before the date when he shall again be required to report for service, the commission may give consideration to a requisition for re-employment, and may certify the persons who have made such formal requests that they shall be reappointed to their former positions, if in the meantime they have not been reported against and are not otherwise disqualified. In every other case such positions must be advertised, in order to determine whether any returned soldier possessing the necessary qualifications is available.

"Provided that for sufficient reason the commission may waive the time limit for filing applications."

2. Yes.

3. All lists prepared by the Civil Service Commission are in order of merit. In deciding cases of promotion the following Order in Council of December 3, 1919 (P.C. 2434), governs, viz:-

"Until such time as the regulations of the commission governing promotion examinations have been approved by the Governor in Council, promotions may be made by the commission based upon an examination of the qualifications of the candidates considered by the commission as in line for the vacancy required to be filled, efficiency and seniority to be the governing factors in such examinations."

COLONEL GRASSIE ARCHIBALD.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Is Colonel Grassie Archibald at present in the employ of the Canadian Government in any position?

2. Was he at one time in such employ at Aberdeen, Scotland?

3. If so, what was the nature of his duties and what salary was he paid?

4. What was the total cost of the office of which he was in charge?

5. Whilst holding the rank of colonel where and when did he serve?

6. Did he have any military service before his appointment as colonel?

7. If so, under what rank or ranks and where did he render such service?

8. What was the total remuneration from all sources received by the said Colonel Grassie Archibald whilst in the Canadian army?

9. Whilst receiving pay for military service did he receive any other pay from any other department of the Government?

10. If so, from what departments and what were the different amounts paid him by each department?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. No.

2. Yes.

3. Canadian Government emigration agent; was appointed at $1,800 per annum and was in receipt of $2,000 per annum at the time of his resignation.

4. $43,000.20, from December 26, 1912 to December 31, 1919. This is made up of $21,051.03, salaries (including salary of Mr. Archibald) $6,276.30 rental; $2,901.75, for shows and lectures; $12,771.12, for advertising, travelling, office and general expenses.

5. This officer did not at any time hold the rank of Colonel. While holding the rank of Lieut.-Colonel, he served as follows: In France, from 2nd December, 1918, to 23rd June, 1919. In England, 24th June, 1919, to 2nd August, 1919. In Canada, 3rd August, 1919, to 15th August, 1919.

6. Answered by Nos. 5 and 7.

7. (a) Appointed to 76th Regiment, Canadian Militia, as lieutenant, 22nd August, 1910. (b) As lieutenant, Canadian Militia, attached to Depot Gordon Highlanders, Arberdeen, Scotland, between 14th May, 1914, and 10th July, 1914, for instruction, and without expense to the public. (c) Joined 1st Canadian Contingent, 17th Battalion, at Pond Farm Camp, Salisbury Plain, 1st November, 1914, from which date he was gazetted to the C.E.F. with the rank of captain in the C.E.F. (d) Captain in France from 15th February, 1915. Major in France from 31st December, 1915. A/Lt.-Colonel, France, from 2nd December, 1918. Temp. Lt.-Colonel in France from 2nd June, 1919. Returned to England, 24th June, 1919. Proceeded to Canada, 3rd August, 1919. Lieut.-Colonel, struck off strength on general demobilization, 15th August, 1919.

8. From 1914 to 15th August, 1919, pay and allowance of his rank, $14,746.50, and, in addition, six months' War Service Gratuity, $2,196.

9. Yes.

10. From Department of Immigration and Colonization during the period of military service $9,354.45.

NEW ONE CENT COIN.

Mr. DENIS:

1. When does the Government intend to make, issue and put in circulation the new one cent coin?

2. Does the Government intend to have these coins stamped in French and English languages?

3. If not, why?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. As soon as coinage dies have been prepared, these dies are now in course of prep-

aration and it is expected the new coins will be in circulation before the end of 1920.

2. and 3. In the new one cent coin the same designation will be used as has been used since Confederation.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT BONDS.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. What is the amount of Canadian Government bonds issued in Canada since the beginning of the war and still outstanding?

2. What is the amount of such bonds exempt from the operation of the income tax law?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1.

	Issued.	Outstanding March 31, 1920.
War Loan, 1915-1925	$100,000,000	$ 43,246,300.00
War Loan, 1916-1931	106,706,300	54,398,700.00
War Loan, 1917-1937	172,926,800	92,652,800.00
Victory Loan, 1917	546,148,750	513,628,150.00
Victory Loan, 1918	681,230,450	676,938,050.00
Victory Loan, 1919 .. .. .. As passed through the books of the Finance Department to March 31, 1920		566,302,847.42
Total		$1,947,166,847.42

2.

All excepting 1919 Victory Loan—Total as of March 31, 1920, $1,380,864,000.00.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY HEAD OFFICE.

*Mr. FOSTER (York):

The Grand Trunk Railway having been taken over by the Government to be operated in conjunction with the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific, is it the intention of the Canadian National Railways Board to have its head office in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: The question has not been considered:

CANADIAN NORTHERN LANDS.

*Mr. TOBIN:

1. Have the 439,380 acres of land earned by the Canadian Northern railway and its subsidiaries from the province of Quebec been transferred to the Government of Canada as part of the assets of the Canadian Northern Railway system?

2. If so, when were said lands transferred?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. Contracts are executed between the province of Quebec and the several railways included in the Canadian Northern Railway system covering the lands referred to, but the land has not yet been selected. Negotiations have recently been under way between the railway and the Provincial Government.

2. Answered by No. 1.

VICTORY LOAN SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Has the Government named a committee on Victory Loan, with headquarters at Montreal?

2. What is the purpose of said committee?

3. What are the names of the persons serving on said committee?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. The Victory Loan Special Committee has a district office at Montreal.

2. The main purpose of the control exercised by the committee is to insure a sound and steady distribution of bonds offered from time to time with a view to preventing violent fluctuations and securing for investors who are forced to sell the best possible prices.

3. The members of this special committee are G. H. Wood, Toronto, chairman; Edwin Hanson, Montreal, vice-chairman; P. McDougall, Montreal; Edgar M. Smith, Montreal; Sir Augustus Nanton, Winnipeg; H. R. Thudhope, Toronto; J. W. Mitchell, Toronto; W. A. MacKenzie, Toronto.

CANADIAN NORTHERN ARBITRATION COST.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

What was the gross amount of legal and other expenses connected with the Canadian Northern arbitration proceedings?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: The following is in so for as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned: $86,178.25.

PAYMENTS ON STERLING TO C.E.F.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Have the members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force who received their pay in England or in France been paid the difference in exchange?

2. If not, who received said benefit?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. All payments in sterling to personnel of the Overseas Military Forces of Canada during the years 1914-15-16-17 and '18 were converted to Canadian currency at the par rate of exchange, $4.86 2/3 to the pound and debited to their pay accounts at that rate. Payments in continental currencies were converted from such currency to sterling at a flat monthly rate of exchange established by the War Office, based on commercial rates, which in the case of French currency

varied from five francs equals four shillings in 1915, to three and five pence in 1919.

2. All payments to members of the C.E.F. Overseas were made out of moneys at the credit of the Dominion Government in the Bank of Montreal, London, which moneys were received from the Imperial Government by way of advances for war purposes, at par, so that no benefit accrued to the Dominion Government by reason of exchange. Balances of pay and allowances held in England by Canadian soldiers were on their return to Canada converted into Canadian dollars at the par rate of exchange.. The expenditure necessary to provide for this conversion being charged to Vote 544, 1919-1920.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

Are the rates of freight charged by vessels of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited, subject to the control in any way of the United States Shipping Board?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

SPUR LINE BETWEEN STE. ROSALIE AND BAGOT.

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. Is the spur line of the railway between St. Rosalie and Bagot wholly constructed?
2. What amount has been spent up to date on that line?
3. Have the farmers been paid for their rights of way?
4. If so, what is the amount?
5. If not, why?
6. What is the level of the new line as compared with the old one?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. No.
2. $225,338.52.
3. Cheques have been issued for fourteen out of a total of twenty-one parcels of land.
4. $7,821.70.
5. Negotiations have not been completed for the balance of the land.
6. Maximum grade, new line, 4/10 of 1 per cent. Maximum grade, old line, 1.07 per cent.

EXHIBITION BUILDINGS USED BY MILITIA.

Mr. FOSTER (York):

1. How much is the Government paying for the exhibition buildings in St. John, N.B., used by the militia during the war?
2. How much is the Government paying for the Toronto Fair buildings used by the militia during the war?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. Insurance premiums	$ 918 85
In full and final settlement of all claims against the department	35,000 00
	$35,918 85

No rent was paid.

2. Construction work and outfitting	$70,337 84
Maintenance (repairs, fuel, light, etc.)	22,677 16
Restoration	124,966 37
	$217,981 37

No rent was paid.

BELL TELEPHONE RATES APPEAL.

Mr. FOSTER (York):

1. What is being done with the appeal to the Governor General in Council by the city of Toronto from the judgment of the Railway Commission granting a large increase in the rates of the Bell Telephone Company?
2. How long has this appeal been pending in the Department of Justice?

Rt. Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. The appeal is fixed for hearing by the Governor General in Council on the 10th of May.
2. The appeal is to the Governor General in Council. It is not and never has been pending in the Department of Justice.

SUGAR IMPORTATIONS.

Mr. JOHNSTON:

1. What quantity of sugar was imported during the financial year ending March 31, 1920?
2. What was the value of said sugar?
3. What amount of duty was paid thereon?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Imported and entered for consumption—

	Lbs.
Raw sugar	1,081,575,107
Refined sugar	1,155,577
Total	1,082,730,684

2. Imported and entered for consumption—

Raw sugar	$ 68,343,171
Refined sugar	114,190
Total	$ 68,457,361

3. Duty paid thereon—

Raw sugar	$14,435,479.98
Refined sugar	22,616.14
Total	$14,458,096.12

THE LAST CENSUS.

Mr. PARENT:

1. Is it true that, in the last census, in certain provinces, and especially in certain

cities, the figures of the population were considerably exaggerated?

2. Does the Government intend to take measures in order to prevent similar errors in the next census?

3. If so, what action will be taken?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The Government has no information of such being the case.

2 and 3. The Government will take every precaution to procure an accurate census.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY FREIGHT TARIFFS.

Mr. MACNUTT:

1. What freight tariffs, if any, were filed with the Government showing the reductions in rates agreed to by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by Special Act 60-61 Victoria, chapter 5, 1897, Crow's Nest Agreement (assented to June 29, 1897)?

2. What are the particulars of each tariff, date, number, date effective, description of tariff and application?

3. If tariffs were not filed, will the Government bring down an immediate report from the Department of Railways and Canals, or the Board of Railway Commissioners, giving the information requested in clause 2 above?

4. What was the carload rate on horses in ordinary box cars, from Toronto and other stations in Ontario to Regina, under the Crows Nest Agreement?

5. What was the carload rate on horses in ordinary box cars, from Toronto and other stations in Ontario to Regina, prior to Privy Council Order 1863, July 27, 1918, and which order authorized the Board of Railway Commissioners to disregard the Crows Nest Agreement?

6. What rates in excess of the guaranteed rates (Crows Nest Agreement) were exceeded by the Canadian Pacifi railway, prior to P.C. 1863, July 27, 1918, referred to in clause 5?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. The Crows Nest Pass Agreement was assented to June 29, 1897. The railway companies, subject to the Board of Railway Commissioners, commenced filing their tariffs with the board, December 1, 1904.

2. Following is a list of the freight tariffs of the Canadian Pacific railway applicable in whole or in part to the commodities covered by the Crows Nest Pass Agreement, as first filed with the board:

Tariff.	Effective.	Description.
C.R.C. E. 257,	Aug. 1, 1904..	All-rail. Eastern Canada to points in Manitoba, and Ontario west of Port Arthur.
C.R.C. E. 259,	Aug. 1, 1904..	All-rail. Eastern Canada to Assiniboia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.
C.R.C. E. 232,	Opening of navigation, 1905	Lake - and - rail. Eastern Canada to Ontario and Manitoba, Port Arthur and West.
C.R.C. E. 234,	Opening of navigation, 1905	Lake - and - rail. Eastern Canada to Assiniboia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.
C.R.C. E. 128,	May 20, 1903..	All-rail. Live Stock, Eastern Canada to stations Fort William and West.
C.R.C. W. 40,	May 10, 1902..	From Port Arthur and Fort William, westbound to Ontario and Manitoba.
C.R.C. W. 41,	May 14, 1902..	From Port Arthur and Fort William, to Assiniboia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.
C.R.C. W. 73,	Oct. 7, 1903..	Grain and grain products from stations in Western Canada to Port Arthur and Fort William.

3. Answered by Numbers 1 and 2.

4. The carload rate on horses in ordinary box or stock cars from Montreal and stations west thereof in Ontario and Quebec to Regina, shown in the first tariff filed with the board, namely C.R.C. No. E.-128, effective May 20, 1903, was 74 cents per 100 lbs., minimum weight, 20,000 lbs. per car.

5. The carload rate on horses in ordinary box or stock cars from Montreal and stations west thereof in Ontario and Quebec to Regina, prior to Privy Council Order 1863, was 96 cents per 100 lbs., minimum weight 20,000 lbs. per car.

6. This cannot be answered specifically as the tariffs first issued under the Crows Nest Agreement are not in the files of the Board of Railway Commissioners. Compared with the tariffs filed with the board, December 1, 1904, the rates on the commodities covered by the Crows Nest Agreement do not appear to have been exceeded until the issue of P.C. 1863, except on horses, in carloads, on which the rates exceeded those of December 1, 1904, as follows, in cents per 100 lbs.:

Tariff.	Effective.	Rate.
C.R.C. E. 28	May 20 1903....	74 cents.
C.R.C. E. 1790	July 21, 1910....	96 cents.
C.R.C. E. 2894	Jan. 1, 1915....	96 cents.

TOTAL LIABILITY OF CANADIAN NORTHERN.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

What was the total liability of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, including also the liability of the Equipment Company of the Canadian Northern, the 31st of December, 1919?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: The total indebtedness of the Canadian Northern Railway as of December 31, 1919, including funded debt, equipment securities, land securities, advances made by the Dominion Government, and all other liabilities outstanding was $566,097,468.10.

ST. THEODORE D'ACTON POST OFFICE.

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. When was the location of the post office at St. Theodore d'Acton changed?
2. Who recommended the present location?
3. Is the Government aware that it is very far from the church and consequently inconvenient to the farmers?
4. Have Messrs. Telesphore Picard and Remi Desautels, both residing in front of the church, refused to take said post office in their homes?
5. Have these two gentlemen been asked to take charge of the post office?
6. If not, why?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. Appointment of Mrs. Rene Gauthier authorized October 10, 1919.

2. Mr. Victor Gaudet, Post Office Inspector for the Montreal district.

3. No.

4. Mr. Telesphore Picard applied for the appointment but there is no record that Mr. Remi Desautels applied.

5. No.

6. The inspector reported that "several candidates were in the field, but a large majority of the leading citizens of St. Theodore d'Acton, not to say all of them, are in favour of Mrs. Rene Gauthier. Recommendations in her favour have been received from the parish priest, the mayor, the members of the municipal council, the secretary-treasurer, the principal merchant of the place, the owner of the butter factory, and several other leading citizens. * * * There is no returned soldier available."

BAGOT COUNTY ELECTORAL LIST.

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. Has the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery received the electoral list of the county of Bagot?
2. If so, is it possible to have copies of same?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has not received the electoral list of the county of Bagot. The obligation on the part of custodians of provincial lists to furnish the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery with certified copies thereof ceased on the passing of the War-time Elections Act, September, 1917.

2. Copies may be obtained from the Registrar for the county of Bagot.

SHAREHOLDERS OF CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Who are the shareholders of the corporation known as the "Canadian Government Merchant Marine?"
2. Did the shareholders invest any of their own money in this venture? If not, who furnished the capital?
3. Who are the directors?
4. Is there a separate company or corporation for each ship?
5. In what name does the title to the ship stand on the registry?
6. Does the Department of Railways and Canals receive a statement at stated periods from the Canadian Government Merchant Marine showing the profits and loss of the business? If so, how often?
7. Who is responsible to the ratepayers for the conduct of the business carried on by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine?
8. Is a separate account kept for each ship?
9. What rate of insurance is being paid on the hulls of ships belonging to this company?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. All of the issued capital stock of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, less directors' qualifying shares, are owned by His Majesty the King and held by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General of Canada.

2. The total investment in the Canadian Government Merchant Marine is made by the Government.

3. Mr. D. B. Hanna, Mr. A. J. Mitchell, Major G. A. Bell, C.M.G., Mr. E. R. Wood, Mr. Robt. Hobson, Sir Hormisdas Laporte, Dr. A. P. Barnhill, Col. Thos. Cantley.

4. Yes.

5. Title to each vessel will stand on the registry in the name of the separate ship company, with a mortgage thereon in favour of His Majesty the King.

6. A statement of the operations of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, as furnished to the directors at their regular meetings, is supplied both to the Department of Railways and to the Department of Marine.

7. The Government.

8. Accounts are kept showing, separately, the operation of each vessel.

9. Arrangements for insurance and rates are made by the operating company. Rates

of insurance vary from time to time and lowest tenders are accepted.

BOARD OF COMMERCE REPORT.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

When does the Government expect that the Board of Commerce will make its report to the Government?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not certain just when the report will be brought down, but my latest information is that it is nearly ready for laying upon the table of the House.

TAXATION OF "MUTUAL" INSURANCE COMPANIES.

*Mr. RINFRET:

1. Does the Government intend to impose a tax of 15 per cent on the "mutual" or non-authorized insurance companies?
2. If so, how many companies, approximately, are to be affected by said tax?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This information will be given when the legislation pertaining thereto, if any, is brought down.

CANADIAN NORTHERN PORT ARTHUR TERMINALS.

Mr. BUREAU:

1. Have the terminals, lands and buildings forming part of and operated by the Canadian Northern Railway system at Port Arthur been turned over to the Government as part of the system of the Canadian National Railways?
2. Have the ore docks and buildings located at Port Arthur and forming part of and operated by the Canadian Northern Railway been turned over to the Government as part of the system of the Canadian National Railways?
3. Have the lands, buildings and other properties of the Atikokan Iron Company been acquired by the Government and are they now controlled and do they form part of the Canadian National Railway system?
4. Have the lands controlled by the Lake Superior Terminal Company, part of the Mackenzie-Mann Company or Canadian Northern Railway system, been acquired by the Government and are they now the property of and operated by the Canadian National Railways?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. The terminals, lands, and buildings used by the Canadian Northern Railway system at Port Arthur are owned by said company.
2. No, but the Canadian Northern Railway is operating these premises under lease.
3. No.
4. The Canadian Northern Railway owns the entire capital stock of the Lake Superior Terminals, Limited, thereby controlling any lands or properties owned by that company.

[Mr. Calder.]

EXCESS BUSINESS PROFITS TAXATION.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

How much has the Government received as an additional revenue through the Excess Business Profits Tax Act over and above what they would have received under the Income Tax Act, assuming that all companies would have been taxed at 10 per cent?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: To answer this question would necessitate the examination of approximately 100,000 returns and the employment of many accountants.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS INCORPORATION.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Have any Orders in Council been passed under the provisions of section 11 of chapter 13, 9-10 Geo. V, An Act to incorporate Canadian National Railway Company and respecting Canadian National Railways?
2. If so, when and what are the number of said Orders in Council?
3. If not, why?

Hon. Mr. CALDER (for Mr. Reid):

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. The provisions of section 1 of the Act referred to have not been given effect to.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie):

1. What are the totals of credits advanced by the Canadian Government to (a) Great Britain, (b) the Allied Powers, before the armistice.
2. Of these totals what proportions were used respectively for the purchase of (a) agricultural products, (b) manufactured goods.
3. What are the totals of credits advanced by the Canadian Government to (a) Great Britain, (b) the Allied Powers, after the armistice?
4. Of these totals what proportions were used respectively for the purchase of (a) agricultural products, (b) manufactured goods?

Mr. BUREAU:

1. How many horses were brought back to Canada from overseas, including those from Siberia?
2. What did it cost per head to bring them back?
3. Are all senior officers from colonel upwards entitled to a horse?
4. What officers get two horses?
5. What was the cost to the country to feed these horses from their arrival in Canada up to the 15th of March?
6. How many officers and men are employed looking after said horses from the date of their arrival up to the 15th of March?
7. Where are these horses at the present time?

Mr. REID (Mackenzie):

1. What is the amount of Income Taxes for which returns have been made for the respective years 1916, 1917 and 1918, but which have not been collected?

2. What is the amount of Business Profits War Taxes for which returns have been made for the respective years 1916, 1917 and 1918, but which have not been collected?

Mr. FOSTER (York):

How much money has been spent by the Dominion Government since Confederation on improvements in the harbours of Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Port Arthur, Victoria and Vancouver?

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Is it a fact that the so-called American experts employed by the Government for the re-classification of the Civil Service have finished their work or been dismissed or have resigned?

2. What are their respective names and salaries per day, and how much extra moneys have been paid to each of them respectively for travelling expenses and overtime?

3. Is it a fact that on leaving employment they have taken away with them the cards filled by the employees for the purpose of the re-classification? If it is so, is it the intention of the Government to claim these cards?

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Is the following statement credited to T. B. Patton, Income Tax Adjuster, correct—that Income Tax collected by the Federal Government from farmers of Canada amounted to the sum of $389,011 in four years, and the total amount collected was $83,768,110 from all other sources?

2. What was the total amount of Income Tax collected by the Federal Government in the past four years?

3. What was the amount of Income Tax collected from each province for each year?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens):

What are the names of all persons who have passed the Civil Service examinations from the province of Prince Edward Island in 1917, 1918 and 1919, showing: (*a*) the grade for which they passed; (*b*) the number of marks made by each; (*c*) those who are returned soldiers; (*d*) those who have received an appointment with the name of their position?

NOTICES OF MOTION.

On Government Notices of Motion being called:

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): May I ask when hon. members will have the opportunity to move the resolutions under "Notices of Motions."

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I desire now to proceed to the order "Notices of Motions" so that any motions that are unopposed may be passed, and that others may be dropped.

BOARD OF COMMERCE PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency) moved:

For a copy of all investigations, reports and proceedings in connection with the work carried on by the Board of Commerce, along with a copy of all decisions rendered showing sentences or fines imposed by the said board and a statement showing the costs of conducting such proceedings and investigations.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not prepared to adopt that motion at the present time for two reasons. One is that the amount of work involved would be very great and the return tremendously bulky. In the second place, the report of the Board of Commerce is pretty nearly ready for laying on the table of the House, and I think it will give all pertinent and really useful information in connection with this question. The motion calls for a detailed report of everything that has been done by the Board of Commerce as a body.

Motion stands.

PROPOSED GOVERNMENT SUPERVISION OF STEAMSHIP COMPANIES.

On the order for the motion:

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton):

That, in the opinion of this House, the recommendations set forth in the final report of the Royal Commission on the Natural Resources, Trade and Legislation of certain portions of His Majesty's Dominions, and presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of His Majesty, in March, 1917, showing that it is not desirable that the operations of the steamship companies carrying passengers and freight between the Dominion of Canada and the United Kingdom should remain longer without some measure of Government supervision, should be given effect; and that this Government should take immediate steps to assist the Imperial Government in bringing about Government control of the ocean carriers doing business (or, from time to time, doing business) between ports in the United Kingdom and ports in the Dominion of Canada, and that a permanent commission representing all parts of the Empire be established, which shall be invested with wide powers relative to transportation on the high seas; such powers, as far as possible, to be similar or analogous to those which have been conferred in Canada and in other Dominions upon permanent commissioners charged with the supervision and control of railway and steamship rates and their methods and conditions of operation.

Mr. J. A. ARMSTRONG (Lambton): May I ask if the Acting Prime Minister is prepared to accept this resolution?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): No, I am afraid not. I would advise my hon. friend to drop it. If he wishes to make any remarks in reference to it he can do so when the House is in Committee of Supply.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I will drop it under the circumstances.

Motion dropped.

CORRESPONDENCE RE INDIAN AFFAIRS.

On the order for the motion:

Mr. CANNON:

For a copy of all correspondence between the last Huron chiefs of the Indian Reserve of Lorette, Messrs Sioui and Sullivan, barristers, and the Department of Indian Affairs since 1883.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I would ask that this motion stand, unless the hon. member wishes to drop it. The amount of work that would be involved in preparing the return to this order would be very large. If there is any particular information that my hon. friend desires I would advise him to take the matter up with one of the officers of the department, and I am confident he would be able to secure the information he seeks without necessitating all the work that this motion would call for.

Mr. CANNON: I will do that with pleasure.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the motion dropped?

Mr. CANNON: Yes.

Motion dropped.

THE HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

On the order for the motion:

Mr. CAMPBELL proposed:

That, in the opinion of this House, owing to insistent demands from the West, extending over a long period, and after many years investigation as to the feasibility of the route, the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway as a national enterprise was commenced in 1910.

And whereas the work progressed very slowly but was carried on until the close of the year 1917, by which time the grade was completed to the bay and rails laid as far as mile 332, including the construction of two large steel bridges over the Nelson, and extensive work at the Port Nelson terminals; the total expenditure now being over $20,000,000.

And whereas, owing to the length of time that the road has been under construction, and to lack of attention paid to the completed part thereof, the whole roadbed is in danger of serious deterioration.

And whereas the construction of this road has been the means of bringing to light the existence of natural resources in the territory through which it passes, and in the bay itself not hitherto known, such as minerals, pulpwood, fisheries, water powers and agricultural lands, the development of which would undoubtedly be to the material advantage of Canada; and whereas to leave the road in its present unfinished state would mean the loss of millions of dollars directly, and much more indirectly, through non-development of the above-mentioned resources. And whereas certain lands in the West were, some years ago, set aside to be disposed of in manner stipulated to create a fund for the construction of the railway, and sales of these lands have been made to the extent of $30,000,000, over one-half of which has been paid, it is advisable that the Hudson Bay railway should be completed to the bay this year by the laying of steel for the remaining 92 miles and the doing of such other work as may be necessary to put the road in proper shape for operation.

Mr. J. A. CAMPBELL (Nelson): I have no desire to delay the proceedings of the House by a lengthy discussion of this motion, if there is some means by which a formal statement of my views might be obviated. I was wondering whether the leader of the Government could say what work it is proposed to do on the Hudson Bay railway this year an—

Mr. SPEAKER: Any statement of that kind will not be in order at this stage. The motion has been called and the hon. member can signify his desire that it stand, or be either passed as non-contentious or dropped. He can obtain his inormation in Supply or on the motion to go into Supply.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) understands that if he allows his motion to stand now he cannot bring the question up on the Estimates, and I suppose he would like to be free to make some remarks on the subject matter of his resolution when the Estimates are before the House. I would therefore advise him to drop the motion.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Very well. I understood, however, that in view of a statement made a few days ago to a deputation, the Acting Prime Minister—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; the hon. member is not in order in discussing the subject at this juncture.

Motion dropped.

CORRESPONDENCE RE CRIMINAL TRIALS.

On the order for the motion:

Mr. CASGRAIN:

For the production of copies of all letters, telegrams, papers and correspondence exchanged between the Department of Justice and others, as the case may be, in reference to the trial of one Onofrio Montzano held at Murray Bay, district of Saguenay, in 1912, and the trial of the Labrie brothers, held at Sherbrooke, district of St. François, and their release from penitentiary on account of irregularities in the proceedings followed at each of these trials, and also copies of all documents contained in the records of the Department of Justice in reference thereto.

Rt. Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): With reference to this motion I may say, so that the hon. member may

not be disappointed, that my strong impression that it is unlikely that the documents called for by this motion will be procured. If the hon. gentleman reflects a moment he will realize that the Department of Justice has no direct communication with the provincial courts in the administration of justice. All the records of those courts are provincial records and we do not get reports of that character.

Motion agreed to.

W. H. TAPLEY AND E. L. BAUGH.

On the order for the motion:

Mr. CASGRAIN:

For production of copies of all letters, telegrams, papers, documents and correspondence in reference to the release from penitentiary of one W. H. Tapley and one E. L. Baugh.

Rt. Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): It is impossible to assent to the passing of this resolution. It is very well recognized in the House that correspondence with regard to applications for tickets of leave is of a confidential nature and is not to be brought down. There are numerous instances in which the matter has been brought up, and the last time I recollect its being discussed was in 1913, when the subject was discussed on both sides of the House, and when the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier entirely concurred in the view that these papers were not of a kind that ought to be ordered to be brought down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall the motion stand, or is it dropped?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Dropped.

Motion dropped.

BOARD OF COMMERCE.

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): I desire permission to revert to Order No. 5:

For a copy of all investigations, reports and proceedings in connection with the work carried on by the Board of Commerce, along with a copy of all decisions rendered showing sentences or fines imposed by the said board and a statement showing the costs of conducting such proceedings and investigations.

I would ask that this motion be dropped.

Motion dropped.

CHAMPLAIN MARKET SITE.

Mr. C. G. POWER (South Quebec): I ask permission to revert to Order No. 6:

For a copy of all documents, contracts and correspondence relating to the negotiations between the city of Quebec and the Transcontinental railway regarding the Champlain market site and the proposed docks and grain elevators situated along the front of the St. Lawrence river, Quebec.

I beg to move this motion:

Motion agreed to.

DR. MICHEL FISET.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Lavigueur) I move on his behalf resolution No. 32:

For copy of all papers, documents and letters in connection with Dr. Michel Fiset, of Quebec city, appointment by Order in Council, dated 18th April, 1914, as parcel post supervisor in Quebec city, with a salary of $2,800 a year.

Motion agreed to.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. LAPOINTE:

For a copy of a letter sent on January 30, 1920, to the Right Honourable Sir George Foster, Acting Prime Minister, by J. T. Ross, Esq., President of the Quebec Board of Trade, concerning the intention of the Government to build in Canada a number of 15,000-ton passenger steamships with a speed of 18 knots for the Canadian service, and a copy of the letter in answer thereto.

Mr. LAPOINTE:

For a copy of a letter of the Board of Trade of Quebec to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, dated December 29, 1919, concerning the loss of the Government steamship Canadian Recruit and the accident to the Government steamer Canadian Spinner and other accidents due to want of icebreakers, and a copy of the letter in answer thereto.

Mr. LAPOINTE:

For a copy of a letter from J. T. Ross, Esq., President of the Quebec Board of Trade, to D. B. Hanna, Esq., President of the Canadian National Railways, concerning certain facts in connection with the operation of the Government railways and the ocean shipping business of the port of Quebec, and a copy of the answer to said letter.

Mr. LAPOINTE:

For a copy of a letter from the Board of Trade of the city of Quebec to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, dated October 24, 1919, concerning the new policy adopted by the ocean mail steamers of not stopping at Quebec in their outward voyage, and a copy of the answer to said letter.

Mr. LAPOINTE:

For a copy of a letter signed by twenty-two senators and members of the House of Commons representing the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, addressed to Sir Robert L. Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, dated September, 1919, recommending the shipment of grain by rail via Quebec; also a copy of the answer to such letter as well as the letters sent by J. T. Ross, Esq., President of the Quebec Board of Trade, to the Minister of Railways and Canals during the months of January and February, 1920, concerning export

of wheat via Quebec, and of the letters of the Minister of Railways and Canals in answer thereto.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

For the production of copies of all letters telegrams, papers and correspondence exchanged between the Department of Agriculture and others in reference to the establishment of a Demonstration Farm at Baie St. Paul, in the county of Charlevoix.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

For the production of copies of all rules of court made by the different Superior Courts of Criminal Jurisdiction of Canada according to the provisions of section 576 of the Criminal Code.

On motion of Sir George Foster the House returned to the Orders of the Day.

REPORT NOT PRINTED AS ORDERED.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, I desire to call your attention, and that of the Government, to an irregularity in the carrying out of the order of the House passed at the last session of Parliament. On the motion of the hon. the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), who was then acting as chairman of the special committee on Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, the House unanimously decided:

That the report of the special committee on Bill No. 10, an Act to amend the Department of Soldiers' Re-establishment Act, the minutes of their proceedings and the evidence taken by them and presented to the House on the 31st October, together with a suitable index to be prepared by the clerk of the committee, be printed in the appendix to the Journals of the present session.

That one thousand extra copies in English and 250 extra copies in French of the said report, minutes, proceedings and evidence—

be printed. It is apparent that no French copies are available or were available at any time. Upon inquiry by some hon. members of the secretary of the special committee sitting this year, and of the distribution office, it is found that no French copies are available and it appears that there never were any French copies available. I am now directing your attention to the subject because some hon. members of the House would like to have copies of this report printed in French.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Order evidently was not carried out.

Mr. BELAND: Evidently.

Mr. SPEAKER: This matter is entirely new to me. It has not been before me in any official way. I shall have immediate inquiry made—although I have no doubt the facts are as stated by the hon. member—and find out the reason why the order was not obeyed.

PRIVILEGE—Mr. KAY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker I rise to a question of privilege. In the Ottawa Citizen of this morning I find a statement which is untrue, misleading and absolutely false. In mentioning a few remarks I made yesterday on the Oleomargarine Bill this paper speaks of "Fred. Kay, member for Mississippi." I wish to absolutely deny that I represent any part of the United States in this House whether it be Mississippi, or even Missouri. I am proud to say I was born and bred a Canadian, that I intend to stay one, and that I have the honour of representing in this House one of the oldest and best counties in the eastern townships, namely Missisquoi.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. S. F. Tolmie (Minister of Agriculture) Bill No. 104 to amend the Inspection and Sale Act was read a second time and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Section prescribing sizes of apple barrels, fruit boxes, etc; penalty section and section authorizing minister to appoint inspectors, etc., repealed:

Mr. BUREAU: We are repealing four sections of the Act of 1918. Will the minister tell us what these sections are? I see in the marginal note that they prescribe the size of apple barrels, and fruit boxes and provide for penalties in case of contravention. Will the minister read the sections we are repealing? I see by the other section that we are not substituting what we are enacting now for these sections. How will the matter stand when they are repealed?

Mr. TOLMIE: In 1918 a conference was held of fruit men, package manufacturers and representatives of the Government fruit branch with a view to arriving at some satisfactory arrangement, with regard to fruit packing—the nature and quality of the packages and the different fruits that will be held in these different packages. It was found that the provisions of the Act did not work out very well and it is proposed to repeal section 325, relating to

apple packages and section 326 relating to berry packages with a view to having these governed by regulations so that they can be changed from time to time to meet the changing situation. A recent conference was held of fruit men, Government representatives and fruit package manufacturers and they agreed that this is the best system to follow in order to meet the situation. Sections 320 and 333 (b) refer to penalties and also give the Governor-in-Council power to make regulations.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. gentleman refers to a conference that was held between departmental officials and representatives of the fruit trade. Did that conference represent the fruit interests of all the provinces? The fruit industry is a very wide one; it affects the Atlantic provinces, the Pacific coast, and to some extent Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. TOLMIE: I am informed by the representative of the fruit branch that this was a very representative meeting.

Mr. FIELDING: Were representatives of the Nova Scotia fruit growing industry present?

Mr. TOLMIE: I will be able to find that out definitely for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FIELDING: All I want to know is whether they concur in what is being done.

Mr. BUREAU: If I understand the minister the Act of 1918 laid down rules as to the package of apples, berries, etc. To-day this power is being taken away from Parliament and it is proposed to give authority to certain officials of the department to control this matter by regulations that shall be adopted by the department. I must again make a complaint that I have made before. We should have before us sections 325 and 326 of the Inspection and Sale Act of 1918. As it is we do not know what the purport of those sections is. If the sections were printed on one side of the Bill we could gather their purport at a glance and readily comprehend what changes it is proposed to make. As far as I can see it is now contemplated to take away jurisdiction from Parliament and vest it in the minister or the officials of his department. I would like to know the nature of the provisions in question and in what respect they were found defective by the meeting of the fruit growers as my hon. friend has just stated. What particular regulation is complained of by the Fruit Growers' Association? In these sections it is stated what the dimensions of the package should be and how the apples should be packed. If the provisions of the law as they stand are defective why not make the correction here, instead of requiring Parliament to abandon the right of making regulations for the packing of fruit and vesting the power in the officials of the department.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause one carry?

Mr. BUREAU: No, I want an answer to the question I have just put to the minister.

Mr. TOLMIE: I might say that the dimensions and specifications of the various fruit packages contained in these sections were unanimously approved, as I said before, at a meeting of delegates from the various provinces held in Ottawa on March 26, 1918, and were embodied in Bill No. 108 which was passed on May 24 of that year. It has since been demonstrated that owing to the highly technical character of these sections, which have to do with the dimensions, capacity, and quality of material in some of the containers, the manufacturers have found it difficult, in some cases, to meet all the requirements.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister has now at his desk an official of his department to advise him. In order that the official in question may understand what I mean I might repeat that as a result of a conference of fruit growers the law of 1918 was passed. I want to know in what particular respect the fruit growers complained against the regulations which were enacted by Parliament?

Mr. TOLMIE: One of the objections was that in Nova Scotia it was necessary to increase the length of the stave and widen the capacity of the barrel—it being of soft wood—so as to contain the same amount as the hardwood barrel.

Mr. FIELDING: Would my hon. friend be able now to answer the question I troubled him with a moment ago as to whether at the latest conference the fruit growers of Nova Scotia were represented?

Mr. TOLMIE: It was a Dominion-wide representation.

Mr. FIELDING: That is a very general answer, but sometimes a conference with Dominion-wide representation is not attended by representatives from all sections. I desire to know whether the fruit growers of Nova Scotia were represented, and if so by whom.

Mr. TOLMIE: In this case Nova Scotia was represented by Mr. McMahon, and the secretary of the Nova Scotia Fruit Growers' Association.

Mr. FIELDING: Those are very excellent gentlemen, and I thank my hon. friend for the information. I am satisfied myself, and I am sure the House is equally satisfied that the hon. gentleman has only good objects in proposing these changes. The minister will see, however, that he is rather running up against—the sentiment of the House, shall I call it? There has been a good deal of talk in recent times with respect to government by Order in Council—

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING: —in fact, a few days ago an hon. gentleman on the Government side spoke very strongly against the ministry undertaking to do things by regulation. It is a very embarrassing question, but I think my hon. friend's object is good; and with the assurance that the fruit growers of my own province have been consulted in the matter, I have no desire to do otherwise than give my consent to the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: It is not a question with me of consulting the fruit growers of Quebec, but it is a question of principle. What reason has the minister for taking into his own hands the power of regulating the packing of fruit in Canada? Did anybody ask for this alteration?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: The only reason the minister gives is that the regulations enacted after the conference of 1918 will force the Nova Scotia people to lengthen the staves of their barrels. If that is the only thing that has given rise to the proposed change, I would propose that we legislate so as to allow the Nova Scotia fruit growers to have a package which will conform with the usage heretofore followed in that province, and to have smaller barrels to pack their fruit in. I am not willing to abandon the privileges of Parliament simply for the purpose of shortening the staves of a barrel by one-half or three-quarters of an inch. I would not consent to the changes proposed except the minister were able to show that they were demanded by the fruit growers throughout the Dominion. It appears, however, that the only objection comes from Nova Scotia that it would involve shortening the staves in the barrels there. I do not think that is sufficient.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. TOLMIE: The change in the barrel is not due to any personal whim of either the minister or any of the officials of the fruit branch, but to a request from Nova Scotia that the barrel be standardized.

Mr. McCOIG: Will the barrel be of the same size in Nova Scotia as in the other provinces under the new regulation?

Mr. TOLMIE: The same capacity.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the use of the change? If Nova Scotia is forced to change its barrel the minister certainly cannot allege that that change is required because Nova Scotia is affected by the legislation.

Mr. TOLMIE: In Nova Scotia, where soft wood is used both for heads and staves, it is necessary to increase the length of staves in order to secure the legal capacity. The experience of the Fruit Branch is that these matters are of a highly technical nature and that it is far more practicable to have them adjusted after consulting the growers and others interested than to wait for a session of Parliament.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Has Nova Scotia now the same size barrel as Ontario?

Mr. TOLMIE: The same capacity.

Mr. ROBB: The legislation of 1918 was not put through hastily; it was preceded by careful consultation with the different fruit growers throughout all the provinces. Now, a year later, the minister suggests another change, not so much at the instance of the fruit growers and fruit dealers as at the instance of those who manufacture the barrels and packages. Have we any assurance that the minister will not soon come before us again asking us for further changes? All these changes involve additional cost and add to the high cost of living. Barrels that were used in prevous years in the domestice trade can be used again this year. Barrels are very scarce and are very expensive, the price having almost doubled within the last five years. The minister may enact legislation that will make absolutely useless the barrels that were used last year, and that additional cost will ultimately come back on the consumer. It seems to me that the minister should make haste slowly and not grant legislation from year to year simply to suit the whims of the manufacturer of packages.

Mr. TOLMIE: The whole movement is designed to standardize fruit barrels all over the continent. It was made at the instiga-

tion of the fruit growers themselves. Sufficient time is permitted for them to use up their old packages. I am not anxious, and I know that the department is not anxious, to make unnecessary changes, but if a change would be a distinct improvement upon what we have had, I cannot guarantee that I will not take action.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I wish to register my protest against too much legislation by Order in Council. This is a very serious matter. As my hon. friend (Mr. Robb) has pointed out, the barrels that were in the trade last year will be used again this year. Barrels that were formerly purchased at 22 cents now cost from 80 cents to $1 each, and that is quite an item to the fruit growers. Moreover, the fruit growers have never any knowledge of what may happen. Orders in Council are published in the Canada Gazette and only one fruit grower in a thousand ever sees them. The fruit grower may be proceeding on the idea that the regulations are the same as they were last year, whereas they may have been changed over night.

Mr. TOLMIE: I have pointed out that the grower is given ample time in which to use the barrels in his possession. There is always a free and full discussion before any action of this kind is taken. I have stated that this legislation was discussed with the fruit growers in every province of the Dominion that is interested in fruit growing.

Mr. BUREAU: If this consultation with the fruit growers resulted in anything definite, the minister ought to know about it by this time. Surely we are entitled to know what changes he proposes when he takes into his own hands the power of making regulations. If he does not know, we should let the Bill stand until he does know. If he does know, he should tell us what changes are proposed. I do not think that we ought to relinquish our right to legislate in these matters and permit them to be dealt with by Order in Council.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the clause carry?

Mr. BUREAU: Lost.

Section 1 carried on division.

On section 2—power to make regulations extended:

Mr. BUREAU: What is the section which is here repealed?

Mr. TOLMIE: It reads as follows:

> The Governor in Council may make such regulations as he considers necessary in order to secure the efficient enforcement and operation of this Part, and may by such regulations provide for the imposition of penalties not exceeding thirty dollars on any person offending against them; and the regulations so made shall be in force from the date of their publication in The Canada Gazette, or from such other date as is specified in the proclamation in that behalf; and the violation of any such regulation shall be deemed an offence against this Part and punishable as such.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand the minister to say that under the old Act the penalty is a fine of $30?

Mr. TOLMIE: The repeal of sections 330 and 330B is desired in order that the penalties may be made uniform. At the present time the Act is inconsistent as regards the maximum penalty that may be imposed on any person violating any of the regulations. The Order in Council dated September 14, 1901, passed under authority of the Fruit Marks Act, then in force, gave the Governor in Council authority to make regulations for the enforcement of the Act and to impose penalties not exceeding $50, while section 333B provides a maximum penalty of $30.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not see any inconsistency. The Bill provides that the Governor in Council may make regulations and provide for a penalty not exceeding $30. If I understand aright the reading of that typewritten sheet, the minister says that an Order in Council was passed providing for a penalty of $30. To-day this section goes further; it reads:

> (d) to prescribe penalties not exceeding fifty dollars, and, in default of payment of any such penalty, imprisonment for any term not exceeding one month, for the violation of the said regulations, which penalties shall be recoverable upon summary conviction under part XV of the Criminal Code.

We are to-day taking away from Parliament the right to regulate a matter of Trade and Commerce which concerns all the people of Canada and which is, therefore, a matter that should be known by all the people of Canada. As was rightly said by an hon. gentleman opposite a few minutes ago, while it is all very well to promulgate the decress of the Governor in Council by publication in the Canada Gazette, the Canada Gazette is read by very few people except those who are immediately interested. Therefore, I do not think it is fair that the Governor in Council should have the right to make regulations which heretofore have been made by Parliament, and to have the power to send people to jail if they contravene these regulations when, as

a matter of fact, the people who contravene them have no opportunity, I might say, to know what the regulations are, and the point that these publications in the official Gazette are not seen by the people the same as laws that are enacted by Parliament, is a good point. If every fruit grower in Canada has to take the official Gazette in order to find out whether he is packing or shipping fruit within the four corners of the section of the Statute, you are asking from that man something that is practically impossible, and you reserve to yourself the right, if that man does not conform with those regulations, to fine him $50 or send him to jail. I would call the thing iniquitous.

Mr. TOLMIE: There is no lack of publicity about any new regulations. They are published in the agricultural and horticultural press, which is obtainable in all parts of the country, and then at all the fruit meetings they are very fully discussed before and after the regulations are put into force, so that all the fruit growers have a very full knowledge of the law. As regards prosecution, no prosecution is carried out unless there are clear-cut grounds of fraud or of an attempt to defeat the law.

Mr. DEVLIN: I should like to second the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau). The great trouble in this country is that we have had too much Government by Order in Council, and the people now want a little bit of responsibility by the Government. It has been the custom of this Government, from its very inception, simply to pass on to somebody else the responsibility which it should assume. We have had instances galore of Government irresponsibility through Order in Council. In other words, to make myself clear, hon. gentlemen opposite who form the Government to-day, who are responsible to the people by the constitution of this country, have preferred to make by Order in Council all their regulations, even regulations extending the Acts of this Parliament. We have had it in the case of oleomargarine; we have had it in regard to all the important legislation that we have had this session. What is the important legislation we have had? We have had amendments to the Opium and Drug Act, to the Oleomargarine Act; we have had amendments to certain Acts which have had for their purpose to legislate us right into heaven. The next thing we know is that some Order in Council will be passed which will transfer us, even without death, right into heaven. The people of this country want to know the legislation that is being passed; they want to be familiar with each part of the legislation, and I would point out to the Minister of Agriculture, who is a new minister and who is, perhaps, not as familiar as he might be with conditions prevailing throughout the whole of Canada, that the less Government we have by Order in Council, the better for the Government, the better for the people who support the Government and the better for the people for whom the Government is supposed to act. We should not have Orders in Council changing, perhaps radically, portions of the legislation now sought to be passed, changing regulations which should be known first to the representatives of the people in order that they may give their opinion, because we have in this House men sent here from all portions of Canada to represent different classes. We have here any number of members like myself representing agricultural communities. We have men like my hon. friends down at the other end of the Chamber representing the National Progressive party. In some parts of the country they call themselves United Farmers; they are National Progressives. They have not yet begun to act under Order in Council, but the Minister of Agriculture has. He is hardly in the Government before he proposes to change the legislation of this country by Order in Council. I call the minister's attention to this, and I hope he will suspend the operation of his Bill until such time as he finds out some other way by which the representatives of the people may pass legislation than by Order in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: We repeal here two sections, sections 325 and 326. Section 325 relates to fruit packages and section 326 to berries and currants. In the same Act of 1918, section 328 provides:

> Every person who, by himself or through the agency of any other person, violates any of the provisions of sections 320 and 321 of this Act, shall be liable, upon summary conviction, for the first offence, to a fine not exceeding $25 and not less than $10; for the second offence, to a fine not exceeding $50; and not less than $25.

And so on.

> —and to imprisonment.

The penalties are graded as the offence is continued; but under this we abandon the right of punishing violators of the law, and we give to the Governor in Coun-

cil power to make such regulations as will land in jail the man who violates section 333B, if he does not pay his fine. I again object to this section, and I think, as my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) said, that we had enough of this legislation by Order in Council during the war. Those were abnormal times, and in those times were willing to allow a great deal of latitude to the Governor in Council so that he might be able to do all sorts of things. But to-day the war is over, and we want to bring things back to normal as quickly as possible and that will not be brought about by continuing the same system as was continued during the war, namely, of curtailing the rights of Parliament and increasing the powers of the Governor in Council in regard to various matters. I want to register my protest against this provision. If sections 325 and 326 required to be remedied they should be remedied here. If the minister has discovered any flaws in the working of the Act, let him state them to the committee. We are asked to hand over all our powers to the minister and he will not tell us what changes he proposes to make by regulations, or what flaws have been discovered in the Act. Parliament is certainly entitled to know these things, and if the minister would give us an explanatory statement we should be able to judge whether it was necessary that he and his department should be the sole judges of what legislation ought to be passed concerning fruit growing, fruit packing and fruit shipping.

Mr. ROBB: In view of the opposition that has developed to this legislation not only from this side of the House, but from supporters fo the ministry, may I suggest to the minister that it would expedite business if he would postpone further consideration of this Bill, and have it referred to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. STACEY: Hon. members who have knowledge of the matter which is referred to in this clause of the Bill will readily realize the importance of some such step as is now proposed by the minister. I happen to know that the Dominion Government in conjunction with certain Provincial Governments is seeking to standardize containers of certain fruits which are produced in this Dominion. It is very essential that there should be uniformity throughout the entire country in this matter. It would be almost ludicrous, were it not so serious, to hear hon. members speaking of determining here in this House what shall be the size of certain fruit containers. I venture to say that there is only a small number of men here in touch with the fruit business who are in a position to form any definite judgment upon these matters, even though they be the representatives of the people. If those who are directly engaged in the business throughout the various provinces can by co-ordination and co-operation with the Dominion authorities come to an unanimous conclusion regarding size of containers and other matters, that is the goal to be reached, and that I am satisfied is the purpose of this Bill. It is, from my point of view, entirely aside from the question to call this proposed legislation "legislation by Order in Council." The purpose of these amendments is to secure fair play for all, in the interests of the industry and in the interests of consumers. Hence the desire to secure uniformity. That is the object of the Bill, and I sincerely hope that it will carry.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Notwithstanding the remarks which have just been made and the risk I may be incurring of being considered one of those who have no knowledge or experience in connection with this matter, I must say that I do not view with approval the clause which is now before the committee, authorizing the Governor in Council to fix the dimensions and capacity of all containers. We were told by the minister when the first clause was under consideration that a uniform container or barrel had been decided on for all Canada. That being the case, I do not see any reason why it should not be mentioned in the Bill. The minister has told us that these regulations are all published in the agricultural and horticultural press of the country, and that those who are interested in the business will familiarize themselves with the regulations which may be enacted. People under certain circumstances may possibly afford to go it blind, provided they have absolute confidence in the wisdom of such a policy, but under present conditions, and in connection with a measure of this kind, I do not think it is advisable or in the public interest to be continually changing the style or size of these containers. I think we ought to have a uniform package for fruits, and it should be mentioned in the Bill so that people would know whether or not they were violating one of the statutes of this country. To do these things by means of regulations which are not yet known is surely not in keeping with the form of government we have in this country. We are asked to pass legislation delegating certain powers to the Government,

without any knowledge of the regulations that are to be drawn up. If that system was adopted in connection with all the business that came before Parliament, we might just as well stay home and let the Government carry on the business itself. Personally, I think this is a case where we should state clearly and definitely what the size of the containers shall be. Then people would know that the size was fixed by statute, and would not be changed by regulations which might hereafter be passed.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. member (Mr. Stacey) seems to think that because a man is not a fruit grower he should not take part in anything that interests the people of this country. When he told us that we knew nothing about fruit growing, I do not know whether he wanted us to infer that he did know something about it and was in fact getting up and addressing the committee as an authority. If it is really true, I am glad to know that he knows something about something.

We do not stand here in the interests of the fruit growers or the makers of packages. We stand here for principle, in the interests of the taxpayers of Canada. This is not simply a case of determining the size of barrels or boxes for the packing of fruit. Parliament passed certain legislation after a conference with the fruit growers of Canada. They certainly know something about the growing and packing and shipping of fruit, as much no doubt, as my hon. friend (Mr. Stacey). They are also taxpayers of this country, and they have sent representatives here to this Parliament to exercise the powers which the constitution gives them and not to delegate those powers to the Governor in Council. We are here to represent the people and legislate for them. My hon. friend (Mr. Stacey) may choose to carry on the business of this country by Order in Council, but I, for my part, will not accept that principle. I think this Bill is wrong in principle because it asks Parliament to divest itself of rights which it has exercised, and wisely exercised, after taking all due precautions by consulting those interested in this industry in this country. The legislation which was passed in 1919 was assented to by all the fruit growers of this country. If in the working out of the Act there has been discovered any flaw or something wrong, I say we are entitled to know what those flaws are, and what it is we are asked to remedy. I think we should have a statement from the minister as to the evils he desires to correct, and

I say further that it is the duty of this Parliament to provide the remedy and not divest itself of its responsibility and privilege of enacting legislation with respect to these matters.

Mr. TOLMIE: I should like to give a little more information. I have already referred to the apple barrel which will contain 7056 cubic inches. It has been found necessary to make a change with respect to the berry baskets, because the express companies practically gave the fruit men to understand that they would cease to carry the fruit in the old package on account of the loss entailed. Under the old conditions the packages contained sloping sides. They are now being made nearly straight in the sides and will contain the same quantities as before, 11 quarts and 6 quarts. This safer carriage of fruit of course means cheaper fruit for every one. These conferences are held by the fruit men and all these matters are carefully discussed with representatives from all over the country, and there is no doubt that the delegates that come to these meetings have previously consulted all the fruit men in their respective districts, so that you really get the opinion of the best fruit men from all over Canada. I know, as a civil servant who has spent a number of years in the Health of Animal and Live Stock branches, that in many cases circumstances have occurred that made Orders in Council necessary, for very serious losses might have taken place had matters been held up until such time as legislation could come before Parliament. I do not wish in any way to push this matter unduly. I desire to do the right thing by hon. members, and if in their opinion this legislation should be referred to the committee on agriculture I am quite willing to accept that view.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the clause carry?

Mr. BUREAU: I understand that the minister is willing to refer the matter to the committee on agriculture, and that appears to be the opinion of all hon. members. It is desirable that we should have a thorough discussion of the subject in the light of further information.

The CHAIRMAN: If it is desired to refer the Bill to the select standing committee on agriculture there must be a motion to report progress. When the Bill is before the House it can be referred by the House to that committee.

Mr. TOLMIE: I move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. TOLMIE: I move, Mr. Speaker, that Bill No. 104, which we have just had under consideration be referred to the committee on agriculture.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion can, of course, be entertained only by unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT.

The Houe resumed from May 4, consideration in committee of Bill No. 12 (Hon. Mr. Guthrie) respecting the election of members of the House of Commons and the electoral franchise.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When progress was reported upon this Bill on Tuesday evening, all of the clauses and schedules had been read and considered.

Mr. BUREAU: Before we proceed, Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to draw the attention of the Acting Solicitor General to the fact that although he made the statement last night that the term "election papers" had been used in several clauses, I have failed to find those words after a perusal of the Bill? I ran through the Bill hurriedly this morning but could not find the words "election papers" anywhere. Would the minister indicate in what particular sections those words appear?

Mr. GUTHRIE: At the present moment I can only ask my hon. friend to compare his copy of the Bill with the copy at the Clerk's table. In some twelve or thirteen places we have struck out the words "ballot papers" and replaced them with the words "election papers." These would appear in all clauses relating to the return which has to be made by the Chief Electoral Officer, and in those clauses which provide for the sending of papers from that officer to the various ridings.

Mr. BUREAU: I read the whole Bill through this morning but I could not find the words "election papers."

Mr. GUTHRIE: You have not amended your copy as we have gone along.

The CHAIRMAN: When progress was reported last evening all of the clauses and schedules has been read and considered. Paragraph (k) of clause 2, clauses 19, 29, 32, 37, 44, 45, 63, 76 and 101, the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Gloucester to clause 37, the amendment proposed by the hon. the Acting Solicitor General to clause 44, and several forms in the schedules to the Bill had been allowed to stand for further consideration. The other clauses and forms had been adopted. Clauses 19 and 76 which provide for the expenditure of money by the Government still await the approval by the House of the required resolution. We have now reached clause 101. Shall that clause carry?

Mr. TWEEDIE: With the consent of the committee, Mr. Chairman, I should like to revert to clause 39, which has been passed, for the purpose of submitting an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: It is, of course, only by unanimous consent that this motion can be made. The hon. member moves that the committee return to clause 39, which has already been agreed to. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Clause 39 refers to the disqualification of candidates. In the consideration of the subsection which had relation to campaign expenses of candidates, a discussion arose incidentally touching the subject of agreements which are in the nature of a recall, and at that time I submitted that we should have legislation on the statute which would cover that point, so as to disqualify from holding a seat in the House any man who signed his resignation in advance of an election or who entered into any agreement which in itself might operate as a recall, placing in the hands of a committee, whether large or small, the power to demand his resignation. Undoubtedly there has been an endeavour, especially in the West, to engraft upon our constitution something which is not in the least degree adapted to it or to the laws of any of the provinces. And while repeated efforts have been made to induce Provincial Governments in the West to enact legislation in the nature of a recall, something of that character having been done in Manitoba, although I believe it was subsequently disallowed by the Privy Council the majority of the provinces have refused to go that length, but have introduced legislation in the form of an initiative and referendum. By the initiative and referendum the electors are given the power to draft initiatory legislation and forward it to the Provincial Legis-

latures for adoption. The referendum could thus take all legislation from the Government and submit it to the people for their approval.

These are not the questions that I propose to discuss to-day but I intend to confine myself to the amendment to this section which I propose to introduce and which will deal simply with the question of the recall in so far as it may be made a disqualification for any candidate at an election. I think that the question of the recall, whether it may have justification, or whether it may have advocates, cannot be introduced into this country but when we get down to the scientific recall which has been adopted in a great many of the western states we find that the power which is given by the recall is not reposed in the hands of any individual, and it is not reposed in the hands of any committee which may be selected by any particular group, but the recall, no matter whether the percentage of those who are required to sign the petition for recall be large or small, is a power which, in theory, is reposed in the body of the electors and the electors as a whole are entitled to exercise it.

What do we find to be the system which is being adopted in this country? There is no pretence whatever to repose power in the majority of the people. There is no pretence to repose in the people, as electors, the right to circulate and sign a petition to recall a man from the legislature but the right is exercised as the result of a bargain. The man who is a candidate in many cases is asked to sign his recall before the people have even had a chance to vote whether he shall represent them or not. In the case which we have cited in this House by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould), we find that an agreement is entered into between the candidate and a committee of fifteen men. These fifteen men are not the choice of the people of the country. They are generally men who are closely allied with a political organization and the object of the agreement is that that committee of men who are bound by party ties shall exercise a jurisdiction over the man who has been elected to represent the people in the House of Commons. As I pointed out before, I believe that any such method as that simply results in the stultification of the man who occupies a seat in this House. When he comes here he must realize that, if he is an honourable man and has entered into an agreement with these fifteen men, or with any committee, he is bound to obey the dictates of those fifteen men and if they say: "You shall vote for some particular piece of legislation," he must either violate his agreement and become a dishonourable man or follow the dictates or instructions which they give to him. It is fettering him in deciding the course that he shall pursue, and it is fettering him in the performance of the duty which he owes to the people as a whole. The results which were pointed out by Edmund Burke in a speech which he made to the electors of Bristol when he was withdrawing from the contest there, are working out in the same way in this connection. Mr. Burke says:

> Let me say, with plainness, I who am no longer in a public character, that, if, by a fair, by an indulgent, by a gentlemanly behaviour to our representatives, we do not give confidence to their minds and a liberal scope to their understandings, if we do not permit our members to act upon a very enlarged view of things, we shall at length infallibly degrade our national representation into a confused and scuffling bustle of local agency.

A man who signs any such agreement with a committee is simply a delegate to this House and not the representative of the people of his constituency or a representative of the people of the whole of Canada. If the people of this country desire the recall, I submit, it is their duty to bring about such a change in our constitution as will permit it but it is not their right to attack and subvert the constitution and try to introduce into our system something that is unconstitutional; or to try to defeat the ends of our constitution or to make the House of Commons which is supposed to be representative, unrepresentative. When they get the constitution amended so that the recall may be properly adopted under it it will be time for us to determine whether or not we shall have the recall in this country. Personally I think it would be a very unsafe thing to have brought into the political life of Canada. I submit that any of these agreements which are entered into at the present time, any recall which may be signed in advance, should be ground for disqualifying the man who signed it to hold a seat in this House because he does not come as the servant of the people as a whole but simply comes as the delegate or agent of a few people in whose hands he places his resignation, or with whom he has entered into such an agreement. I do not propose to take any longer time. I am bringing this before the House for the purpose of getting a free expression of opinion and I shall now read my amendment. I beg to move:

That clause 39 be amended by inserting, as paragraph (h) of subclause 1, the following words:

"(h) Persons who have signed any agreement, whether amounting to a resignation, a recall or otherwise, which would in any manner whatsoever limit the independence of such person in the event of his being elected member of the House of Commons."

Mr. FIELDING: With my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) I have little admiration for the recall. In these progressive days, so-called, there is a demand among many excellent citizens for a plan of political action which is described as the initiative, referendum and recall. I do not find myself able to join in that demand. The referendum is occasionally necessary. We have it in our municipal affairs, we have it in the Scott Act, and we are going to have it under the Act which we adopted last session in connection with the question of prohibition throughout the Dominion. We are all in a measure joining in the referendum from time to time. The initiative has less to recommend it, although I speak with great respect because I know very many people in the country regard it as one of the things which modern politics require.

In regard to the recall, I entirely disapprove of it. I have no sympathy whatever with the recall, but why should I prevent any man in any part of Canada supporting the recall system if he wants it? I regard it as an unwise thing on the part of the farmers, but if they are pleased to regard it as a part of wisdom, and they want to establish the recall amongst themselves, I do not see why we should by legislation deny them that privilege.

I may think it is not the best form of legislation; I may think we would be very unwise in passing it; I would not vote for a candidate who signed a recall pledge; I think good reasons could be shown why the recall ought not to commend itself to the best judgment of the country; I regard it as a matter entirely belonging to—shall I say the internal economy of the Farmers' Party; but if it pleases them I do not see why they should not be allowed to have it. We may do very many things which in the eyes of our neighbours are unreasonable and foolish, but we would not legislate against them. If the farmers say they will not vote for a red-headed man I might think it is unwise, but if it pleases them it does not hurt me—let them have the privilege if they choose. They may say they will not vote for a man who wears good clothes—we have these days a movement for the wearing of overalls—and they will only vote for the man who belongs to the Old Clothes Brigade. That is perhaps very commendable, but I do not think it is a matter for legislation in any shape or form. I strongly urge upon my hon. friend from Calgary—with whose views concerning the recall I largely sympathize—not to treat it as a matter for legislation at all. Let us leave the recall to the people of this country; let them try it a bit. I believe the best thing we can do in the case of some of these so-called modern reforms is to give the people a chance to try them out and they will discover very often that they do not produce the great results they hoped for. With reference to the recall, if it pleases our farmer friends to have it as part of their platform, let them have it within themselves, and I think they will get tired of it eventually.

Mr. R. H. HALBERT (Ontario, N.): I think my hon. friend (Mr. Tweedie) is mistaken as to the working of the recall. In the first place, no committee has a right to recall the member who has been elected until they have had placed in their hands a petition signed by from sixty to seventy-five per cent of the electors of that riding; and for my part I would not want to hold a seat in the House if seventy-five per cent of the people in my constituency did not wish me to be here. No doubt some hon. gentlemen fear the idea of a recall because it might prevent them from getting a judgeship or a seat in the Senate. Take it in connection with the running of a business. Suppose I were a business man, and my hon. friend from Calgary came along to me and said he wanted to hire a manager. Let us suppose a conversation took place along this line: "Halbert, will you take the job?" "Yes, under certain conditions." Very well, name your conditions." "My conditions are: First, that you engage me for four years and in that time you cannot sack me. If in that four years I think my services are worth more to you than they are at present, and I wish to have my salary raised, you must not object. Or, if I see a better job in those four years I wish to be at liberty to resign. I will take that better position and you can have no comeback." If I hired a man under such an arrangement as that it would be up to my friends to look after me, because I would certainly need their care. But that is the way in which members of Parliament have in the past been elected, and that is why the recall finds a place in our platform. However, my reason for speaking was to

put the hon. member right in this respect—that no committee of ten or twelve has any power to put the recall into effect until they have had presented to them a petition signed by sixty or seventy-five per cent of the electors of that riding. And if that percentage of the electors do not want the member to remain in Parliament I do not see why he should stay there. I can see the fear which some hon. gentlemen entertain. If I may use the expression without irreverence, they have had the fear of God put into their hearts by reason of the adoption of the recall platform. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to return home when seventy-five per cent of the electors in my riding say so. In conclusion, in order to put the hon. member right upon another point, let me say that I did not sign any recall—I was not asked to.

Mr. D. L. REDMAN (Calgary E.): I am not clear as to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Halbert) meant by stating that if sixty to seventy-five per cent of the people of his constituency were opposed to him he would not wish to retain his seat. Let me say further that I do not believe that any such percentage of the electors in his constituency voted for that hon. gentleman when he was elected some few months ago.

Before proceeding further with a discussion of this matter, I think it is well that we should clearly recognize the difference between the real or radical recall and the signed resignation with which we are dealing to-day. The recall—which usually goes with the initiative and the referendum—is a matter of legislation, and may form the subject of an Act introduced by a ministry to deal with the election of members of Parliament. That policy is now in existence in many of the states of the American Union. In general terms it provides that sometimes twenty-five per cent, and sometimes fifty per cent of the voters in any constituency may petition for the holding of a new election, and when the requisite petition has been duly filed a new election is held. A majority vote will then elect either the sitting member or any candidate who runs against him. That is the way in whcih the real, or radical, recall operates. It has been in existence for many years in various states of the Union, and even to-day after years of experience opinion is greatly divided as to the benefit which has been derived from that legislation. Perusing a book of Professor Barnett, of the university of Oregon, written in 1915, dealing with the results of the operation of the recall in that state, I find he cites three cases which may be briefly stated as follows: First, the case of a mayor who was asked to resign on the supposition that he had diverted public funds from their proper channel; but it was pointed out that the real reason was that he had wished to open certain streets which some property owners had closed, and they taking advantage of the recall had brought these charges against him and had him defeated. In the next case a charge of immorality was brought against the official, and it turned out that the real question at issue was a fight between two banks which had had control of the city for some time. The third case was where an official was accused of diverting public funds but it transpired that the real reason for the demand for his recall was that the anti-prohibition forces wished to get rid of him on account of his stringent enforcement of the prohibition law. Let me say that I am not making an argument against a scientific, radical recall; I am simply pointing out the nature of the first three cases which arose in the state referred to. If you refer to the book in question you will find that the same conditions prevailed in case after case—that is, the recall was practically never used to get rid of an improper official, but was improperly used by people who had special financial reasons for invoking its use, and that its use was accompanied by gross misrepresentations of the character and efficiency of the man who was holding the position and by the inflaming of public passion. It is extremely doubtful whether any good resulted from the use of the system. However, that sort of recall is at least an attempt to give the people greater control over their representatives, and it is necessary that the people should have some way of getting rid of improper officials. As to the value of the real recall we are not to-day asked to vote for that principle; we are dealing to-day with an entirely different thing—the signed resignation. The signed resignation is as far from the recall as the north pole is from the south. The recall is an attempt at radical and advanced legislation; in the signed resignation I can see nothing but an attempt to perfect a political machine. No other conclusion can be come to. It is not a attempt to give the people greater power over their representatives; it is an attempt to defeat the will of the people and to take away from them the representative which they have just elected. In making these remarks I am not speaking of any arrange-

ment by any member of the House although the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) the other day stated that he had signed a resignation.

Mr. GOULD: I beg to differ from my hon. friend.

Mr. REDMAN: Well, he said he signed an agreement of that nature. He did not state the nature of the agreement and so we do not know what the nature of it is; or whether it is harmful or beneficial. But I am now discussing the problem itself as an abstract problem.

As the member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) has said, a member elected to this House is not necessarily only the representative of his own constituency. I think it is his duty first to lay before Parliament the rights and claims and needs of his own constituents, just as any counsel would do on behalf of his clients. But that done, it is his duty, in casting his vote, to have regard to the best interests of Canada as a whole; if necessary, to compromise on the interests or needs of his own constituents if that must be done in order that legislation in the best interests of Canada as a whole may be passed. That is my conception of the duty of a member of a British Parliament. How would it be possible for a member who had placed in the hands of an individual or a local committee a signed resignation, to represent the best interests of the whole of Canada? Is it possible for that man to represent all his constituents? Could it even be said that he represents the majority who elected him? While the individual or committee who hold his signed resignation may at the time of the election have had the confidence of or have been in agreement with the majority who elected the member, it does not follow that a year hence or two years hence when new problems come up, new issues have to be faced, this individual or this committee will be in agreement with the majority who elected the member. So that logically, by a process of reasoning to which there can be no answer, the only person or group of persons whom the member who has submitted a signed resignation can be said to represent are those who hold his resignation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have arising in this country new sorts of political parties, and I think that the question of "signed resignations" in relation to these new parties should be discussed. It would be extremely dangerous for political parties the basis of whose organization is a policy which they believe to be in the best interests of the country, to use this signed resignation. That being true it is exceptionally dangerous when the signed resignation is used in the case of a political party whose basic principle is the betterment in their view of an economic class. I think we must accept the principle that that is the basis of the new political parties that are arising. We may also conclude that members of an economic class party must of necessity legislate in the interests of that economic class. It may be that they will legislate at some time in the interests of all the people of Canada, but on the other hand it may be that the interests of their economic class will be opposed to the interests of all the people. If that be not true, then why do they organize as an economic class? Surely that argument need not be pressed further.

Now, if we have as members of this House representatives of political parties the bases of which are certain economic principles for economic classes, the committee or individual holding their signed resignations is bound to think solely along the lines of these economic principles. They are not here like the ordinary member, to hear the opinions of other economic classes; they are not here to hear the opinions of the representatives of other parts of Canada. They are away at a distance; they are naturally full of the ideas entertained by their own class, and they will restrain the free action of their member here under threat of filing his resignation with the Speaker if he does not fulfil their orders and act in accordance with what they consider to be the interests of their economic class.

But what are the other classes of this country to do? It may happen that this new formed economic class may have control of the Government of this country although the majority of the people may have voted against them as we see in the province of Ontario to-day. Who is going to take care of the other economic classes? Who is going to take care of the interests of the majority of the people if we have here groups of members who dominate the Government, who have left behind them in the various constituencies of Canada signed resignations and who have to act in exact accord with the local and class viewpoint, of the individuals who hold their resignations?

You may ask, why, if in the past we have never had such legislation as that pro-

posed by my hon. friend (Mr. Tweedie), it is necessary to ask for it now? For the first time in the history of this country we find a tendency on the part of political parties to use this signed resignation and when we are considering the Franchise Act under which the members of Parliament will in the future be elected, I believe it is the right time to get rid of this signed resignation business. It has nothing to do with the recall. It is, in my opinion, absolutely reactionary, and is brought forward for one reason and one reason only, that is, to perfect a political machine.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I think we ought to be careful when dealing with this matter about continually referring to the farmers as though they were entirely responsible for the idea of the recall in this country. Besides, I am not of the opinion that all the farmers of the country are of one thought and of one mind with those who are called the leaders of the farmers in this House. I am also of opinion that as soon as the farmers in general shall have discovered that their leaders are made of clay, a large number of them at all events will change their opinions very considerably. It is their gods that I attack; not the farmers as a class. For instance, I hold in my hand a pamphlet that was issued by the Tory Party in Alberta calling upon not only the farmers of that province, but everybody in the province to support the Opposition at the ensuing election because of their policy on the initiative, referendum and recall. So that our good Tories are as much at fault in that respect as the farmers.

I wish to say a few words with regard to the remarks made by the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), who says that "if the farmers want the recall, why, let them have it; if anybody wants anything, why, do not dispute it." I myself was to a certain extent in favour of the recall when I had not nearly as broad a view of politics as I have acquired since I came to Ottawa and have had opportunity to study the science of Government at closer range. What I see in the recall, whatever may be its form, is an intimidation of the member, who is asked to follow only a particular course and who must resign his seat if he does not follow that course. The clause that was put in the platform of the Conservative Party in Alberta with regard to the recall is as follows:

> The recall is a method by which electors may exercise direct control over a representative. If he acts contrary to their will, he may, on petition of a certain percentage of the electors of his constituency, be suspended from office. A new election is then declared, at which the so-called representative may stand. The operation of the initiative and referendum tends to lessen the necessity for the exercise of this right.

Mr. Chairman, if the recall in any form whatsoever means that you may have by-elections all over the country at any time, it is bad even from the point of view of expenditure. But that is of minor importance when you consider that the recall appeals to the intellectual and moral weakness of the candidate, because it characterizes his whole course with a lack of courage in that he may not use his intelligence and his judgment for the best interests of Canada. It so controls or intimidates him that he may vote in this House against his conscience, and when he does that, it is a form of corruption. The recall in any form whatsoever is bad, and contrary to the opinion of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), I say that if the recall being bad in its essence, it then becomes the duty of this free Parliament to condemn it, since it is going to bring about in this country a condition of things which is not desirable. I shall be pleased to support the amendment.

Mr. BEST: I wish to support the amendment because I believe there is not in this House a member who is elected to represent only his own constituents, as distinguished from the people of Canada as a whole. The opinion of the people is that every member, who is elected by a majority of the voters of his constituency, is elected also to represent the Dominion of Canada as a whole. I was rather surprised to hear my hon friend (Mr. Fielding) say: "If the farmers want this, why not let them have it?" The hon. member can surely see that the farmers are just as much divided in opinion on public questions as other classes in this House. We have many farmers sitting on the other end of the Chamber and others distributed throughout both sides of the House, and on every question that comes up in the House, the farmers are divided, just the same as hon. members in other pursuits in life, so that the farmers are not all of one opinion. I understood the hon. member for Ontario North (Mr. Halbert) to say that he would not want to sit in this House unless he knew that from 60 to 75 per cent of the people in the constituency that he represents were in favour of his being here.

Mr. HALBERT: I said that if 75 per cent of the electors of my riding signed a petition

asking for my resignation, I would not wish to sit here in this House.

Mr. BEST: If that be so, the hon. member should have resigned before he took his seat because much less than 60 per cent of the electors voted for him. That people should want to have a law permitting the election of a member by a majority of say one vote—and that means a good deal less than 60 per cent of the electors—and at the same time stating that 60 per cent should be required to recall him, is something that I cannot understand. As regards the recall, I know that, in the case of provincial members, I heard a candidate say on the day of the nomination: "My resignation is now in the hands of the committee." So his resignation was there. I do not know why we should have in this country a law whereby in the case of a member who is elected by a majority of five or ten in his constituency, should have to resign, if ten or twelve men should get sore on him for something he has done, perhaps in the best interest of the country, they should be able to get together all that voted for him and five or six more—and that would not be 60 per cent of the electors of the constituency. Hon. members are elected for a term of five years at the longest, and one man cannot ruin this country in that time even if he makes some mistakes. There is not in the whole Dominion any constituency in which nearly all the electors think that their representative votes or does wrong on any particular occasion. Therefore, it is very wrong to have any law that will allow a few people, if they get sore on any member, to cause him to resign his seat, thus bringing on another election. Such a system is vicious and should not be allowed. I therefore, heartily support the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Tweedie).

Mr. GOULD: I am glad to have an opportunity of making a few remarks to the committee upon this question. It seems to me that I have been the direct cause of this amendment, and of the speeches that have been made supporting it. It has occurred to me to ask why, seeing that this has been a public question in all parts of the Dominion of Canada for fifteen years, the hon. gentleman who moves this amendment today has not thought so before, although he had many opportunities to do so. If he is now, as he says, asking in the interest of truth and justice, why has he so long refrained from bringing the matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Might I be allowed to make a correction? My hon. friend (Mr. Gould) is not the direct cause of this. This is simply a question of principle, and the reason it was not taken up in the House before was that there are for the first time members holding seats in this House who have acknowledged on the floor of this House that they have signed such an agreement as to resigning.

Mr. GOULD: I accept the hon. gentleman's explanation, but I did not wish to infer at all that this amendment has been submitted in any spirit of vindictiveness. I appreciate very much the manner in which the hon. members for both Calgary East (Mr. Redman), and Calgary West (Mr. Tweedie), presented their arguments. I would again revert to this, that evidence has been submitted today that on the provincial platforms of Alberta, mark you, a Conservative party and mark you further, while they are in opposition—and that suggests the argument that they are equally as pure while they are in opposition as they are while in office —approve of the recall. The hon. gentleman for Calgary West has been living in Alberta, and it is not recorded, or at least I have not yet met the evidence, that his voice has ever been raised in provincial politics to denounce this vicious recall which is being advocated by the Tory party.

Mr. TWEEDIE: If the hon. member had been living in Alberta privately or publicly, he would have known many years ago my feelings on that matter, and they have never changed. I have always opposed that in convention and out of convention.

Mr. GOULD: You were the leader of the Conservative party out there, and yet you allowed that party to adopt that principle in their platform.

Mr. TWEEDIE: If I may again correct the hon. member, I was not the leader of the Conservative party, and I never would allow any party to which I belong to have any such plank in their platform.

Mr. GOULD: Very well. I am, however, pleased that this has come to the surface to-day, and I am also pleased that evidence has been submitted that the Conservatives of Alberta have been more guilty than possibly I have been myself. You try to explain the recall, and again you say "resignation in the hands of the committee." I have a recollection of April 13, when I ex-

plained to the House that I had neither signed the recall nor placed my resignation in the hands of the committee. I believe I made a statement in regard to an agreement with the committee and I will give the information once more, that the agreement which I have with the committee is that if they disapprove, they can ask me to come back and explain, not to resign. The onus of responsibility is on the committee in the first place, and I maintain that it is in the interest of good legislation that all the members of this Parliament should be under a similar arrangement. I have a committee of fifteen who are keeping themselves well posted upon public matters in that part of the country, and they are advising me from time to time. They are sending me information and their opinions on public questions, and this helps me materially in my course in this House. I am very much pleased to have their opinions, and I am sure the hon. gentleman for Calgary West can find in his electoral district fifteen men who can and would advise him, and possibly at times he would find that their advice would not conform with the opinions he expresses here. The advice I receive is good, and I say that such a course is progressive. That is one of the reasons why we claim the right to call ourselves progressive. The hon. gentleman states that he believes in the initiative and the referendum. Oh, yes, it is in actual operation throughout the Dominion, and it has been; but I will point out that the initiative and the referendum are more on the principle of direct legislation, and I will point out further that, through the medium of the initiative and the referendum, you can get the recall and a true expression of public opinion, and no power in Canada will prevent that.

If you give the right to initiative and referendum, you have the right to recall and for any act brought into being through the initiative and referendum, and consequently if you are consistent you cannot enact legislation preventing the recall. Hon. members come to this House with the right to sit for five years, representing or misrepresenting the people during that time. Some have done things contrary to the interests of the people, yet the people who sent them here have had no recourse. That is the reason why the recall has been introduced, and I believe it is a good thing to bridge the gulf between the time a member is elected and Parliament dissolves and he presents himself again to the people. That is one of the reasons why I approve of the recall, and why I cannot support the amendment. I think I could refer to a text from Scripture to illustrate what I mean, and that is, to take the beam out of your own eye before you presume to take the mote out of your brother's. If pressed very hard, I think I could also give evidence to show that your own ranks have been working to get this recall put on the statute book.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to address his remarks to the Chair, and not to the other side of the House.

Mr. GOULD: I was going to say that the hon. member (Mr. Tweedie) has let pass many opportunities of bringing this matter to the attention of the House, but since I made the statement in this House on April 13 the hon. member, actuated by some pure and holy motive, has become anxious to have members elected to this House by the straight and narrow way. I think that his newly-found virtue should be studied very closely by hon. gentlemen before they think of enacting his amendment into law. I would point out to the hon. member that public opinion is demanding the recall, and I honestly believe that there are members of this House to whom the recall would be a very, very dangerous thing. I believe that some hon. members who are so anxious to have legislation preventing the recall are the very ones who have reason to be afraid of its operation. I do not wish to discuss the matter any further. I might say that I have been asked by many hon. gentlemen opposite to give them a copy of our platform to study. It is a very interesting document, and I have given away so many that I have not a solitary one left for myself. I do not know whether they desire copies of it for purposes of discussion or to inform themselves just what our platform contains, but I am very pleased to let them have copies, and I have written to the West for a further supply. I hope they will find nothing wrong in our platform, but much that is progressive. We approve of the initiative and referendum. We believe in direct legislation. That is one of the planks in our platform, and one of the reasons why our platform is so progressive.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have no fault to find with the hon. member (Mr. Gould) or any other hon. member for subscribing to the platform of the party to which he belongs. If he and others sitting alongside him think that the referendum and recall is

a plank which should be generally adopted in this country, they have a perfect right to put it in their platform and advocate its general adoption. But I take exception to the hon. gentleman and those who think with him carrying into effect the planks of their platform before they have had an opportunity to crystallize them into legislation, for that is a very different thing. If the members of this House wish to place legislation on the statute book favouring the referendum and recall, that is all right, but for some people in certain parts of the country to take the law into their own hands, as some have done in this matter, is something which I think should be very strongly deprecated.

The hon. member (Mr. Gould) has addressed some remarks to the hon. member (Mr. Tweedie) which I think he might very well have addressed to some hon. gentleman in his own particular group who have been in this House as long or longer than the hon. member (Mr. Tweedie). The hon. member (Mr. Halbert) sitting next to my hon. friend (Mr. Gould) thinks that some members of this House are rather fearful of the recall. Well, I do not think the hon. member himself had such an overwhelming majority that he should feel entirely peaceful at the prospect of facing his electors again. He did not have a very large majority to boast of, although he was in the field a long time and had a host of supporters backing up his candidature. He says he would not want a seat in this House if 60 or 75 per cent of his electors petitioned for his resignation. Would he wish to hold his seat in this House if 50 per cent of his electors sent in a petition for his resignation? The hon. member does not see fit to answer that question. It is getting on pretty thin ice so far as he is concerned. He was mighty careful to fix the percentage pretty high in his own case, and was mighty careful not to say that he would resign if 51 per cent of his electors petitioned for his resignation. That would be on too dangerous ground for the hon. member. My hon. friend does not know the facts with regard to the recall. He says that 60 or 75 per cent of the electors of a constituency must ask for the recall of a member before he gives up his seat, but the hon. member (Mr. Gould), speaking in this House on April 13th, said:

> An agreement does exist between my committee, whose names I have read, any myself. Forty per cent of the number of electors who voted at my election——

Not forty per cent of the number of electors on the list, but forty per cent of those who voted at his election.

> ——may, if I refuse to do what this committee asks me to do on the floor of this House—and that committee must meet very often and find out what public opinion is in the district of Assiniboia—if they advise me and I refuse to do that, they can apply the recall and ask me to go back.

So my hon. friend (Mr. Halbert) did not know what he was talking about when he spoke of 60 or 75 per cent having to sign a petition for the recall, for according to the hon. member (Mr. Gould) if forty per cent, not of the electors on the list, but of the electors who voted at his election, ask for his resignation he is bound to give it.

The objectionable feature is that the hon. member (Mr. Gould) entered into an agreement with a certain group of men in his constituency. He thereby placed himself in the hands of some fifteen men in that constituency and he says they keep careful watch of all his movements and actions in this House. He gets advice from there occasionally as to how he should conduct himself down here. They keep tab on his movements and discuss his every action in Ottawa, and the retention of his seat in this House depends upon his strict compliance with the dictates of these fifteen men. This, at any rate, is according to the statement of the hon. gentleman made on April 13th. He entered into an agreement which is tantamount to a signed resignation; he says so himself. His conduct is vigilantly watched by these men, who keep track of everything he does and says in this House, and if he should assume an attitude down here that does not commend itself to them they can initiate certain steps to get him to resign his seat. He may object to these fifteen men commanding him to hand in his resignation, because he has a sort of court of appeal to which he can resort. He can say: "It is all right; I entered into an agreement with you fifteen gentlemen—the council of fifteen—and although you think I have not done right at Ottawa and are asking me to quit, still, according to the agreement, I may either quit or ask you to present a petition signed by forty per cent of the number of those who polled votes." That is the position in which the hon. gentleman stands. If they get forty per cent of the number of votes polled at the election, then he must resignedly step down. Why, Sir, that is not even an expression of the opinion of the constituency. If it were fifty-one per cent or anything

over fifty per cent of the votes of the electors of the constituency you might perhaps say that you were having an expression of opinion from one of the constituencies of Canada; but it is not even the majority of the constituency that is going to have the power to tell this man to give up his seat and go back to Assiniboia. I say, Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to those who believe in the principle of recall, that this important matter should be determined on the floor of this House. If a majority of the members approve of it and feel that its practice will be beneficial, all well and good; we can adopt it and crystallize it in the form of legislation. But until that is done, I certainly say that no group of people should be allowed to hold that power in their hands, for it is not in the best interests of the country at large that this principle, until at least it is recognized by a majority of this House, should be put into practice. Take the situation to-day in the province of Ontario. In the legislature of that province there is a combination of parties with a very narrow majority. The Drury Government may be giving to the province of Ontario the best legislation which that province ever received from any government, but it might run counter to the opinions of three or four groups of men in so many constituencies in Ontario, and with the narrow majority which the Government have at their command to carry on the administration, it would be possible for these three or four groups of people to call upon their members to resign their seats and thereby force an election upon the country. That I say is something that is to be deplored. It is in my judgment a reprehensible and dangerous attitude for any class of men to take. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould), under existing conditions, is in actual fact not here as a member of Parliament but as a delegate of a particular group of men in a certain part of the West. I do not know whether it would be in keeping with the rules of the House for me to address the hon. member as "the hon. delegate from Assiniboia" rather than "the hon. member"—

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Order, order.

Mr. EDWARDS: If my hon. friend from Red Deer will suppress his temper—

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The universal practice of this House has been for hon. gentlemen, when referring to other members in debate, to designate them "the hon. member for So-and-So." My hon. friend is raising the question whether it is not proper to refer to a certain hon. member as "the hon. delegate." I submit, Sir, that that is a breach of the rules of this House.

Mr. EDWARDS: May I discuss the point of order for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may do so.

Mr. EDWARDS: According to the superior wisdom of the hon. member for Red Deer, it seems that I am out of order in even asking whether I might properly refer to the hon. member for Assiniboia as the hon. delegate from Assiniboia. Had I referred to the hon. gentleman as "the hon. delegate," my hon. friend from Red Deer might properly have raised his point of order; but I did not do so. I simply asked whether, under the rules of the House, I would be justified in referring to the hon. member as the hon. delegate for Assiniboia, and I fail to see that the hon. member for Red Deer has any ground for raising a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not understand the hon. member for Frontenac to refer to the hon. member for Assiniboia as the "the hon. delegate." Had he done so, the point of order raised by the hon. member for Red Deer would have been well taken. As the hon. member for Frontenac himself has declared in discussing the point of order, that he did not refer to the hon. member for Assiniboia in the manner suggested, there is no reason for interference by the Chairman.

Mr. EDWARDS: Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. member for Red Deer will be perfectly satisfied that he was out of order himself in suggesting that I was. I think the point I was making must have been clear to every hon. member, and certainly to the member for Red Deer, who is not slow in catching the point of an argument. The whole point I was endeavouring to make was that in view of the statement made by the hon. member for Assiniboia himself that he had entered into an agreement with a certain group of men in his constituency and was at their behest as to whether he should resign his seat or not, he was in fact a delegate of that group, sent to do certain work in this House. Under the rules I suppose I could not be permitted to refer to the hon. gentleman as the hon. delegate from Assiniboia, and yet the point in my argument was that he was not a

member of Parliament in that independent sense in which the rest of members are. My point is, in short, that he is here in the capacity of a delegate, I intended no offence to the hon. member for Assiniboia in putting forward that contention, and as a matter of fact no hon. member can construe my remarks into anything offensive. I think the hon. member has made a mistake in subscribing to such an agreement as he says he has signed. The principle is bad and I therefore support the amendment moved by the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie).

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I cannot congratulate the Opposition or the Government supporters, and least of all can I congratulate my hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie), on the strategy of this amendment. I do not know that in my short political experience, and in the longer time that I have been reading the annals of Parliament, I ever knew an amendment proposed or a motion brought forward that had in it so many certain boomerang strokes. The hon. member for Edmonton has stated what I think is absolutely correct that the Conservative party in Alberta has been for years a very advanced party. Indeed it has not been Conservative in anything but name. It has been singularly unfortunate in its attempts to gain power, but the fact remains that it has had very democratic planks in its platform. One of its planks according to the hon. member for Edmonton who is generally correct in what he states——

Mr. GRIESBACH: Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to designate properly? He is referring to the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie).

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Well, the greater includes the less, the less bears the name of the greater. I am sorry that I should have ruffled the feelings of my hon. friend (Mr. Griesbach).

Mr. GRIESBACH: Not at all; it is only in the interest of accuracy.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I am endeavouring to be as accurate as I know how. The member for East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) has stated that this democratic plank has been the referendum, the initiative and the recall. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Tweedie) deny that it has ever been a plank in the platform of the Conservative party of Alberta?

Mr. TWEEDIE: It is not to my knowledge that the initiative, referendum and recall has been advocated, as the hon. member states. Personally, I have always been opposed to the recall and I am opposed to it now. Even if I had not opposed it, surely the hon. member for Red Deer would give a member the liberty of changing his views on any question?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I will certainly extend to my hon. friend all the liberty of thought that is within reason, but the liberty claimed by my hon. friend to be the leader of a party which could ever be suspected of supporting a democratic plank such as that in a province, and then to come into the debates of this federal House and found himself upon a statesman who lived at the end of the eighteenth century, who, great though he was, if he had been here to-day would be looked upon by all parties as a most obfuscated Tory, is a very large liberty indeed, and his change of mind is as swift as forked lightning.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I have the floor and my hon. friend can say what he has to say at some future time.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Red Deer has the floor and he cannot be interrupted unless he gives way.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I was only illustrating one of the possible boomerangs that might result from this amendment of unfortunate strategy. I may mention something more before I am finished with what I have to say on that subject. What I do want to say is that while I would not go so far back as Edmund Burke, great as he was, for my political models, I have a great personal regard for old British constitutional methods, and my feeling would be that the recall upon which the people of this country might particularly rely would be the recall of a majority in a general election held under ordinary circumstances and in a general way. But there are exceptions, Mr. Chairman. I think it was because there was distinct ground for thinking that there were exceptions that I had pleasure in supporting the amendment of the hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) at the beginning of this session. There are exceptions, and I am here to state that, great though the constitution may be and great though parliamentary institutions are, circumstances may get to such a pass in the history and in the life of a country that it is not only necessary to recall a member, but it is necessary to recall a Gov-

ernment. I am here to state further that if the Government, seeing all these changes, were to go to the country, in so far as any evidence that is forthcoming from the recent by-election is concerned, the recall would come with mighty and sudden swiftness. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) talks of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) not being the member for Assiniboia. Has he looked at the records of the election at which my hon. friend was elected?

Mr. EDWARDS: I did not say anything of the kind. I must correct my hon. friend. Let him quote me correctly and I will not say anything.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: My hon. friend said he was not the member in the ordinary, accepted sense in which others are members.

Mr. EDWARDS: Just so.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Now I have stated it, but after all it is a distinction very largely without a difference.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have heard that before.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Having altered the statement and brought it into absolute agreement, will my hon. friend kindly tell me why he says the hon. member for Assiniboia is not an ordinary member of this House when my hon. friend from Assiniboia had a majority of 5,294 in a total poll of 10,000 in his constituency?

Mr. EDWARDS: Very good.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: He is in this House quite extraordinary in that respect and if there were a general election tomorrow there would be a vast number of ordinary members on the other side and a larger number who might find themselves not members at all. The extraordinariness would be transferred to the supporters of the Government on the other side if the recent by-election give us any indication as to what may happen. My hon. friend from Assiniboia would be prepared, I am quite sure, to contest his constituency again to-morrow if need be and I do not think the result would be very different. No Unionist would think it would be, because they fought very shy of that constituency. They did not go near it. They did not put candidates up in it.

While I say again that I am a constitutionalist, in the old sense, I want to give my hon. friend all the points I can possibly give but when any body of men anywhere in this country come to me and ask me to sign an agreement, while I do not go the length that my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) went, and make a draft upon my future by making a distinct pledge here as to what I would do,—I am going to concede that it will be a pretty hard hurdle for me to jump. I have done a lot of thinking on my own account ever since I have taken an interest in public affairs and I am free to confess that this will be a pretty hard hurdle for me to jump and I will not commit myself any more on that point at the present time. I want to congratulate the hon. member for West Calgary upon his very suddenly acquired fondness for sound and ancient democratic principles. To those of us who come forward as the champions of larger democratic principles it is most charming to hear such confessions from some hon. members even although they only think they are democrats. I think the most democratic sentiment on this subject is that which has been uttered by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's. I have not the least doubt that in the few words he uttered he expressed the doctrines of true democracy on this question. While he mentioned what his own personal predilections would be in favour of, the real attempt to curb the power of the people is on the part of those who want to say that when you are elected—by any scratch chance or on any single issue—you can sit there until the term of Parliament is out whatever your changes of view may be and whatever changes may have taken place in the country. That is not democracy, Mr. Chairman; that is securing power, by democratic subterfuges, to substitute an autocracy for a democracy.

If there were no other grounds on which I felt inclined to vote for this amendment I should certainly vote against it on at least these two grounds. The committee noticed, no doubt, that my hon. friend from East Calgary drew a very marked distinction between a signed agreement and a recall; and I am bound to say that my hon. friend from West Calgary spoke in the other sense. Mark the language of the amendment. It speaks of persons who have signed any agreement, whether amounting to a resignation, a recall or otherwise—that is to say, the amendment makes no distinction in principle between an agreement and a recall. We have the mover speaking in the sense of his amendment also making no distinction between an agreement and a recall; and yet his seconder from the

same constituency of Calgary—or rather the eastern portion of that constituency— draws a very marked distinction between an agreement and a recall. Now, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit to the hon. members of this committee that it is almost an insult to our intelligence to ask us to vote for an amendment whose strategy is so bad, and which has been drawn up so hurriedly, that the mover and the seconder do not agree as to their opinions upon it, and do not agree as to what their amendment means. That would be sufficient to condemn the amendment in the eyes and in the minds of all sensible men. There is another thing: I am a little hazy as to what the amendment would bind one to if one voted for it. I think the weakness of the amendment—as was hinted at by the hon. member from Shelburne and Queen's—is this: It does not make the very necessary distinction between a man acting in his private character and acting as a public representative. A man may sign an agreement, in his private character, with a partner that if their business requires he should go back to it he would resign his seat in Parliament. Until that private agreement was put in force would he necessarily be any worse servant of the people in Parliament? A man might make a written declaration to his wife in a letter that he would resign. In that case he would be bound to obey if he had the experience of most ordinary mortals. Would he on that account—while his written agreement with his wife was in existence—be any worse servant of his country in Parliament? The great thing, Mr. Chairman, that we want to obtain is that when a man is in Parliament—whether he signs an argeement or merely gives pledges to a party—he should live up to that agrement, and be true to his principles and to his pledges. Then he need not fear a recall either before or at a general election, in most cases. That is the sound principle.

Now I think a very neat argument was made as against the amendment by my hon. friend from North Ontario when he said that if seventy-five per cent of the electors signed an agreement for his recall he would not wish to stay here. I dare say his experience is not universal in this Chamber. If I were to look carefully around and to scrutinize, I might find some hon. members who would sit here, according to the way they vote, if even eighty per cent of their electors signed such an agreement. But there was nothing wrong in what my hon. friend said. He did not define that as the recall; he said that if seventy-five per cent wished him to go out he would not wish to stay. I endorse his sentiment. If seventy-five per cent, or any fair percentage above the half, signed a petition for me to get out of here, I should lose my own self-respect as a representative of the people if I stayed.

I have no more to say. The amendment is hazy; its authors do not agree as to its meaning; it does not commend itself to my intelligence; it does not commend itself to my democrartic principles. I endorse very heartily the position taken by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), and I shall have pleasure in voting with him against the amendment.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, I can see no real objection to such a bargain as that attacked by the amendment being made between a member and his constituents. Neither the member nor his constituents get from that bargain what they suppose they do get. I believe further, that such a bargain is hardly consistent with the proper working of the British constitution. If a member comes here as a delegate subject to the control of a section of his people, and not as a representative, the principle of responsibility is violated. If he comes here representing an opinion which is imposed by a portion of the electorate, they and not he are responsible. And there is no means of calling them to account. On the other hand, if he comes here bound to exercise his best judgment in deciding upon a question and if he makes a mistake, or if for any unworthy motive he votes in the wrong way, he is responsible. He must make his explanation to his people, and when he again submits himself for their judgment they express their opinion with regard to the consequence of his action and upon his personal connection therewith.

A bargain of the sort that is proposed, in the first place, puts a member at a very serious disadvantage, as I see it. He is not a free agent in respect of many of the questions that come before this House. If questions of fiscal policy, questions of great public import, have been decided upon by those whose delegate he is, he is not free to speak his mind upon them; he speaks the mind of some one else. Everything he

says is subject to this condition. It is not the free judgment of a free man; the opinion which he expresses is that which is delegated here to express, just as counsel advocates his client's case in a court of law; no greater authority stands behind the opinion that he comes here to express. On the other hand, the people themselves are adversely affected by the contract. He is not responsible to them. They have taken the responsibility upon their own shoulders, and in very many cases they are not in a position to give a fair judgment upon the question at issue. We know that situations constantly arise in connection with which there is not a great deal of time to get information and to form a judgment upon a given question, and the public as a matter of fact are not informed upon it. I can think of one case in my experience, if you will pardon my making a personal reference. The first question upon which I spoke in this House was the question of alien labour and its conscription. I took the position that the principle was wrong. Practically every newspaper in my riding criticised my attitude. Now, I was right and my riding was wrong; yet had I at that time been subject to recall I should have been defeated upon that question because there was so much false opinion abroad in the riding. That is an illustration of how this matter would work out.

While holding these opinions, I think that when a member proposes an amendment in this committee the burden is upon him of showing: first, that there is an evil; second, that the evil is of such magnitude that it should be dealt with by legislation; third, that the legislation proposed will correct the situation. I do not think that any one of these three conditions has arisen. I cannot see that there is an evil. Right here let me call attention to a remark made by the member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark). He spoke of this amendment covering, in its terms, agreements other than those between the member and his constituents. But you will notice, Mr. Chairman, that it is not the agreement at all that is attacked; it is the signing of the agreement. That is, if the agreement is made without being put in writing, that act is not covered by the amendment now submitted. The amendment clearly does not touch the essence of the question which it was intended to touch. We have had no case before us yet where this has led to any abuse, and it is time enough for this House, or for any legislature, to deal with a condition when it has really developed into an abuse. The suggestion to deal with it in advance seems to be prompted in this case, I am sorry to say, by a desire to snatch a party advantage, and that is a false principle upon which to pursue any matter of legislation. Therefore, I would say that the mover of this amendment would be well advised if he would withdraw it and leave what I feel to be the natural consequences and penalties of the situation to correct it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am one of those who do not believe in the system of recall. It is a wrong principle, it is opposed to the principles upon which British parliamentary institutions are based. The advocacy of this system was brought into the western provinces by gentlemen coming from the United States, and in that country conditions are very different from those in Canada. Under the British parliamentary system a member of Parliament represents not only the electors of his constituency, but the whole country; under the United States system he represents his district or division. The difference is fundamental. Under the British parliamentary law a member of Parliament could not very well be a free agent, as he is supposed to be, and represent the country, if he is subject to recall, because his parliamentary activities would naturally have to coincide with the views of the men who may recall him at any time. I do not believe at all in this system in Canada, and I could not subscribe to a platform of which this system would be one of the main planks. On the other hand, I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding). I am opposed to this system personally, but I do not see why I should be opposed to any people holding as to it a different opinion from mine. This system is in operation in many states of the Union and even in some of the British Dominions, and I should not like to be a party to depriving compulsorily any man or group from having this opinion and holding that the recall is a good policy. The recall is not a Liberal policy; it is not a progressive policy. Some people are wrong in calling "progressive" every new thing that they advocate; there are innovations that are not reforms and that are not conducive to progress. On the other hand, the amendment is not a Liberal amendment; it would be an arbitrary measure on the part of this Parliament to disqualify any man who would subject himself to recall by the electors of his division.

Mr. HOCKEN: As I see the matter, the recall is the most objectionable feature of

class government, and it is something that could be worked out by a class aspiring to rule the country in the interest of that class to the detriment of the whole community.

Mr. GAUVREAU: The hon. member goes straight to the point.

Mr. HOCKEN: I do not see any difference between a man coming into this House, having signed an agreement with fifteen farmers to retire when they request him to do so, and a man coming into this House, having signed an agreement with fifteen manufacturers to retire when they ask him to do so. What would my hon. friends of the third party say if a man came into this House who had signed up an agreement with fifteen manufacturers, or fifteen bankers, or fifteen of any of those classes that they call the capitalistic classes? But there is absolutely no difference. Let us assume that the manufacturers put up the campaign funds for a man and he is elected to this House. They will then be doing exactly what the farmers are doing in the West, and because in the West they put up the money to elect a man, they tie a string to him and say: You can stay in the House of Commons only as long as you do as we say. If that be parliamentary government under British institutions, then I do not understand parliamentary government.

Mr. GOULD: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. HOCKEN: When I get through, you may. I had an idea that when a man came into this House, he should come in as a free man. His constituents know his views from the way in which he has presented them on the platform and probably by a long acquaintance with him and frequent expression of his opinions, and if they are willing to elect him, knowing all that, then they must give him the right to exercise his judgment upon all questions that come before this House. If we get away from that and we have a group of labour men tied up with an agreement with fifteen men, a group of agrarians tied up with an agreement of fifteen men, and other groups tied up with other similar agreements, we would have a Parliament that would not be able to govern this country very satisfactorily. I was sorry to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) give the weight of his authority in condoning this particular plan of action. He does not believe in it; he thinks it is wrong. I think it is most pernicious, and I was sorry to see an hon. member with so much authority in this House go as far as he did. Unless we can, in this House, deal with each question as it comes up in accordance with our judgment and our consciences, we are not likely to be capable representatives of the people of the country as a whole. While I represent a population of about 80,000 in our city, I do not regard myself simply as representing them; I endeavour to the best of my ability to represent the people of Canada. A man who comes into this House tied up with such an agreement as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) has admitted he has made is not in a position to do his work in this House as he should. Perhaps it would be a good idea if the hon. member for Assiniboia would produce the agreement and let us see what it contains.

Mr. GOULD: I might tell the hon. gentleman that the agreement I had was to go and buy a steer.

Mr. HOCKEN: I think the hon. member must be talking Ruthenian; I do not understand him. I should like him to produce the agreement.

Mr. GOULD: I should like to tell the hon. gentleman that it is none of his business.

Mr. HOCKEN: If that is the attitude the hon. gentleman takes, I suppose we shall have to submit to it; but it is very peculiar for a man in the responsible position he occupies to say in this House that he has made an agreement with fifteen men in his constituency to retire when they ask him to do so.

Mr. GOULD: I never made that statement.

Mr. HOCKEN: You have signed an agreement with these fifteen men.

Mr. GOULD: To do what?

Mr. HOCKEN: To resign when they want you to.

Mr. GOULD: I did not.

Mr. HOCKEN: I submit that after all the hon. member has said, not only to-day but on former occasions, he owes it to himself to produce the agreement and let the House see what it is. If it is a secret agreement that he cannot make public, so much the worse. We have his own words that he did make such an agreement, because on the 13th of April he said in this House:

An agreement does exist between my committee, whose names I have read, and myself.

That surely is a frank admission, and I submit that the hon. member ought to produce the agreement and let the House determine just what kind of a string his constituents have on him.

Mr. L. THOMSON: I rise to a point of order. I submit that an amendment is before the Chair, not an investigation of the character and actions of the hon. member for Assiniboia.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the point of order is well taken, because as a matter of fact we are not discussing the position of the present member for Assiniboia, but an amendment which is now before the Committee. I understood the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) to refer to this matter merely by way of illustration.

Mr. HOCKEN: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. My hon. friend (Mr. L. Thomson) has saved his friend from Assiniboia from further criticisms with regard to that agreement. If any other member had said as much as I have said, and I had an agreement of that kind in my pocket, I would produce it. I would stand by it—or I would renege. I just want to register my protest against this un-British system of men coming here with the possibility of their being recalled by a handful of men in their own constituency or anywhere else. I was very much surprised that the hon. member (Mr. M. Clark) with his long parliamentary experience and thorough knowledge of British institutions should defend such a practice.

Mr. L. THOMSON: I can agree in two particulars, perhaps, with some hon. gentlemen who have spoken in this discussion. I am not so much in love with the recall myself. Still, I believe this amendment is not called for, that there is no good ground for it. As to another particular, I do not know that I can quite agree with any hon. members whom I have heard discussing it to-day—I have not heard all the discussion, but most of it. It seems to be assumed that if a person signs such an agreement as has been mentioned, he cannot come here as a free and independent agent, that he cannot act independently. My hon. friend (Mr. Hocken) nods his head. I am astonished, because I had a better opinion of him. I really thought he was more independent. I can sign all the agreements you like, and I would still feel that I could act here in an independent way. I do not require the recall, because the moment my constituents satisfy me that they want me to go back I will go without waiting for a recall. So what difference does it make if I have signed an agreement to go back providing the majority of my constituents are opposed to me, when I will go back if I am so satisfied without any such written agreement?

Mr. HOCKEN: Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he would sign an agreement to do a certain thing and that he would then not do it?

Mr. THOMSON: My hon. friend did not understand me at all. I say that without signing an agreement I would go back in such a case. If I were satisfied that a majority of my constituents were opposed to me I would resign right now, without any written agreement. So the position is exactly the same. To show wherein I differ from some of the views expressed here to-day I cannot do better perhaps than to quote what I said in the House last year as reported in Hansard of the First Session of 1919, page 3579:

> But so long as we are elected to represent the people of the country, so long as our constituents select us to voice their views, and we are called here for the purpose of considering and discussing public measures, it seems to me we are bound by our voices and votes to give effect, so far as we are able, to the desires of our constituents, at least in so far as we are able to understand these desires and can conscientiously support them; and when we reach the stage where we feel that our own views and convictions are so far from being in accord with those of the majority of our constituents that we cannot properly represent them, we should resign and allow our constituents to select representatives who can represent them.

From the discussion this afternoon it would appear that members generally are entirely opposed to those views, although I thought at the time that they received the general approval of the House. I feel sure that if hon. gentlemen who have spoken would give voice to their best thoughts they would agree with those sentiments; that we should, so far as we can conscientiously do so, represent the views of our constituents, and when we cannot conscientiously represent the majority, let us get out, because the people have a right to be represented here. I notice that a distinction is drawn between the ordinary common people and the cream of creation who come here. I do not draw any such a distinction. It is said that the voice of the people is the voice of God. I think that is over-drawing it, but I think it is just as much the voice of God as is the voice of any clique here or elsewhere. I certainly dislike what has been

preached in this House from time to time, that we are a sort of select few who stand on a different level from the ordinary common people of the world. But we have that doctrine preached to us very often, perhaps not in so many words, but in effect.

I believe that every member should not only represent the views of his constituents, but also do the best that in him lies for the benefit of the country at large. My hon. friend (Mr. Hocken) looks doubtful, as if the two propositions were contradictory. They are not so in the least. Some people believe they are contradictory because they have not enough faith in their constituents. I have sufficient faith in the constituents of Qu'Appelle to believe that they want me to act here, not merely in their own interests, but in the best interests of the country as a whole. A great many hon. members apparently think their constituents are so narrow-minded that they do not want their member to do anything except attend to their own special interests. I do not take that view of the people I represent, and the moment I do, I will get out, and very quickly, because I would not want to represent such narrow-minded people as a great many hon. members this afternoon seemed to think they were representing.

With regard to the recall, I am not in love with the principle. I do not say that I would not sign an agreement if I were asked to, because my position would then be no different from what it is now. It is chips in porridge as to whether I sign such an agreement, just as it is with any other hon. member who is not so firmly attached to his seat that he is not prepared to leave it when he feels that he is not able to represent his constituents properly. My hon. friend (Mr. Hocken) asked how we would like hon. members before they come here to sign an agreement whereby fifteen manufacturers would have the power to recall them. I would not have the slightest objection, providing there were the safeguards that my hon. friends (Mr. Gould and Mr. Halbert) have mentioned, namely, that the majority—for that is what it practically amounts to—want the member recalled. As long as those fifteen men are honest, and can satisfy themselves that the majority of the constituents want the member recalled, there is no objection whatever to his being recalled. I think it would not be a bad idea if some of us were recalled.

Mr. HOCKEN: That's bad doctrine.

Mr. L. THOMSON: I believe in the people ruling. My hon. friend does not.

Mr. HOCKEN: I believe in all the people ruling.

Mr. L. THOMSON: So do I. While I agree with my hon. friend that we should keep in mind the good of the people as a whole, my view is that the people of any particular locality who select a candidate and send him to Parliament have a right to have their special views represented in the House. I believe that we should bear always in mind the good of the whole people, and I believe that our constituents entertain that view. Before I was nominated at the last election I tried to make my position perfectly clear. My experience in the House had shown me—and it was not a very pleasant experience, I must say—that unfortunate situations might arise at times from a party point of view, that under certain circumstances a man had the right to use his own judgment and that it was not safe for him to depend on the views of any one else. I therefore said to my constituents: If you are going to select me as your candidate I want you to understand that I will go on one condition only, and that is, that I shall be entitled to use my own judgment in any case where I think necessary. And I said further: If you are not going to send me to Parliament on that condition I do not want the nomination, and I will not go.

Mr. HOCKEN: That is not the case with your hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould).

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: Having made that perfectly clear, I was returned to Parliament by acclamation, which I think showed that the people generally in my constituency held the same view that I hold, namely, that while to a large extent a member represents the views of his constituents, he must be given a free hand and be allowed to exercise his own judgment when circumstances demand that he should do so.

Mr. EDWARDS: Suppose, when the hon. member had put to his constituents in that manly way the position he took, they had said: That is all very well; now, will you sign your name to this agreement before you go to Ottawa?—what would he have said?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I would have no hesitation in signing it. I might not ap-

prove of the proposal in its entirety, but I say that those people would have the right, if they saw fit, to ask that their views should be presented before Parliament. And without signing any agreement I represent their views now.

Mr. EDWARDS: You would not regard that request of theirs as a mark of confidence, would you?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: The fact that they have returned me to Parliament is a mark of their confidence in me. With regard to the remarks of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and others in connection with the question of initiative and referendum, I do not see why certain constituencies should not do certain things they want to do if they see fit. I have no objection to the principle of initiative and referendum. I took my stand on that question long ago, and am in favour of it; and if the majority of the people were in favour of recall I would accept it because I would be in a minority. My main objection to the recall is not the objection that has been urged here. I object on the ground that it would relieve the people themselves of a certain responsibility which they ought to shoulder. When the people of a constituency select a man to represent them for four or five years we have the right to expect that they shall exercise every care and precaution to ensure that the man whom they choose is a man in whom they can repose absolute confidence and on whom they can depend during the term he represents them in the House. I think we have the right to expect that the people should shoulder that responsibility, and that is the ground upon which I object to the recall. I do not object to the recall because I do not want to be recalled myself should a majority of the people whom I represent be dissatisfied with the manner in which I have discharged my responsibilities to them. If I am fool enough not to know when the people are dissatisfied with the way in which I represent them I hope they will show me my error. My hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) is a lawyer and should understand the legal effect of his amendment, and I think he will agree with me that that effect is that the agreement which is signed must be of such a character as to limit the independence of the member. If he considers for a moment I think he will agree that it will depend on the man himself as to whether his nomination is regular and legal. If the man were of such a character that his independence would not be affected it would be perfectly safe to nominate him; but who is to decide whether a man is of that calibre or not? Is it the returning officer who is to decide that point? The returning officer decides a great many things, but is he to call witnesses to decide whether the man nominated can be trusted to exercise his own independence in spite of his liability to be recalled? He must decide whether the man is so crooked and unreliable as not to be trusted to act on his best judgment for fear of being recalled. I think my hon. friend will see that there is a valid objection to his amendment as framed. If the man is worthy of nomination this amendment cannot apply to him, because a man is not worthy of nomination unless he is independent enough to act on his own best judgment even though he expects to be recalled five minutes after.

Mr. BURNHAM: I must say that I am very much at sea after listening to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. L. Thomson). I do not know whether he proposes to vote on principle or in defiance of principle, or whether he agrees with the amendment or not. At one moment he says he agrees with it and at another he says he does not. It is a case of "now you see and now you don't." The fact that I cannot apprehend the exact view of my hon. friend is perhaps due to my unfortunate stupidity, but nevertheless that fact remains. If members of the House are sent by their constituents with instructions to vote for the recall, the House will pass a law enacting the recall. I do not think there is any doubt about that. So that saying that there shall be no recall or that the principle is wrong is surely beside the question. If the people elect members and send them to vote for recall, initiative and referendum, the whole three if you will, they certainly will vote for it. If they are not sent here for some specific purpose of that kind possibly it would be premature for them to do so. I can understand the agreement that some of these gentlemen are said to have signed. It is in anticipation of the legislation that is demanded by some, namely, that there should be the recall. As a consequence, the constituents, feeling that it ought to be the law, if it is not, require their member to sign some such agreement. I do not think that can be said in any way to restrict the independence of the member, because the member who is invited to represent the constituency is well aware of the restriction which exists, and moreover the mem-

ber is invited to represent the constituency, not himself. Many people run away with the idea that they are here to exercise their own judgment. They are certainly not, except within the limits of absolute right or wrong—which neither they nor anybody else can comprehend;—they are here to represent their constituents within reasonable limits and excepting some of the glaring measures now before the public which deny reason and right.

Within reasonable limits therefore we may say that a man finds that some policy has arisen—such, for example, as the Canada Steamship merger or the steel merger, or the great agricultural merger that is now maturing, or something like that,—on which he has had no instuctions, but on which he may have very definite opinions. These opinions may be entirely contrary to the opinions of a great number of his constituents. Surely it would be absurd, within reasonable limits, that this man should not accept notification that he should return and confer with his constituents on the subject. In any event it will undoubtedly be the law some day that a member will take his membership on the understanding that all these restrictions apply;—if he does not like to take the job he can stay at home. But that this new law is coming is undoubted. I think anybody can see that everything that facilitates the movement of the machinery of legislation is likely to be enacted, and endorsed and received by the public.

Undoubtedly, sometimes, Mr. Chairman, it might not work well, but it is within the power of the constituents to see that it does. It is true that we have had measures adopted in this House which defy the constituents and that we have had members who have defied their constituents. The constituents are tired of that, and I fancy a good many of the members are, too. Democracy, instead of developing on democratic lines, has in the most extraordinary manner, as someone well expressed it the other day, settled itself in government. Privy councils were originated in the reign of the Stuarts for the purpose of curbing the power of the king. They were then supposed to represent the opinions of the people. But having disposed of the absolute authority of the king they have proceeded in these later days to dispose of the absolute authority of the people. These things must be said, and surely it is but common sense to say that the people who pay the taxes and bear the burden and heat of the day are entitled to be consulted.

While I myself personally would feel it a severe affliction, and a reflection upon my judgment, should the people take action by way of recall, I must nevertheless admit that it is right and reasonable, with proper safeguards, such as possibly twenty-five per cent or something of that description. I would be recreant to my duty if I did not speak in favour of that advanced principle. It may be possible that if we did confer with our constituents the member would convince them that they were wrong and he was right, in which case the blushing member, after he had converted his entire constituency, would return to Parliament in a great wave of popular approval and the offence which might be given to his supersensitiveness would be compensated for by the acclaim with which he would be received in recognition of the astounding victory that he had achieved over his constituents. But do not let us commit the error of saying that we stand in the way of trying any reasonable measure which would allow us to confer with our constituents in order that they might express their opinion and that we might express ours.

Mr. J. F. REID: Mr. Chairman, I have always supposed that the Conservative party of Alberta stole this plank of the recall from the platform of the Non-Partisan League which was strong in Alberta at that time. I am told also on good authority that this was a very astute expedient of the Conservative party in Alberta to put one over on the Non-Partisan League. The hon. member for West Calgary—

Mr. TWEEDIE: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct him?

Mr. J. F. REID—was the leader of that party at that time. I am not quite sure whether he was the recognized or official leader, but I do know that he was the man "with the punch" behind the leader, if he was not the actual leader himself. On account of that I understand that the Non-Partisan League in the province of Alberta has pretty well gone out of business, the assumption being that the Conservative party in Alberta became the Non-Partisan League whose strongest appeal was direct legislation.

Considerable has been said about signing an agreement. An attack has been made on the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) because he signed an agreement which seems to tickle the curiosity of hon. members opposite. Why? The Conservative party was the party which in-

stituted this procedure. If the hon. member for Assiniboia has been guilty of the offence of signing an agreement, he is not the only one in this House who is guilty of it. There is an old Scotch saying that you had better clean your own doorstep before you go abroad to clean the doorsteps of others. What is the difference between the procedure instituted by the Conservative party and signing an agreement such as the one which the hon. member for Assiniboia is understood to have signed? I am of the opinion that not one hon. member on the other side of the House sits there a free man. I will endeavour to prove it. Is it not a fact that in the election of 1917, before hon. members received the endorsation of Union Government, they promised allegiance to the Union Government?

Mr. HALLADAY: Absolutely not.

Mr. J. F. REID: I will call for the next man who will get up and deny it.

Mr. CLEMENTS: I deny it, absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN: This proceeding is wholly irregular and not in accordance with the rules.

Mr. J. F. REID: I am sorry if I have trespassed the rules of the House, but I have respect for your ruling, Sir.

Mr. GAUVREAU. It was very interesting, though.

Mr. J. F. REID: I will say, this, however, that in the province from which I come, the candidates who got the endorsation of the Union Government had to pledge themselves.

Mr. LALOR: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. J. F. REID: I will tell the hon. members of this House what was the reason for the bringing into being of this recall —it was the old party system. I know whereof I speak. We elected members out in Western Canada whom we thought to be strong enough to stand up here in Parliament and represent the views of the people who elected them; and some of them have told me that when they got down here they were whipped into line and they had to support their party. That is the reason the recall was put into force.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Shame.

Mr. J. F. REID: Those hon. gentlemen were tied, they were not free.

[Mr. J. F. Reid.]

Mr. EDWARDS: May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. When the Chairman rises it is the duty of all hon. gentlemen to take their seats. I ask the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) does he desire to put a question or state a point of order?

Mr. EDWARDS: If I may be permitted I wish to ask the hon. gentleman a question, but if he does not consent, well and good.

Mr. J. F. REID: My practice in this House—I think all will agree as to that—is not to interrupt any hon. gentleman when he is speaking in debate.

Mr. CAMPBELL: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is the recall.

Mr. J. F. REID: I do not believe in favouritism.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not think you have any favourites.

Mr. J. F. REID: The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) accused the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) of being the representative of a class.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. J. F. REID: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member for Assiniboia is the representative of a class, and if he has signed any document putting himself in the hands of such a class my hon. friend from West Toronto should be the last one to throw stones at that hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. J. F. REID: Is it any worse to represent a class than to represent an Order?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HOCKEN: May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member wish to ask a question or state a point of order?

Mr. HOCKEN: There is such an absolute misrepresentation in the hon. gentleman's statement that I want to put it right.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Take your medicine.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for West Toronto has a right to correct any misrepresentation when the hon. member who now has the floor has concluded his speech. It will not be in order to make the correction at the present time.

Mr. HOCKEN: I hope to have that opportunity.

Mr. J. F. REID: It seems to me hon. members opposite are living in fear and dread of something, but they do not know what it is.

Mr. HOCKEN: No. we are not.

Mr. J. F. REID: I doubt whether any hon. member in this House has seen the good or the ill effects of the recall, but it seems to me that some, at least, have come to the conclusion that there is going to be a recall. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if there was a little less throwing of mud at each other across the floor of the House it would be better.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HOCKEN: You have thrown a little yourself.

Mr. J. F. REID: Those who started it are more responsible than those who indulged in it on provocation.

Mr. HOCKEN: You are starting it.

Mr. J. F. REID: While the hon. member for Frontenac was attacking the young member for Assiniboia, the youngest—no the second-youngest—member in this House, I wondered whether the chivalry of Parliament had vanished. The hon. member for Frontenac—

Mr. EDWARDS: Get the baby carriage.

Mr. J. F. REID:—is one of the oldest and one of the ablest members in this House. In fact, I understand his ability is such that he was considered eligible for a position in the Cabinet.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: No, the Senate.

Mr. J. F. REID: Then why should any hon. member with the splendid ability of the hon. member for Frontenac attack a young and inexperienced member of this House?

Mr. EDWARDS: Get the nurse and the baby carriage.

Mr. HOCKEN: I rise to resent the mean insinuation of the hon. member—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. HOCKEN:—that I came into the House to represent anything else but one of the best constituencies in the Dominion of Canada. There is a population of 80,000 in my constituency composed of every class —foreigners and English speaking people of every creed;—and six thousand soldiers went from my constituency, which accounts for a majority of over 10,000. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that neither he nor any other man in this House is more truly a representative of the people as a whole—men and women, rank and file—than I am in the constituency of West Toronto.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In view of the fact that this amendment has a direct bearing on the important question of the independence of members of Parliament I should not like it to go to a vote without expressing my views as to the significance of its proposal. In my opinion every member of Parliament should feel, if he wishes to represent the people in the broadest possible way, that when he enters this Parliament he is a representative not of any class, not of any creed, not of any section—I might say not of any particular constituency except to see that the views of his constituency are always properly presented—but that above all he represents the people of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. That, I think, is the only view a man can take as to his responsible position as a member of the Parliament of Canada. Having stated my belief in that regard, may I consider the significance of the amendment and what it proposes?

All our political institutions are a matter more or less of evolution. There was a time when the Governor of this country thought that he could dictate to his ministers, and that the ministers should have no say whatever unless it suited the particular view which the Governor entertained. It was an attitude which those who wanted things done only in accordance with their own way of thinking, were apt to encourage. A familar example which will be in the minds of members of the House was the occasion when Lord Elgin was asked to assent to the Rebellion Losses Bill which Parliament had passed in 1848. The Tories of that day thought that our governmental institutions were being outraged. They told Lord Elgin that if he assented to that Bill he would have to take all kinds of consequences, including his recall to England. What was the position that Lord Elgin took? He said that his advisers had given him the Bill to sign, and that he proposed

to accept the advice of his advisers. What was he told? I am not quoting the exact words, but they were to the effect that his advisers were fools. To this Lord Elgin is said to have replied: If the people care to send me fools as advisers, then I must abide by the advice of fools. In that expression we find the principle underlying responsible government. From that time to this it has been held that the Governor is bound by the advice of his ministers so long as they represent the people, and that it is not for the Governor to say who his advisers shall be.

It seems to me that in regard to this particular amendment we are in a position very similar, as respects what is fundamental in what we mean by representative government. It is for the people to say whom they wish to send to this Parliament as their representatives, not for this Parliament to tell the people whom they shall or shall not send. If the people desire to choose as a candidate and to send to this Parliament as their representative a man who is tied, manacled or bound, whether by physical infirmity, by agreement, or in any other way, so long as all the facts and circumstances surrounding his position are publicly known, it seems to me that, on the theory that the people have the right to govern and to send whom they will to Parliament, they have a right to say whether or not that candidate should go to Parliament.

Now, with regard to the particular matter of the recall, were I in an election and had I as an opponent—I understand that there is the possibility of such being the case—one who is bound by any recall, I should urge strongly upon the electors that that was one of the main reasons why they should not give him their support; that one who is bound by an agreement, fettered in any way, subjected to any restriction of his liberty in this Parliament to take whatever action seems best as questions come up, is not in the best position to serve as a representative of the people. That, I think, is a strong reason why such a candidate should not be returned.

But that is a very different thing from this Parliament here and now saying that they will not allow the people of the country the liberty to choose between a man who is bound by the recall and a man who is opposing him and who will not be bound in that way. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the question is one which affects the fundamental rights of the people in the matter of Government, and believing as I do that the people should have the fullest liberty, the fullest freedom, in the choice of whom they wish to send to this Parliament, I shall oppose this amendment because I believe that it would deprive the people of a certain liberty in that regard. At the same time, I repeat what I said at the outset: that any member or any man who presents himself to the electorate and at the same time tells the electorate that he is not free in all particulars to use his best judgment as circumstances dictate, is not, to my way of thinking, the best type of representative to have in Parliament.

Mr. GUTHRIE: To a very large extent, speaking for myself, I agree with the views just now expressed by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). However, I think it is just as well that this question has been ventilated in the House; I do not think that the time that has been taken up in this discussion will be found to be wholly unprofitable.

Perhaps, there is some misconception as to the real meaning of the amendment. If I read the amendment aright, it does not raise the question of the legislative recall as it has been discussed in this House today; it raises rather the question of agreements which would in any manner whatsoever limit the independence of members of Parliament. Having regard to the real meaning of the amendment, I think most hon. members will agree that any agreement which does limit the independence of a member of this House should not be permitted to exist. I have heard it stated by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark), a man of broad learning and great experience, that these agreements are nothing more than political pledges. If that were all, I would agree with him that there is very little wrong in them. But they are not political pledges. Political pledges are made in the open.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Not always.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Political pledges are pledges made for the purpose of convincing an elector; they must be made in the open; they must be made notorious, or they will have no effect. The vitiating principle of such agreements as are referred to in this amendment, if I understand it aright, is the secrecy of the proceedings—a secrecy which, in the case of one agreement that I know of, an hon. member is determined to maintain. I heard my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) this afternoon say that he had been followed around this House by members who sought to obtain from him

the platform of the Farmers' party. Well, around the corridors of this House I have heard a good many members say that they would like to obtain, not the platform of the Farmers' party, but the secret agreement which the Farmers' party insist that their candidates shall sign. Here is one principle to which I seriously object; that ten or fifteen or twenty men in any riding should hold any document of a secret nature—I emphasize that point, because if it is free and open I have no objection to it— which will in any way limit the independence of a member of this House. It is a wrong principle; it is a vicious principle; in my humble judgment it is a principle which Parliament should seek to do away with. I do not know that the amendment now proposed is the correct remedy; probably it was launched for the purpose of having this question discussed. I believe that the whole of the people should be made acquainted with these facts. My position is this—and I think I can speak for the Government in this respect—that so long as your agreement is made public, so long as the people understand it before they take advantage of the opportunity of voting on it, I see no objection whatever to it. If a candidate for election as a member of this Parliament is bound by an agreement of a special nature to any particular class of people, and if these facts are known, all well and good; let him go to the polls on that understanding. But the case is entirely different when the agreement is of a secret or private nature, if that agreement limits the independence of the member of Parliament.

Mr. M. CLARK: Will the hon. member allow me to tell him exactly what the Farmers' platform contains upon this question?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think I can dispense with that.

Mr. M. CLARK: There is no secret agreement mentioned in it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I can dispense with that for the moment. It has been brought to my attention—rumours at all events are afloat to the effect—that in the Ontario legislature to-day men are sitting who have been elected and who have actually signed a form of resignation in the form prescribed by the Ontario Statute, which form is witnessed by two electors. These documents were signed, I am told, before the nominations took place. Certainly, they were not made public before the election. If such documents exist, if they are secret documents and if they are permitted by the law, then I say that the law should be amended. That is my personal view of the matter. I hardly think this amendment is in the proper form to remedy the matter; but the amendment has at least served one good purpose; it has brought the whole question to the attention of the House and of the country, and I think it is a subject which should receive the attention of the Government. I do not know what the ultimate object of my hon. friend (Mr. Tweedie) in moving this amendment is. I would suggest to him, now that we have had the benefit of this discussion, now that we have a better understanding of the whole subject, that a little time be permitted to us to study out the question and come to some conclusion on it after we have made a better and fuller study of it than we have made up to the present. My suggestion to the hon. member is that he should remain content with the discussion we have had and withdraw the present amendment.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I would be very glad to follow immediately the suggestion made by the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) who has charge of this Bill, and I can assure him that I shall follow his advice and the suggestions also of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), after I have made a few remarks which I feel I should make in justice to myself and those who have spoken on this side of the House in connection with this amendment. When I introduced this subject, I introduced it purely as a question of principle without having in mind the status of any individual member of this House. I endeavoured, so far as was within my power, to avoid any personalities in connection with the discussion. I did not wish, that any remarks that I made or any remarks which were made by any hon. member in support of the amendment which I moved should in any way be derogatory or belitting of or hold in ridicule any hon. member who felt it his duty to speak in connection with this amendment. To that, I will refer later.

I have no apologies to make for moving this amendment, because I feel that, in connection with the political life of this country, while the question has not yet assumed vast proportions, it is a growing question which must be dealt with, and if we are to conserve our constitutional rights, it behooves us, as members of this House

of Commons, to take into consideration and have in this House a frank discussion of the arguments which might be adduced for or against this question of the recall, the signing of a resignation before an election, or the entering into any agreement with any committee, which agreement might limit or control the activities or duties of a member of this House.

I cannot agree with the arguments which have been submitted by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) when, standing up in his place in this House as leader of one of the great parties of this country, he says that there is growing up in connection with our constitution a principle to which he cannot adhere and which he cannot support, and then says that he thinks it should be allowed to go unchecked. If this be a principle which is contrary to the constitution of this country, then it is our duty either to amend the constitution or to enact legislation which will prevent the circumvention of our constitution and the introduction of a system of which we are not, as a people cognizant.

A particular feature of this discussion which must certainly be very gratifying to every member of the House, is the free expression of opinion which we have here. The sentiments of members of the Opposition, as expressed by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's and the leader of the Opposition, go to show that that party with which they are allied do not believe in either the doctrine of the recall, or the doctrine of signing an advance resignation, or the doctrine of having any man who is a candidate in any constituency of this country enter into any agreement which is going to limit or fetter the exercise of his rights as a representative of the people in Parliament. But while it might be expected that the members of the Opposition would take that stand as one of the old-line parties in this country, and while we might look for expressions of opinion of that nature from this side of the House, a party which is composed of Liberals and Conservatives.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, all Tories.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Well, I will say they are all Tories, and I am glad my hon. friends recognize the conversion to the true principles which should govern this country. While I rejoice in that fact, I must say that I was greatly amazed and also greatly delighted when I heard the utterances of the representatives of the National Progressive Party in this country, as they have assumed to call themselves, or the agricultural or rural representatives. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. L. Thomson), who is a representative farmer, who supports the policy laid down by the Council of Agriculture of this Dominion, a policy which says that they believe in the initiative, the referendum and the recall—

Mr. L. THOMSON: No.

Mr. TWEEDIE: —that hon. gentleman standing up in his place in the House says that he is not in favour of the recall. Let us consider the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark), the hon. member who speaks with such eloquence, force and decision, the hon. member whose utterances on any question in this House are, so far as he is concerned, the last word to be said. That hon. gentleman, who speaks about myself having a lightning change of attitude, sits in this House as a member of the Farmers' Party in this country, a party which has as its platform the initiative, the referendum and the recall.

Mr. L. THOMSON: No.

Mr. TWEEDIE: In all my experience in a legislature or in this Parliament, I have never yet witnessed such an exhibition of straddling as the hon. member for Red Deer has given to-day in connection with the stand which he takes on the recall, the advance resignation, or the entering into an agreement with any committee of men in regard to his decisions in the House of Commons. He refers to the amendment which I have moved, and in closing his remarks, he very patronizingly says that that amendment does not appeal to his intelligence. But I am not responsible, Mr. Chairman, for the intelligence of the hon. member for Red Deer. If I judge from the discussions which have taken place since the moving of my amendment this afternoon, I am sure the amendment appeals to the intelligence of almost every member in this House, and there are in it points which are worthy of consideration and discussion.

When he got up to reply he very patronisingly said that he could not congratulate the Opposition, he could not congratulate the supporters of the Government, and least of all could he congratulate the hon. member for West Calgary, the mover of the amendment in regard to their stand. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I do not hold my seat in this House for the congratulations of the hon. member for Red Deer or anybody else, and if I were looking for congratulations in this House the hon.

member for Red Deer can rest assured that he is not the first man to whom I would appeal for congratulations. He takes the amendment, analyses it, and discusses it. He asks, what does it mean? He says: A man may want to enter into an agreement with his partner, but if this amendment passes he cannot enter into any such agreement Mr. Chairman, a man who has any intelligence, to use the hon. member's words, if he simply reads the amendment will see that it has no reference whatever to business, but simply to an agreement which limits the independence of such person in the performance of his duties as a member in the event of his being elected to the House of Commons. It has to do only with the performance of the duties of a member of this House, and it is immaterial whether a man enters into any agreement with his partner in regard to their business relations, as to his willingness to resign or not to resign or business reasons relating only to himself and not to his constituents. It is immaterial whether he enters into an agreement with his wife before he leaves home as to whether he will resign for family reasons. The question is, is he going to be allowed to enter into any agreement with anybody which is going to interfere with his independance as a member of the House of Commons or of the body in which he sits? He also suggests that so far as the mover and the seconder of this amendment are concerned, they evidently did not consider fully the meaning of the amendment. Being an old parliamentarian, such as he is, a man with much greater experience in political life than I have had, he must realize that when you are sitting in Committee of the Whole House there is simply the mover of the amendment. I have no seconder and there never was a seconder to this amendment. The hon. member is therefore either ignorant or else he wishes to misinform the House and give a false impression to the people generally. There was no agreement between myself and any member who has spoken on the amendment. Many of those who have made speeches on the amendment never saw it until it was presented. I am perfectly willing to stand on the construction of the amendment as it stands, and notwithstanding anything that the hon. member or Red Deer may say in this connection, there was no agreement, no arrangement, no discussion, no argument between those up here who supported that amendment and myself before I introduced it into this House. If he were unable to found his argument when he is considering a question so serious and so vital to the people of this country on matters which are mythical I am afraid that a great deal of the eloquence of his speech and a great deal of the eloquence of many of the speeches which he has made in this House would fade into insignificance. Were he tied down to hard facts in debate, much of the glamour would disappear.

I do not propose to take the time of the House at very great length, but I must refer to a matter in connection with which the hon. member for Red Deer saw fit to upbraid me, the fact that I read a passage from a speech delivered by the Rt. Hon. Edmund Burke to the electors of the city of Bristol when he withdrew from that contest. He uses the suggestion that I am founding my argument and backing my principles on the utterances of public men who lived in the latter part of the eighteenth century. It is very true that the Rt. Hon. Edmund Burke entered the British House of Commons in the year 1765 and for many years after remained one of the most valued members of that House and one of the greatest statesmen of the British Empire. If I have a choice between the declarations of the Rt. Hon. Edmund Burke and those of the hon. member for Red Deer, if this House will pardon me, I must state that I am going to accept the views of such an eminent statesman as the Rt. Hon. Mr. Burke.

Mr. M. CLARK: Will my hon. friend—

Mr. TWEEDIE: Sit down.

Mr. M. CLARK: I want to explain that I rose for the purpose of respectfully requesting—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Red Deer was quite justified in rising for the purpose of asking permission to put a question. I understand the hon. member of Calgary will not give way, and therefore, of course, the question cannot be put.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Mr. Chairman, I am a great believer in fair play. There is an old maxim which says, Do unto others as they do unto you. My hon. friend from Red Deer did it first; I am going to do it now. I said this afternoon when he was speaking "I rise to ask a question," but with that rapidity and speed, that vehemence and force, which he can put into effect, he kept right on. He said, "I have the floor and my hon. friend can say what he wishes to say at a future

time." That being the treatment that was accorded me this afternoon by my hon. friend from Red Deer, I have great pleasure in stating to him now that he can say what he has to say at a future time. As I was about to remark, the gravamen of the charge which the hon. member for Red Deer held against me this afternoon, although I saw him clapping his desk when I read from the Rt. Hon. Edmund Burke's speech, was that I had the presumption to stand up in this House when we were discussing a very vital question and read a passage from an illustrious statesman who entered Parliament in the latter half of the eighteenth century. He says that I founded my doctrine on a statesman who lived in the eighteenth century. That is perfectly true, and if he will go back to Lord Macaulay he will find statements in Lord Macaulay which substantiate those in the speech of the Rt. Hon. Mr. Burke. Is it an offence that a member of this House should endeavour to inquire into what has transpired in the past history of Great Britain? Has there ever been a gentleman occupying a seat on the floor of this House who has held higher and oftener waved aloft the traditions of the British Empire than the hon. member for Red Deer? It is perfectly true that the Rt. Hon. Edmund Burke may have lived and taken his seat in Parliament over a hundred years ago, but, Mr. Chairman, if there is any man in this House of Commons who browses amongst musty pages of ancient history for dectum arguments to support his political foibles it is certainly the hon. member for Red Deer. I have sat in this House and I have watched him roll the Holy Scriptures under his tongue as a sweet morsel, and then thrust from the end of his tongue with venom some single passage therefrom, which he thought would forever silence his opponent. Is there any antiquity in the Scriptures? Is there any antiquity in the writings of the prophets or the disciples? Its antiquity is simply a matter of thousands of years. The gentleman who says that the utterances of the past should not come in, is the man who nurtures himself upon antiquity by day and night. I have listened to the hon. member for Red Deer delivering speeches in this House on many occasions on free trade, and whenever he makes those speeches he gives evidence that he sleeps by day and night with John Bright and Richard Cobden, whom he never fails to quote on those occasions, who were prominent in the public life of their native country in the early part of the nineteenth century, almost as ancient as Burke.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out to the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Tweedie) that we are not discussing the conduct of the hon. member for Red Deer in this House or elsewhere, but an amendment to clause 39 of the Bill now before the committee.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Mr. Chairman, I was replying to the hon. member for Red Deer in regard to the questions of personal recall, advance legislation, and initiative, and I thought that it was necessary to look back somewhat into history to ascertain what eminent men, whom the hon. member never tires of quoting, have said. And, if I referred to Burke, I did so not by way of criticism of the hon. gentleman. Indeed, Sir, I think my hon. friend is entitled to abundant commendation from this House for his thorough and indefatigable study of ancient history and economics. I am referring to these things merely to show how valuable an achievement the hon. member for Red Deer considers it to be to have read ancient history and to be able to cite Cobden and Bright and other eminent men who lived many decades ago, to say nought of the inspiration which one may get from Adam Smith if one desires to make a free trade country of Canada. I am about to close Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. TWEEDIE:—but I want to point out that it would not be wise for the members of this House to be discouraged because the hon. member for Red Deer has endeavoured to discourage the reading of history and the speeches and the lives of brilliant statesmen of the past. We should read these works and look back into past history for precedents and endeavour to apply them so far as they may conform to existing circumstances; and if such historic precedents are found to be incompatible with present conditions then let us discard them but evolve from such knowledge as we may acquire principles which may be applied to the present. Now, Sir, I have a word or two to say regarding the hon. gentleman's sincerity.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must ask the hon. member to abide by the ruling just given. This is not the time to discuss the sincerity of the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Mr. Chairman, I graciously bow to your ruling. I shall not

question the sincerity of the hon. member, but with your permission, Sir, and by leave of the House, I desire to draw a few comparisons between the hon. member for Red Deer and myself. I think I referred to some remarks of the hon. gentleman in which he says: "His"—that is, Tweedie's—"change of manner is as swift as chain lightning." Let us consider this statement for a moment.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: What I said was "forked lightning." I think you will agree with me, Sir, that I should not have words put into my mouth which I did not use. However, if the hon. member prefers the words "chain lightning" then he can employ them in the comparison.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Oh, it is forked lightning, is it? Well, I am very much obliged to the hon. member for Red Deer for the suggestion, because forked lightning will suit the purpose of my comparison much better. If we ever had a good illustration of forked lightning we certainly had it this afternoon when the hon. member for Red Deer spoke on this question of recall. That hon. member sits there as a supporter of the Farmer's party or the National Progressive party, or whatever else you like to call it, a party who have in their platform the initiative, referendum and recall. The hon. member stands up and tells this House—not unequivocally, but I think we can read between the lines—that he does not like the recall. He does not like it. There he is, standing up in this House as a member of a party which has the principle of recall as one of the planks of its platform, and at the same time telling us that he did not believe in it. On which horn of this dilemma does the hon. member prefer to be impaled? Again the hon. gentleman evidently had the idea of speed pre-eminently in mind when he used the expression "forked lightning" in his reference to myself. I do not believe that he used the figure of speech for the purpose of painting any picture of diversified interests; I think he meant to convey an impression of speed to the utmost limit. Well, let us analyse his figure of speech for a moment. First of all, let me say that so far as my position on the question of recall is concerned, since I have been in public life, I have always opposed it, I oppose it now, and I have yet to see good reasons advanced why I should ever endorse it or advocate it in this country. As regards the signing of any resignation in advance, my position is absolutely the same; and I take the same stand in regard to entering into any agreement with any committee whereby they shall have the control of my political conduct. I wish to point out to the hon. member for Red Deer that I stand square to the issue. I desire to make perfectly clear to every hon. member in this House precisely what my position is, and that is something which my hon. friend from Red Deer failed to do in his speech this afternoon. Now, let us look at his "forked lightning" and compare the speed of the hon. member for Red Deer with the speed of which I am capable. At one time in the career of the hon. gentleman he was one of those old staunch Liberals who sat in this House behind the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier and held aloft the flag of free trade and waved it in every corner of this wide Dominion. Now, I—

The CHAIRMAN: I feel sure that the hon. member for Calgary can reply to the speech delivered this afternoon by the hon. member for Red Deer without covering ground that is not relevant to the question before the committee.

Mr. TWEEDIE: My point is this, Mr. Chairman: The hon. member wishes to convey the impression to this committee that I changed with lightning rapidity, and I thought it might be somewhat instructive to hon. members if I might metaphorically place myself side by side with the hon. gentleman and let us compare our political race so that our representative speed capacities might be ascertained.

The CHAIRMAN: The statement having been made this afternoon by the hon. member for Red Deer, the hon. member for Calgary should be allowed to reply by a similar statement. He would not be in order in going back over the entire history of an hon. member's career in order either to justify or to refute any statement that bears no relevance to the question before the committee.

Mr. TWEEDIE: In deference to you, Mr. Chairman. I shall endeavour not to carry the analogy too far but just to the extent that it may appeal to the "intelligence" of the hon. member for Red Deer. I was about to point out that he had a prominent career as one of the leading Liberals of this country and that while he enjoyed that career I believe I was as devoutly attached to the tenets of the great Liberal Conservative party.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I do so not in the least because I object to anything my hon.

friend has said but because the Chair, for whom I have always displayed the utmost respect, has been openly defied.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that if I in the least degree have trespassed the rules of the House I am very sorry for it. I only asked for permission to answer the speech of the hon. member for Red Deer this afternoon and you can rest assured that I shall always obey your ruling, which I have considered to be extremely fair in the past, with the utmost willingness. But the hon. member for Red Deer seems to like lingering around the time when he was a great supporter of the Liberal party and just immediately I start to get away from that time he rises to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I feel sure that the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) and the other hon. members of the committee will realise that if every hon. member in discussing this question went into the past history of every other hon. member to this same extent, it would be impossible to make any progress. I must once more respectfully ask him to bring his remarks to bear upon the question before the committee.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Without going into the past history of the hon. gentleman, I would just say that once we were opposed, then we were united, and now the hon. member is with the National Progressive party. I am with the old party in which we were united. He has beaten me by one lap, which shows greater speed than I had ever dreamed of in my life. There are other instances which I would like to enter into but I feel the hour is getting late and perhaps the House is weary. But I want to point out to the hon. member for Red Deer that in connection with any business before the House I am perfectly willing to transact that business in the usual way, but I do not propose to take lectures from the hon. member in this House, or other persons. If we get a general understanding in this House that one man is not sent here to lecture any or all other members, we will make more rapid progress with the business of the country that is placed before us.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that the House and the country as a whole should be delighted that this discussion has taken place here to-day. It has shown that the Liberal party opposes the doctrine of the recall, advance resignations and agreements with committees. The supporters of the Government are opposed to the recall, advance resignations and agreements with committees. Two men who spoke for the National Progressive party, of which there are some eight members in this House, repudiate the doctrine, and two more stand up and say that if they get 60 or 75 per cent of the electors in their constituency to sign a petition for them to go home, they will go. There has not been one man stand up in this House to-day and say that he believes in the advance resignation, that he believes in signing any agreement limiting the performance of his duty as a member or that he believes in placing the control of his seat in this House in the hands of a few men.

Following the suggestion of the Acting Solicitor General, who has charge of the Bill and the suggestions of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's and the leader of the Opposition, I shall be glad to withdraw this amendment and leave it to the further consideration of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that the hon. member have leave to withdraw his amendment?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I wish to register my protest against an hon. member taking five or six hours of our time for the entertainment and amusement of the House without having in any way mentioned the measure that is at present before us. I object to allowing this committee to be experimented with in that way. I believe the object of the hon. member (Mr. Tweedie) was to get the feeling of the House, and I am convinced that if he had expected that he would achieve any measure of success he would have pressed the question to a vote. He has either gone too far or he has not gone far enough. If it is worth while to have an expression of opinion it is worth while to have a division. Then we will have a real expression. I might also point out another objection that I have to the proceeding that has taken place. Upon two or three nights during the present week, the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Guthrie), who is in charge of this Bill, has complained that its progress has been hindered by Opposition obstruction.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have never made such a complaint.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Well then I will withdraw that remark and I will say that he has complained about the early rising of the committee. To-night when an hon.

gentleman who was speaking upon a matter that had no bearing upon this Bill at all, and was simply amusing the House, announced his intention of concluding his remarks, the minister called out, "go on; go on." Therefore, there is no sincerity at all in the statement of the minister that the Opposition are in any way lacking in a desire to proceed with public business, or that they are responsible for keeping the Bill before the House.

As the hon. member for West Calgary did not mention the amendment in my hearing to-night I do not understand why there is so much alarm about this recall. An organization outside of this House, one that has nothing to do with it, in its little union, or lodge, or whatever they call it, passes a resolution setting forth the principles upon which its members are willing to agree. I cannot see that in that there is anything that it is the business of this House to object to. If it were not for an agreement made by hon. gentlemen in 1917 there would not be any Union party to-day. Men came down here tied and bound by the conditions of an agreement which they had subscribed to, stipulating what they should do when they came here. I am not going to discuss that; I know it would not be in order but I would like to ask the Liberal Unionist members on the other side what their agreement was with the Union party?

Mr. EDWARDS: Were the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) and the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) parties to that agreement?

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I would think so. I did not enter into the agreement therefore I do not know what it is, but I read the platform of the Liberal Unionist party and it was stated that they had agreed to support the Government, and they appealed to the electors for that reason. Therefore they come down under exactly the same conditions with a pledge; the Farmer members come pledged to support the Farmers' platform. Many of them got a recall last winter, but they did not respond. In two or three constituencies, after they had failed to fulfil their agreement and were recalled, they did not stand for it.

In order that I may not be misunderstood I wish to say that I am not a member of that organization, but on the contrary have always been opposed by it. As far back as 1911 I was opposed by the Secretary of the United Farmers' Union, although the issue at that time was reciprocity. Their candidate ran as a third man and opposed me although he stood on the same platform that I did. That gentleman signed a recall. I can remember the date on which he signed it, and the fact that half a dozen members of the organization went down and saw that the document was signed and sealed in the Merchants Bank in Vegreville—and I may say in passing that it is still there. So that the recall is not a dangerous thing, sometimes indeed it is very harmless. It is not a thing that will do harm to any one. It did not harm me in 1917 when I had a difficult election coming on and did not take the popular side on the questions at issue. Another man—a member of the same organization, in the person of Ex-Governor Leedy of Kansas—called himself a non-partisan and stood on the same platform that I occupied as a supporter of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I think those people were the first to initiate the policy. Ex-Governor Leedy had his recall all right but it did not affect my election. I think hon. gentlemen opposite—particularly the member for West Calgary and some of the other Western members—are being stampeded with the fear that possibly this organization is going to meet with so much success that it will be difficult for them to secure any seats in that part of the province. If that is the view they entertain I agree with them. I believe the movement will be successful. At the same time, I do not see why the farmers, or any class of people, should not have the right to make conditions with their candidates the same as the Union Government did at the last general election. The Union Government at that time made an agreement with their candidates that they would support certain measures if elected. Perhaps, after all, those who are to blame for this movement are hon. gentlemen opposite, many of whom belonged to Farmers' organizations at the time of the last general election. At that time they told their electors that they only meant to support the Government on war measures, but that on the fiscal policy of the country and other questions they would adhere to the Farmers' platform. Many of them failed to carry out their promise, and perhaps it was for that reason that the recall plank was inserted in the Farmers' platform, so that in future when members do not live up to their pledges the people will have a right to recall them. My own opinion is that the opposition to it is merely an exemplification of the old Tory distrust of the people. They are afraid of the people. They dread

this organization, which is growing all the time, and they are afraid to trust the people when the time comes for an election. They see something wrong about the Farmers' movement because these people band themselves together and pass by-laws that in my opinion have nothing to do with this Parliament. On several occasions this session I have noticed that when labour legislation, and other Bills of the same character were introduced, and the National Progressive members did not take part in the debate, attention was called to the fact and complaint was made that they did not support the measures in question, or else that they did object to some Bill. Criticism was levelled against them on both grounds. I think to-day's amendment is another example of the same policy. It has been introduced more with the idea of trying to draw out and get even with the members of the Progressive party at the other end of the Chamber than from any other motive. As the leader of the Opposition has said: Let the people rule. If a majority of electors in any constituency are in favour of the recall they have a right to enter into any arrangement they may care to make with their representative. For my part, I have always been opposed to calling upon members to sign recalls. I do not suppose I shall ever be asked to sign such a thing although there is very little difference between our party and theirs. The difference between us is of the nature that was described a few days ago by an hon. member when he remarked that on one occasion Lord Salisbury said that, "Gladstone was an old man in a hurry". I think the only difference between our friends at the other end of the Chamber and ourselves is that perhaps they are a little in a hurry. They are probably a little more advanced than we are, but they are standing on the same platform. We are pretty nearly agreed with them with the exception of what I may term these few "progressive" planks that have been adopted by them. The amendment of course has been withdrawn—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. WHITE: I should rather say the request has been made that it should be withdrawn. I do not think it is right that after so much valuable time has been taken up in discussing it the hon. member who moved the amendment should be allowed to withdraw it. The amendment should go to a vote in order that every member of the committee might record where he stands.

Mr. M. CLARK: I do not rise for the purpose of continuing the debate on this question, but simply for the purpose of removing a misapprehension which I would gladly have done earlier if the minister (Mr. Guthrie) had displayed his usual courtesy and granted me an opportunity. My purpose in rising is to read three lines of the platform of the Dominion Council of Agriculture on the question before the House. The minister seemed to base his support of the amendment on some idea he had that there was a secret agreement mentioned in the platform of the Council of Agriculture. My only purpose in rising is to say that no secret agreement whatsoever is mentioned in that platform; the word "agreement" is not mentioned at all. The plank in the platform reads thus:

> The establishment of measures of direct legislation through the initiative, referendum and recall.

Amendment (Mr. Tweedie) negatived. Clause agreed to.

On clause 101—Act to apply in elections under Canada Temperance Act:

Mr. GUTHRIE: This clause was permitted to stand because it had reference to the Canada Temperance Act. Under this clause it is proposed to take any vote that may become necessary under any of the proposed referendums which are being held in the various provinces. I beg to move that the clause be amended by adding thereto the following words:

> And upon the issue of a proclamation for the taking of a vote under the Canada Temperance Act, voters' lists shall be prepared in accordance with the provisions of this Act for any county or province as set out in such proclamation in the same manner as voters' lists are required to be prepared in the case of the issue of writs for a general election.

As the committee will understand, there will be no writ for election in the case of the Canada Temperance Act; proceedings will be instituted by way of proclamation. The object of this amendment is to provide that on the issue of the proclamation the lists will be prepared under this Act just as they would be prepared on the issue of a writ for a general election.

Mr. STEELE: Does that mean that the lists will be prepared in each constituency as they are in a general election?

Mr. GUTHRIE: In this case it will be in the province instead of in the whole Domin-

ion, but the lists will be prepared in each constituency.

Mr. L. THOMSON: In preparing the lists for an ordinary election, the persons whose names may be placed on that list must have resided in Canada for twelve months prior to the issue of the writ. Will the provision in this case be that the residence in Canada shall be twelve months prior to the issue of the proclamation?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. L. THOMSON: That is made clear in the Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. POWER: I am opposed to the adoption of this clause, because it provides that the Act shall apply to elections held under the Canada Temperance Act. My view is that public moneys should not be expended in order to hold referendums in the various provinces on such questions as prohibition or prohibitory legislation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think I shall have to rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The provisions of the Canada Temperance Act are not under discussion.

Mr. POWER: My point is this: It is quite possible that the Canada Temperance Act may be repealed; it might even be repealed this year. I would like the minister either to suspend this clause or not to amend it so as to make it easier for provinces to come to the Dominion Government and ask for the use of federal funds every time they wish to hold a referendum or to change their minds with reference to prohibition or prohibitory legislation. As I understand it, the minister's point of order is that we have so amended the Canada Temperance Act as to provide that referendums may be held under it, and that these shall be governed by the Dominion Elections Act. To that I reply that it is not within our province to make it easier, by the provisions of this Act, for the local legislatures or local bodies to hold any such referendums. If the minister's point of order is well taken, then I may not proceed; if it is not, I shall proceed to discuss the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Any discussion of the results of the application of any province to the Federal Government for a referendum under the Canada Temperance Act would not be in order upon this clause.

Mr. CANNON: With further reference to what the hon. member (Mr. Power) has said, I do not wish to get in conflict with your decision, Mr. Chairman; I simply wish to direct the attention of the minister to the following facts. The Temperance Act is either complete or it is not. If it is complete, it must contain provisions for the taking of referendums; if it is not complete, it ought to be completed.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That, of course, may be done by another Act.

Mr. CANNON: Exactly. Why put in the electoral law of Canada a clause which has exclusive relation to the Canada Temperance Act? This clause ought to be inserted in the Canada Temperance Act, not in the Franchise Act.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think the hon. member (Mr. Cannon) is absolutely right in his contention. This clause should be put in the Canada Temperance Act, not here.

Mr. DOHERTY: The Canada Temperance Act itself provides that the persons who shall be entitled to vote under it are such persons as would be entitled to vote at a Dominion election held on the day of the plebiscite under the Temperance Act. Now, this Act simply says that the provisions which apply to everybody who is entitled to vote at a Dominion election shall apply in the case of a vote taken under the Canada Temperance Act. It is simply meeting the express provision of the Canada Temperance Act.

Mr. CANNON: The remarks of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) complete my remarks. I said that the Canada Temperance Act was either complete or incomplete. The minister tell us that it is complete. Therefore, this clause is useless.

Mr. DOHERTY: I did not say that; I said that this clause completes it.

Mr. CANNON: If the Canada Temperance Act says that the referendum is to be taken according to the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act, why put this clause into the Dominion Elections Act having reference to the Canada Temperance Act? The clause in the Canada Temperance Act, of which the Minister of Justice has just spoken, renders this clause without any purpose or use.

Mr. DOHERTY: When that enactment was made in the Canada Temperance Act, there was then an Act of the Dominion of Canada, determining who it was that voted at the elections for this Parliament held under that Act; and the Canada Temper-

ance Act, taking the existing condition of things, enacted that persons entitled under then existing legislation to vote at a Dominion election would be entitled to vote under the Canada Temperance Act. We are changing the whole law governing who is to vote at Dominion elections, and the purpose of the provision under discussion is simply to make it clear that, as this measure changes the class of persons entitled to vote and the provisions with regard to voting at Dominion elections, it shall in the future apply for the purpose of implementing and carrying out that express provision of the Canada Temperance Act.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Then, I submit that the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) had a right to raise the question he raised. When the Canada Temperance Act was enacted and provisions were made for a referendum to be taken, the provincial lists were to be used for the purpose of taking that referendum. With this new clause in this Bill, new lists will have to be prepared for the special purpose of taking that referendum, and the cost of that will be paid by this Government. That means that if the Provincial Government of Ontario take a referendum, lists will be prepared under this Bill that will cost, perhaps, $500,000, and that amount will be paid by this country. As I stated before, when the Canada Temperance Act was passed, it was not contemplated that we should have to prepare special lists as will have to be prepared under clause 101. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Power) was right in complaining that such a tremendous cost should be forced upon this country. If the province of Ontario or any other province wants to take a referendum this year, or next year, or the following year, let that province pay for it. I am certainly in order, and my hon. friend (Mr. Power) was in order, in opposing this clause on that ground.

Mr. POWER: I may not have expressed myself as well as I should; but I still maintain that I am in order inasmuch as this present Bill is possibly, even probably, a more expensive measure than the Act which was formerly in force, in that in a large number of provinces we now have a system of enumerators and we have added certain officials who did not act under the old Act. I am in order in opposing the application of this measure to the Canada Temperance Act on the ground that this is a new and more expensive measure, and, therefore, the people of Canada will have, on different occasions, to expend more money to suit the whim—or the wishes if some of my hon. friends prefer that term—of some of the various provinces of Canada. For that reason, I am opposed to the adoption of clause 101. I am opposed to it also, because, as has been so well stated by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon), if the Canada Temperance Act is complete, it should have within itself a provision such as this, to the effect that the Act for the election of members of the House of Commons of Canada shall also apply to the Canada Temperance Act. Such a provision as we have in clause 101 is utterly foreign to the Bill now under consideration, and, to my mind, should never have been inserted in this Bill, and I think the minister ought to see that it should be withdrawn from the Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The point which has been raised is a very important one. Much will depend on how the lists are to be prepared. If the Bill is to remain as at present drafted, it means that a large number of enumerators will have to be appointed every time the machinery of this measure is set in motion. I do not think we are justified, if we take exception to the vast expenditure which that machinery is going to involve, in voting at this time to duplicate that expenditure every time the Canada Temperance Act comes into operation. Before we can intelligently discuss this clause and determine whether it is wise to pass it or not, we should know in what final shape the machinery of this law is to be, and then we can go on and discuss the next step. But if this bill is to remain as at present drafted, by passing this clause we shall vastly increase the drain on the federal treasury in connection with another Act already on the statute books. I ask the minister to consider that phase of the question, and I think he should let this clause stand until we have seen whether the Government cannot possibly meet some of the suggestions which have come from this side of the House in connection with the preparation of the lists, and which we believe will be just as effective as regards the machinery necessary for the Act and vastly less expensive.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think there is anything to be gained by so doing; but if my hon. friend wants to let this clause stand until clause 32 has been discussed and passed, I am quite agreeable.

Section 101 stands.

On section 29—qualification of electors:

Mr. GUTHRIE: Some days ago I gave notice that, when this clause was considered, I would move an amendment. I, therefore, move to amend clause 29 by adding, as paragraph (d) of subclause 1, the following words:

(d) Provided, however, that any Indian ordinarily resident on an Indian Reserve who has served in the naval, military or air forces of Canada in the late war shall be qualified to vote, unless such Indian is otherwise disqualified under paragraphs (a) (b) and (c) of this section.

Mr. CANNON: How could he be "otherwise disqualified"?

Mr. GUTHRIE: He might not have the residential and age qualifications, for instance.

Mr. BUREAU: Is the idea that the man who has served in the army or navy and is not twenty-one has not the right to vote? He is disfranchised?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Under the amendment I have proposed the Indian who has served with the forces would only be entitled to vote when he complies with all the other requisites in regard to British citizenship, residence and age.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why limit it to Indians who are ordinarily resident on a reserve?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Indians who are living on a reserve and who are receiving the bounty of the Government are the wards of the Government and they have nearly always been disqualified under our Dominion Franchise Acts.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But there are Indians who are not living on a reserve, and they have no right to vote unless they are enfranchised. There are many Indians who are working and living outside the reserve. They have no right to vote at the present time, but why shouldn't they vote if they have served in the army or navy?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Any Indian not ordinarily resident on an Indian reserve is entitled to vote provided he has the other qualifications.

Mr. LAPOINTE: When he is on a reserve he will not vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If he is ordinarily resident on an Indian reserve he will not vote.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Because he is looked on as a ward of the Government.

Mr. JACOBS: I am rather in favour of this clause. I think that any person who is in receipt of assistance from the Government, or who can be influenced by the Government, ought not to have the right to vote. It is an easy matter to see how they would vote if they had that right.

Mr. CANNON: What about an Indian who has served with the forces and who is not resident on an Indian reserve, but lives outside at a nearby village? Near Quebec there is an Indian reserve at Lorette. Some of the Indians live on the reserve, but others who are emancipated live in the village of Lorette outside.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They are not disqualified under this clause.

Mr. CANNON: Under the amendment an Indian requires two essential qualifications in order to vote. First, he must have served in the army or navy or with the air forces, and secondly, he must be ordinarily resident on an Indian reserve.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Off the reserve.

Mr. CALDWELL: Suppose an Indian had served in the late war and lived on a reservation, would he be entitled to vote?

Mr. CANNON: The amendment reads:

Provided, however, that any Indian ordinarily resident on an Indian Reserve who has served in the Naval, Military or Air forces of Canada in the late war shall be qualified to vote.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The minister said the amendment read: "Not ordinarily resident." Which is right?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It seems to be so simple as not to need explanation. A man is qualified to vote, not being an Indian ordinarily resident on an Indian reserve. The meaning of that is that an Indian who is ordinarily resident on a reserve has no vote. But if such an Indian residing on a reserve served in the army or navy or air forces he will have the right to vote provided he has the other qualifications.

Mr. HAROLD: Will an Indian who is not a resident on an Indian reserve and who is not enfranchised have the right to vote?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Unless there is some special disfranchising Act. This Act does not disqualify him. This Act only disfranchises an Indian ordinarily resident on an Indian reserve. I know of no other disfranchising Act. It may be that the Indian Act provides that an Indian in receipt of bounty shall not vote, but I am not sure about that.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend (Mr. Cannon) is absolutely right. The Act provides that an Indian ordinarily resident on an Indian reserve who has served in the army or navy or air forces shall have the right to vote, but there is nothing here giving the right to vote to a man who does not reside on a reserve but has served with the forces.

Mr. GUTHRIE: He does not need it. He is not disqualified. There is nothing in the Act that will disqualify a man who does not reside on a reserve.

Mr. BUREAU: He may be a member of the band, subject to all the rules of the band, and live outside the reserve.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is nothing in this Act that disqualifies him.

Mr. CANNON: As the law stands now, under the Indian Act an Indian is absolutely disfranchised. An Indian, to cease to be an Indian, has to be emancipated or enfranchised under the procedure laid down in the Indian Act. If that procedure has not been followed, and if the Indian has served in the late war and does not reside on an Indian reserve but in a nearby village the amendment does not give him the right to vote, I think he ought to have it. We have a reserve at Lorette near Quebec. Some members of the tribe live on the reserve and others in the village. Those living in the village have no right to vote unless they are enfranchised. I know that some of the members of this tribe have served in the war. By this amendment they would not be entitled to vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This Act is pretty specific in its provisions. I am not sure what is in the Indian Act, but I am inclined to think from what I have heard around me that there is some disqualification in that Act of an Indian who is in receipt of money from the Government. They are looked on as wards of the Government. This Act won't interfere with them. There is no disqualification in this Act except of the Indian ordinarily resident on a reserve, and even they have the right to vote if they have served with the forces and are not otherwise disqualified. If he resides off the reserve he is not disqualified under this Act.

Mr. PARDEE: Yes he is, unless he is enfranchised.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If he is off the reserve this Act does not disqualify him. It only disqualifies the Indian on the reserve.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: But the Indian off the reserve is disqualified by law until he is enfranchised. At the present time we have a Committee of this House studying the whole Indian question, and some members of the Committee are in favour of compulsorily enfranchising the Indians who live off the reserve because they are no longer wards of the Government. There are certain disabilites; they cannot be sued for debt, and so on. So my hon. friend is wrong when he says the Indians living off the reserve will have the right to vote. They will have that right only when they are enfranchised under the law.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Any disability is not under this Act; it is under the Indian Act.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The other Act may be amended when the House sees fit to amend it. There is no disability under this Act except as against Indians who live on the reserve.

Mr. CANNON: Why not strike out the words "Indian ordinarily resident on an Indian reserve."

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think there is something in the Indian Act which provides that unless an Indian renounces his tribal allegiance he has no vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If he does renounce his tribal allegiance and then goes back to the reserve he cannot vote under this section.

Mr. PARDEE: Is an Indian who was not enfranchised but who served in the war and is now living off the reservation, entitled to vote?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Not if the Indian Act says not.

Mr. PARDEE: Why not? If an Indian served in the war and is thus entitled to vote, why should he not vote, whether he lives on or off the reserve?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Perhaps we had better look at the Indian Act; we have so many different opinions.

Mr. PARDEE: The minister says, and this Act provides, that the man who is ordinarily resident on an Indian reservation and who has served with the air or military forces shall be entitled to vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. PARDEE: If a man is not ordinarily resident on a reservation, what is his status?

Mr. GUTHRIE: He can vote anywhere.

Mr. PARDEE: No, not unless he is enfranchised.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This Act declares that he shall have the vote.

Mr. PARDEE: No, it does not declare that. Only the man ordinarily resident on the reservation shall vote. Now, why should the man who is not on the reservation but who served in the war not be entitled to vote? That is the point.

Mr. HAROLD: This point must be made clear. When our committee was sitting, we had before us Lieut. Martin, of Toronto. He is at present living in that city and has not a vote ordinarily because he is attached to the band and is not enfranchised. I think, therefore, that this amendment should cover those Indians off the reservation.

Mr. PARDEE: Exactly.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I move to strike out of the amendment the words "ordinarily resident on an Indian reserve."

Mr. HAROLD: Will the minister consider giving the vote to the wives of the Indians?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No; we give the Indians the vote only because of their war service.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I move to amend clause 29 by adding to the said clause the following words:

Provided that no disability imposed by paragraph (b) of subsection 4 of section 8 of "The Naturalization Act", chapter thirty-eight of the statutes of 1919 (first session), shall disentitle a person on that ground alone to the said certificate.

Mr. EULER: When the principle of this clause was discussed on the second reading of the Bill some weeks ago and it was realized that the clause, when read with a certain clause in the Naturalization Act, would disfranchise probably one hundred thousand British subjects, I was very much gratified to hear the pronouncement from the Government, through the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), that it was not the intention of the Government that there should be such an effect. and further that an amendment would be introduced later on that would remove the injustice. That amendment is now before us, and I may say frankly, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that a better remedy would have consisted in striking out that part of the clause altogether. I shall speak of that very briefly a little later. It is impossible to discuss the amendment intelligently without discussing to some extent at least the Naturalization Act. Indeed, I think there is even now in the House, and perhaps throughout the country, a very considerable misconception as to the purport of the Bill as it stands and of this amendment as it is now proposed. There are two groups of people who have been discussed in connection with this Bill, and the reason for that is to be found in the Naturalization Act that was passed last year, particularly section 8. I have no desire to transgress the rules, but I think it is necessary that I should make some reference to the Naturalization Act in connection with this subject. In section 8 of that Act provision was made that no persons of enemy alien origin could be naturalized in Canada without living in this country for ten years after the conclusion of peace. That provision embraced people who had lived in Canada for a great many years, and I discussed that question at the time and made an objection to the principle of applying that provision to men who had lived in this country for so many years, many of whom had considered themselves British subjects and many of whom had voted in the past. However, it was said at the time that it was necessary to draft the clause in that form because of the requirements of the British Government, who desired that all certificates issued in the future by the Canadian Government should carry with them Imperial naturalization. It was also promised by the Prime Minister at that time that he would make representations to the British Government to have that matter modified. That has not as yet been done, but I understand from interviews with certain members of the Government that application has been made to the British Government and that action may be expected. I should like to say, by the way, that if that cannot be obtained I would suggest to the Government that in all fairness they should introduce some legislation whereby these people might be given, if not Imperial naturalization, at least Canadian naturalization, which would meet the requirements of nine hundred and ninety-nine out of a thousand of those who would like Canadian naturalization to permit them to vote. This would be all the more reasonable, because we know as a matter of fact to-day that the man in Canada who was formerly an enemy alien, or at least

who was born in Germany or Austria and who has Canadian naturalization, finds it absolutely impossible to get the Imperial naturalization certificate even though he served in the war. If these people could get Canadian naturalization that would remedy the matter, as far as the franchise is concerned.

The amendment as proposed does not affect those people of enemy alien origin who cannot be naturalized for another ten years. I think there is an impression throughout the country—I know I have met with it in my own constituency—that by this amendment all those who cannot be naturalized until they have lived in Canada for ten years will now be able to vote. I think it should be made perfectly clear that people who have not been naturalized are not affected by this amendment at all, and that it only deals with those who are British subjects by operation of law. The people who are spoken of as British subjects by operation of law are those who are naturalized by reason of the naturalization of their fathers, in the case of children and minors, or those who are naturalized by reason of the naturalization of their husbands in the case of the wives of these men. In the Bill as it was presented these people would have been prevented from voting and I think, with the exception of one point that I desire to bring out briefly, the amendment as proposed by the Acting Solicitor General will make it possible under certain conditions that these people now receive the franchise.

The point I wish to raise is a legal one, and perhaps it may seem somewhat presumptuous for one who is not a lawyer to raise it. It is a point that I discussed with the Acting Solicitor General. He did not think there was any force in it. I discussed it with certain other members of the House who are learned in the law, some on this side and one or two on the other side, and in order that the opinion which I myself have on the point might be supported or otherwise by someone who could not in any way be considered a partisan, I drew it to the attention of a gentleman who has a great deal to do with matters of this kind in connection with naturalization and discussed it with him. That was the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Thomas Mulvey. When I placed it before him and asked him for his opinion, he said that the meaning which I took out of it was correct, and that at the very best it would be doubtful whether under certain sections of the Naturalization Act the right to vote which would be given by the amendment now proposed, would not again be taken away. I am bringing the point out now, not for the purpose of raising any objection but simply to make absolutely certain that the declared intention of the Government to give the franchise to these people shall be carried out.

The point is as follows: Under section 29, which we are now discussing, a certificate may be given to those British subjects who are British subjects by operation of the law. The certificate is given to:

> Every person who is naturalized as a British subject by operation of law who, but for such naturalization, is qualified and would be entitled at the date of this certificate to be personally naturalized in Canada.

For these hundred thousand people who are naturalized by operation of law it will be necessary, before they can vote, to go before a judge and prove to him that they are qualified for personal naturalization. They are not required, as I take it, to actually secure that personal naturalization, but they must have the qualification before he can issue a certificate to that effect which certificate gives them the right to vote. In the Naturalization Act, section 5, subsection 3, there is the following clause:

> Except as provided by this Act, a certificate of naturalization shall not be granted to any person under disability.

The word "disability" is defined in section 33 paragraph (d) as follows:

> The expression "disability" means the status of being a married woman, or a minor, lunatic or idiot.

What I have particular reference to in this connection is that the expression "disability" means the status of being a married woman. In the Act itself there appears to be no provision whatever for the personal naturalization of a married woman who is already a British subject, because her husband is a naturalized British subject. Therefore it would seem that when such a woman appeared before the judge and asked for a certificate which would give her the right to vote the judge would very naturally say to her that he is not entitled to issue a certificate of personal naturalization because there is no provision for the naturalization of a married woman who is already a British subject by operation of law.

The Acting Solicitor General did not agree with that view, as I have said before, and I have no doubt he will place his view on that point before the committee. If there is anything in it at all, the amend-

ment which has been offered by him should be so framed that all possible doubt will be removed and that the object that is sought to be attained by the amendment will be fully carried out, and so that those who are British subjects by operation of law will find there is no obstacle placed in the way of their obtaining certificates and being allowed to vote.

I said a few moments ago, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion the best remedy would be to strike the paragraph out altogether. It would make it very much more simple, there could be no doubt whatever about it, and it would base the franchise broadly upon the fact of British citizenship, which seems altogether fair and which would carry out the principle enunciated by the Acting Solicitor General himself when he introduced the Bill in the first place.

The point I want to make is that people affected by the amendment are already British subjects, and while I have no fault to find with the principle that is sought to be enacted here, that every alien should receive personal naturalization, it does not seem to me to be altogether fair that the principle should be made retroactive and that you should force British subjects, many of whom have voted in the past, to again appear before a judge in order that they may obtain a certificate. Indeed the chief objection that I have to that is this: I think it is altogether likely that in a great many instances these people will not appear before the judge, for various reasons. One of these reasons might quite conceivably be a certain matter of pride. For example take the case of the men who may have voted for ten or fifteen years, ever since they came of age, and who were naturalized because their fathers were naturalized. I do not see why these men should be placed in a separate class and again be asked to prove that they are fit for citizenship and for the exercise of the franchise; it seems to me they might very well be excused from that. Again, I believe it is altogether probable that in many cases the names of these people— wives of naturalized British subjects, and men naturalized by operation of law—will be placed on the voters' lists, and they will assume that they are entitled to vote. They will take no further trouble in connection with the matter. They will appear at the polls, and then it may be quite possible that somebody will object, will ask them for the certificate, and as they will not have it, they will be deprived of the franchise at that time. It seems to me that that should be avoided. It would be quite fair, I think, that the law might apply to all newcomers or those who are naturalized in the future, but that it should be made retroactive, it seems to me, is not fair at all. I would ask the Government in that connection not to have their amendment stop short of giving complete justice to these people, but to strike out the paragraph altogether, and let the franchise be the inseparable and logical accompaniment of mature citizenship, and give the vote to all who are British subjects of the proper age.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The question raised by my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) is not without some complexity. Under the Bill as originally introduced—clause 29, subclause 2—the intention of the Government in framing the clause was hardly expressed by the language used, as was pointed out on the second reading of the Bill by the Minister of the Interior. The effect of the clause as originally drawn, and now printed in the Bill, would be to disqualify a certain number of people in this country who had heretofore become British subjects by operation of law. The people who would have been thus disqualified, were the section allowed to remain in its present condition, were the wives and children of those who had come to this country from foreign countries and obtained naturalization in Canada during their minority. As the committee is well aware, the wife of an alien who becomes naturalized in this country, under our law, becomes a British subject. The wife did not have to appear and obtain the certificate of naturalization—she became a British subject by operation of law by the fact of her marriage. Under the old common law idea she merged her existence, her identity became merged in her husband, and by operation of law she became a British subject. So it was also with the children who were minors at the time the parent became a British subject. Not so with the children who had come to the age of twenty-one years. They retained their original citizenship until they should themselves apply for naturalization in this country. My hon. friend from North Waterloo was, I think, the first to point out, during the debate on the second reading of this Bill, that the clause as drawn, had the effect of depriving a certain number of British subjects of the right to the franchise. The Minister of the Interior very promptly informed the House that such was not intended—that if that were the interpretation of the language of the section it did not convey the intention of the Government—and

he promised the House that when the Bill came up again an amendment would be introduced to give effect to the intention of the Government, which was to maintain the right of those persons who had become naturalized by operation of law to all their rights, including the right of the franchise. Now the amendment which I have just had the honour of moving is intended to cure that defect in the section as it is printed in the present Bill, and I would ask the committee to examine the language of that amendment. In my humble opinion the language of the amendment does cure the defect; but if there be any doubt on that point I have no hesitation in saying the Government has no desire to create a doubt on the subject, and we will employ any language that may be necessary to make the matter plain and free from doubt. In my humble opinion, however, the section which I have just moved as an amendment does remove the doubt.

It refers to paragraph (B) of subsection four of section eight. Let me read that paragraph:

> No certificate of naturalization shall, before the expiration of a period of ten years after the termination of the present war, be granted in Canada to any subject of a country which at the time of the passing of this Act was at war with His Majesty, but this provision shall not apply to a person who,
>
> (1) having served in His Majesty's forces or in the forces of His Majesty's allies or of any country acting in naval and military co-operation with His Majesty was not discharged from such service by reason of his enemy nationality, sympathy or associations, or,
>
> (2) is a member of a race or community known to be opposed to the enemy governments, or,
>
> (3) was at birth a British subject.

Now subsection 2 of section 29 of the present Bill makes this provision:

> For the purposes of this Act, the allegiance or nationality of a person, as it was at the birth of such person, shall be deemed incapable of being changed, or of having been changed, merely by reason or in consequence of marriage or change of allegiance or naturalization of any other person, or otherwise than by personal naturalization of such first mentioned person. Provided, however, that this subsection shall not apply to any person born on the continent of North America, nor to any person who in person applies to and obtains from any judge having jurisdiction in naturalization proceedings, a certificate under the hand of such judge and the seal, if any, of his court, to the effect following:—

Now as those two sections stand I think there is no doubt that the wife of a naturalized British subject, and the children who become British subjects by reason of their birth or their minority at the time their parent was naturalized—the effect of that section as it is printed to-day would be to deprive these people of a vote. Now, Mr. Chairman, note the amendment:

> Provided that no disability imposed by paragraph (B), of subsection four of section eight of the Naturalization Act, Chapter 38, shall disentitle a person on that ground alone to the said certificate.

So that if the only ground is the ground set out in paragraph (b), namely, that they cannot obtain naturalization for ten years because of the fact that they belong to what we know as the enemy races during the late war, that disqualification is removed by the amendment I now move; that shall not stand in the way of anybody who is a British subject by operation of the law heretofore.

My hon. friend from North Waterloo discussed this question with me very candidly a few nights ago. I understand that he has in mind some difficulties which he thinks might possibly arise in connection with the language of the naturalization law which is in force in Canada. I tried as best I could to point out to him—and I still maintain the same view—that his fears were groundless. But it is not desirable that there should be any doubt upon the subject, and if there is any way of making it clear I am quite prepared to make it clear. The hon. gentleman pointed out, in the first place, that our Naturalization Act, section 5, subsection 3, provides as follows:

> Except as provided by this Act, a certificate of naturalization shall not be granted to any person under disability.

I ask the committee to note the precise language: "except as provided by this Act". Then, he referred me to the interpretation clause of the Act, which says:

> The expression "disability" means the status of being a married woman, or a minor, lunatic or idiot.

Consequently, the impression created in my hon. friend's mind was that as a married woman was a person under disability, according to this interpretation she could not, having regard to the provision of subsection 3 of section 5, obtain naturalization. But the interpretation clause, section 33, commences this way:

> In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires . . . "disability" means . . . a married woman.

But that interpretation cannot be placed on the word "disability" in this Act, because the Act distinctly says otherwise; the context does otherwise require. Note again subsection 3 of section 5:

Except as provided by this Act, a certificate of naturalization shall not be granted to any person under disability.

Now, what is the provision of the Act? Section 11, to my mind, is so plain that he who runs may read. It says: "The wife of a British subject shall be deemed to be a British subject". That is in the first paragraph. Then follows paragraph (a):

Provided that the wife of an alien may be naturalized in like manner and with the same effect as if she were a feme sole.

Then it is provided that her naturalization shall not affect her children. There are two classes of people concerned: first, the wife of a British subject shall be a British subject, that is clear; second, the wife of an alien may be naturalized in like manner as if she were a single woman. That is clear; language could not be clearer. How does that apply under our section as amended? We come to the certificate. A woman says: My husband is a naturalized British subject; consequently I am a British subject by operation of law and I am entitled to vote. But, they say: you cannot vote: you have no naturalization certificate. Under this Act she has the right to go before a judge and say: I am one of those persons who have become British subjects by operation of law, I cannot appear personally and obtain naturalization because I am a British subject. The judge says: if that be so, then here is your certificate and she goes and votes. So, too, with minor children.

Now, the certificate contains a clause which might give rise to some shadow of a doubt, though I do not think it does. The certificate, which may be obtained from any judge who has power to deal with naturalization—and that includes all our county and minor court judges—is merely this:

This is to certify that from evidence submitted before me, I am satisfied that A.B. of.....in the province of.....(occupation).....is a person naturalized as a British subject by operation of law, who, but for such naturalization, is qualified and would be entitled at the date of the issue of this certificate to be personally naturalized in Canada.

Meaning clearly that being a British subject by operation of law, she cannot go personally and obtain naturalization. An alien might do so; a single woman might do so; but a British subject cannot do so because she is a British subject; that is the meaning of the section. Now, if there is any way of clearing up that doubt, if there is one, with regard to these people who are de facto British subjects, I am quite willing, if some one will suggest what language should be adopted, to meet the suggestion. So much with regard to that particular class of people—the wives of naturalized British subjects and the minor children who have become British subjects by law, by reason of their parents becoming naturalized.

Now, as to the broader question—a question which is a good deal involved. As the committee is aware, this Parliament in its wisdom passed a Naturalization Act in 1919. We were not, I admit, bound to pass it, but we did pass it, and we passed it after conference with the British Government and the Governments of the other British Dominions. The British Government submitted to these Dominions a certain Act and said to them: if you are willing to pass Part 2 of our Naturalization Act, we will accept Canadian naturalization throughout the British Empire; if you so desire, we will have a uniform Act; we cannot impose our will on the Parliament of Canada—that is stated in so many words in the British Act—but there is our Act; we leave it to you to decide whether you take it or refuse it. They said the same to Australia, New Zealand and the other Dominions. Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, I think, have adopted the suggestion; I am not sure about India. That made an Imperial Naturalization Act. For the first time, naturalization certificates issued in Canada become good throughout the British Empire. They are recognized in Great Britain, and theirs are just as good in Canada. That Act was passed by the Parliament of Canada with full knowledge of the circumstances; we must assume that, at all events.

Now, the difficulty that has arisen in this country is that there are apparently a number of people of German or Austrian origin —chiefly German, I think—who have been residents of Canada for a great many years and who have in most instances considered that they were British subjects. But the number of these people is limited; I do not think it is as great as we sometimes hear stated. It has been represented that hundreds of thousands of these people are going to be disqualified. Well, I do not think so. I live in close proximity to my hon. friend from Waterloo (Mr. Euler) and I know something about this matter. Well, these people have become careless in regard to the matter of their naturalization, or perhaps they have been imposed on by politicians who induced them to imagine that they were British subjects and had the right to vote. Perhaps some of them in the dim

and distant past did obtain naturalization certificates which have since become lost or destroyed, or the records in connection with which have become obliterated. At all events, we have at the present time in various ridings in Ontario very old and very worthy people of German descent—possibly of Austrian descent, too——who cannot establish the fact that they are British subjects. They may say that they have voted for twenty, thirty or forty years. I have personal knowledge of some instances, because the admission was made to me, in which men who had voted had never been naturalized.

It has been argued that these people should not now be deprived of the right to be naturalized, though in section 8 of our Naturalization Act we have adopted the Imperial clause that provides that people of a former alien enemy state shall not be entitled to naturalization for ten years after the conclusion of peace. The situation is not a happy one; but it is one that has arisen, I think, largely on account of lack of interest or carelessness of the individuals themselves who did not see to it in years gone by that they were properly naturalized, or who were so careless in regard to the matter that the records became lost or the certificates were destroyed and they are unable to establish the fact now. The hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) makes a suggestion to meet the difficulty; he made it last session. He has made it, I think, privately to the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), and his request has been promised, and has received consideration. His proposal is this: That we in Canada have still the power to pass a Canadian Naturalization Act and that we should pass a Canadian Naturalization Act and by that means give these people the Canadian franchise. The matter has, however, assumed more than a Canadian aspect. We have passed an Imperial Naturalization Act which gives us the right to confer upon the people of this country citizenship throughout the British Empire. We passed that Act with our eyes open, making it on all fours with Acts passed in the other British Dominions. We passed it deliberately after a long experience during which we granted Canadian citizenship after three years' residence in this country, good only within Canada, and such a Canadian citizen who left Canada was not a British subject. In fact, I am told that high dignitaries of this country went as representatives of this country to Great Britain and found when they got there that they were not British subjects, simply because they had only Canadian naturalization. Now a man who gets a certificate of naturalization in this country, is justified in believing that he is a British subject throughout the British Empire. My hon. friend (Mr. Euler) says: You have it in your power to give Canadian naturalization. Deliberately, we rejected that old system and adopted a new one; we placed ourselves on a par with the other Dominions and the Motherland herself, and that was done after full consideration of all the circumstances. I think it was last session that the Prime Minister promised my hon. friend that he would fully consider the matter and take it up with the Imperial authorities. Doubtless the failure of his health and his consequent absence from this country prevented him from doing so personally although he started the negotiations. I am able, however, to tell the committee that the negotiations have proceeded, but they have not proceeded to that extent that the Government is able to announce that an arrangement has yet been reached.

I do not know if a satisfactory arrangement can be looked for in the near future. Personally, I am inclined to think this is one of the matters that may be discussed at the Imperial Conference to be held in 1921, although I cannot give the committee any more than my opinion in that regard. It is certain that up to the present moment we have not received the assent of Great Britain to that proposal. Shall we deliberately derogate from our own Act and create a new status after having deliberately overthrown the old status and accepted the Imperial one? I do not think it will be a very long time for us to wait until we have a final decision. It may be that there will not be any great necessity for voting in the interval; I hope there will not, but as to that no one can speak with any confidence. That, however, is the situation. The object of the present amendment is to make definite and certain that every one who is actually a British subject shall enjoy the right to vote, and if the amendment that I have moved does not make that clear, we shall make it clear if a better method can be suggested.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Who will be the persons, British subjects by operation of the law, who will remain disqualified or who will be unable to obtain a certificate entitling them to vote under this clause as amended? Will there remain any such persons?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No one who is a British subject.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Then, what is the purpose of subclause 2 of clause 29 if every person will be able to vote?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not quite catch my hon. friend's meaning.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I want to know who are those who will be unable to obtain a certificate giving them the right to vote?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Those who could not go personally and get naturalized; those who depend only on their marriage or their parentage could not obtain naturalization under subclause 2.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): In that class will be included those who do not have a good knowledge of the English or the French language.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That would be a disqualification. Any one who could not comply with the qualifications of our Naturalization Act, which include a knowledge of either the French or the English language, would be disqualified.

Mr. PARDEE: Might I ask the Acting Solicitor General, in opening, if those who were aliens and who had already become naturalized prior to the Nautralization Act of 1919, are still entitled to vote?

Mr. CALDER: A male?

Mr. PARDEE: Yes. He became naturalized prior to the Naturalization Act of 1919. Is he still entitled to vote?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I shall have to examine the clauses of the Naturalization Act as to that. I have them before me, but I have not time to examine them just now. It may be there is some discretion. He would have formerly one of the limited certificates, good only in Canada. My hon. friend refers only as to the vote, not as to obtaining Imperial citizenship?

Mr. PARDEE: I am speaking only in regard to the right to vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, he can vote, but he has to make a new application if he desires to get an Imperial certificate, or a certificate under the Act of 1919.

Mr. PARDEE: But in order to vote at any succeeding election, he has not to get a new certificate, provided that he was naturalized prior to 1919, even though that Naturalization Act was passed in that year?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think there is any doubt that a man who has heretofore been naturalized under the law of this country as that law stood at the time of the issue of his certificate, has a right to vote, and his wife would be a British subject according to law.

Mr. PARDEE: Would she have a right to vote?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes. Unless she were a person born in North America, she would have to apply to a judge to show that she would have a right to vote, to get a certificate.

Mr. PARDEE: Even though the husband is entitled to vote owing to naturalization prior to the Naturalization Act of 1919 and his wife thereby became a British subject prior to 1919, the husband would not have to apply again and would be entitled to vote, but the wife would have to apply for a new certificate?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, she would have to apply to the judge, before voting, for a certificate under this clause.

Mr. PARDEE: In other words, although she became a British subject by operation of law, owing to the fact that her husband was naturalized prior to the Naturalization Act of 1919 and is still a British subject for the purpose of the franchise, his wife would still have to obtain a certificate in order to vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, it is to meet her case that this clause was drawn.

Mr. PARDEE: But this would have no bearing at all on the man himself?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No.

Mr. PARDEE: I ask the Acting Solicitor General these questions by reason of the fact that the other day I received from a very eminent barrister, who has had much to do with the naturalization of these people, a latter in which he states:

The Government of Canada in 1917 took cognizance of the fact that there were many aliens who had resided in Canada for many years whose sympathies were with the United Kingdom as its Allies in the Great War and who had no Pro-German or other alien affiliations. This fact was officially recognized particularly in Orders in Council No. 2552 and No. 2948. Thereupon the Department of the Secretary of State published in pamphlet form the Naturalization Act of 1914 with Amendments, the Orders in Council and the departmental regulations applicable to naturalization.

The Act and the regulations prescribed all the steps necessary to be taken by an alien in order to perfect his naturalization. He was told that he must post up a notice, and furnish cer-

tain facts, and attend before the clerk of the Court to sign a petition, and then, finally, appear before the County Judge and give evidence to show that he had qualified under the Act.

The Orders in Council, the Regulations and the pamphlet freely distributed practically constituted an invitation to those who came within the meaning of the Act to come forward and become British subjects and Canadian citizens. Scores responded to the invitation. In the county of Grey about one hundred and fifty made application. I dealt with a number of these applications myself. Looking over these applications I see that some of them came to Canada in infancy; some at the age of four or five years; I believe that the majority of them came when under ten years of age; few came after twenty years of age; some of them had lived in Canada for sixty years; they practically knew no other country; ninety per cent of these men were told by the politicians of the day that they were qualified to vote if they would only swear that they were British subjects and they were told that all that was necessary was to take the oath of allegiance. Not knowing any better they believed that they were British subjects and voted as such at every election. They occupied positions of municipal trust, took a general interest in Canadian affairs and lived irreproachable lives so far as law and order are concerned. When the war broke out they were more or less opposed to Germany because the parents of many of these men had left Germany to avoid the burden of military service.

These men followed diligently the regulations prescribed by the department, engaged counsel and paid the fees prescribed by the Government, and to that extent enriched the Treasury, attended at the County Town once or twice and incurred expenses in connection with their naturalization varying from $25 to $35.

The applications were heard by the County Judges. Those who, in the opinion of the County Judge, who, from his local knowledge is best able to ascertain the facts, gave satisfactory evidence had their applications approved. Those who did not satisfy him were rejected.

A very large number of these applications were heard at the end of June 1919. Two weeks afterwards, on the 7th of July, 1919, the present Naturalization Act became law and these applicants, who had been for months making their applications, found that certificates would not be granted for a further period of ten years when the majority of them would be in their graves.

I need hardly say that solicitors who, like myself, had prepared the applications for these men and advised them as to the steps to take and the circumstances under which certificates would be granted, resent very strongly being placed in the position of taking fees from these men and then, owing to the Act of 1919, being compelled to advise them that the whole procedure was a farce and that they have lost their money.

One County Judge referred to it as a scandal and all who were concerned in putting through these applications feel that we were placed in a false position.

That is the opinion expressed by a very eminent Canadian barrister. Now are these men who had obtained these certificates prior to the Naturalization Act of 1919 still entitled, as they were before, irrespective of the ten-year clause in the 1919 Naturalization Act, to vote under the present Bill?

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is no doubt about it, if they obtained their certificates. I am speaking of the naturalization certificate under the law as it stood prior to the passing of the 1919 Act.

Mr. CALDER: There must be a naturalization certificate from the Secretary of State.

Mr. GUTHRIE: A certificate that complied with the law as it then stood.

Mr. PARDEE: So that any man who appeared before the county judge and was deemed fit for naturalization would be entitled to vote under the present Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think he would be naturalized, under the 1914 Act.

Mr. PARDEE: Prior to 1919, complying with the law as it then was.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If my hon. friend looks at the 1914 Act he will find differently I think.

Mr. PARDEE: All the applicant had to do was this. He had to go before any barrister, preferably the County Crown Attorney, and prove if he was foreign born, that he had a residence of three years in Canada, then make his petition, then make his affidavit that he would file that petition, and give notice of application for naturalization for three months before the sittings of the county court sessions, and then become naturalized. What I want to know is this: Are those men who received their naturalization certificates from the County Crown Attorney, through the medium of being naturalized by the high court judge or a judge of the sessions, entitled to vote under the Act as it stands?

Mr. DOHERTY: No.

Mr. PARDEE: What have they got to do?

Mr. DOHERTY: They are not entitled because they did not get certificates of naturalization.

Mr. PARDEE: They did.

Mr. DOHERTY: Let me point out what they got. The judge, under the Act of 1914, gives nobody a certificate of naturalization, but a certificate that the applicant has satisfied him, the judge, that he has the necessary qualifications to be naturalized. That certificate of the judge is not a

certificate that he is naturalized, but a certificate that he has the necessary qualifications. That certificate has to go to the Secretary of State, and upon that certificate the Secretary of State may issue the certificate of naturalization. He is under no obligation to issue it. On the contrary, he has an absolute discretion, and a man has never got his naturalization certificate until he gets it from the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State can grant it, and nobody else.

Mr. MORPHY: That is since 1914?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. The judge intervenes simply as the instrument to gather the necessary evidence and forward to the Secretary of State the certificate that he has satisfied himself that the man has the qualifications. The people to whom my hon. friend refers are entitled to every sympathy, but unfortunately, as the situation is described, if all they got before the last Naturalization Act came into force was the certificate that emaninated from the judge, they did not get their certificate of naturalization and apparently this legislation of 1919 operated to hold the hand of the Secretary of State and prevent his issuing certificates of naturalization.

Mr. PARDEE: Taking what the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) says, it means that those who had received naturalization prior to 1914 by certificate of the judge are not under this Act entitled to vote, and by reason of the Naturalization Act of 1914, they will yet have to wait four years before they are entitled to vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: The man who before 1914, or in fact, for three years after 1914, got naturalized under the old Act—under the old Act the judge naturalized; he gave his certificate of naturalization and that was the end of the operation, for his certificate was the certificate of naturalization —was a naturalized British subject in Canada, and the later legislation did not take away from him what he already had.

Mr. PARDEE: But it is taken away.

Mr. DOHERTY: The man who was naturalized under the Act in force prior to 1914, and which for people who had come into the country before 1914 remained in force for a further period of nearly three years, got naturalization in Canada alone, but he still has that thing that he got. So far as he personally is concerned his rights, so far as I know, are not affected by the legislation of 1919.

Mr. PARDEE: He is still entitled to vote.

Mr. EULER: I might just make a comment on what the Minister of Justice has said. He has given the impression, quite fairly, that those people who applied to the judge for naturalization were unfortunate in that the naturalization was not completed through the Secretary of State, and he intimates, I think, that they were unfortunate in that the Naturalization Act of 1919, which contains that ten-year clause, was the cause of their not completing their naturalization. With that I must take issue because, as a matter of fact, a good many people in my riding, some ninety-odd, made application through the judge, were approved of and the certificates forwarded to the Secretary of State for final naturalization. But naturalization was refused, although the power was there to grant naturalization, because in 1917 the Government had passed certain Orders in Council which made provision purposely for the naturalization of just such people as have been described in the letter read by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee). Yet while the machinery had purposely been created by the Government for the naturalization of these men, their applications having been approved of by the judge, when those applications finally came before the Secretary of State, who had at his disposal everything provided for the purpose, for some reason or other finally he declined to give naturalization. I submit that that was wrong.

Mr. DOHERTY: I was dealing with the case which the hon. member for West Lambton put forward, of the man who was cut off by the passing of the legislation of 1919. It is perfectly true that during the war the issuing of certificates under the legislation of 1914 to persons of alien enemy nationality was suspended.

Mr. EULER: Why, then, were Orders in Council, providing for such naturalization, passed during the war?

Mr. DOHERTY: When you say "Orders in Council," it is difficult to know precisely to what particular Orders in Council you refer. There were certain Orders in Council, looking to the particular cases of people who had been long periods of years in the country, and providing for exceptions to the general suspension that had been decided upon of the issuing of naturalization certificates to persons of alien enemy nationality during the war. Orders in

Council were passed making it possible to create exceptions. But such exceptions were not given effect to under those Orders in Council, because it was found essential to the general safety of the Empire that, while the war was actually in progress, there should be no grants of naturalization to people of enemy nationality. That view was so strongly pressed and insisted upon that it was thought justifiable, notwithstanding that Orders in Council were passed, not to grant certificates while the war was on.

Mr. EULER: Do I understand the minister to say that there were actually no certificates of naturalization granted to people who had been born in Germany for example? Does he say that no exceptions were made?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not in a position to say that there was absolutely no exception made; I would have to verify that statement. But the general practice which the hon. member was complaining of was that certificates were not granted. Now, whether there were one or more cases that were considered absolutely exceptional I am not in a position to say. The administration of the Act was not in my personal control but in the Department of the Secretary of State, and I am not in a position to answer that question. I was trying to explain to the hon. gentleman how it happened that though there were Orders in Council looking to the making of exceptions, on general principles certificates have not been granted and those Orders in Council have not been generally carried out. I cannot say that, during the course of the war there were not possibly some cases so exceptional as to justify the granting of certificates.

Mr. PARDEE: Are those who were not naturalized prior to 1914 or 1919 and who had lived in this country for forty years, entitled to become naturalized, or must they wait for ten years?

Mr. GUTHRIE: If they came from what we know as alien enemy countries they must wait for ten years.

Mr. PARDEE: Even though they may have lived here forty years?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Even so.

Mr. PARDEE: Then I want to make a strong protest against such an invidious restriction being incorporated in this statute. I do not believe it will be in the interests of the country. I have very strong sentiments in connection with the war and the duties of citizenship, but it does appear to me that after all has been said and done, we should try as far as possible to get away from the war spirit and try to build the nation on the new principles which the war has taught us. Is it right that we should say to people, of whom undoubtedly there are large numbers in this country, that although they came here in order to get away as far as possible from the conditions that existed in their own countries; although they left their native land to avoid unjust and autocratic forcing into military service, coming to this country to seek peace and quietness and happiness and to contribute to the wealth of their adopted land by their thrift and economy,—is it fair that we should say to them that, notwithstanding the fact that they are good citizens, they shall be deprived of the rights of citizenship? No one knows better than the Acting Solicitor General that if you go up into these very sections where the largest percentage of these people live—and I can speak for Ontario—you will find men and women than whom there are no more thrifty, energetic, honest, law-abiding, God-fearing people anywhere. Yet, we are going to say to those people—Although you left your country many years ago, when you were mere children, and came here to escape the tyranny of your own country; although you have proved yourselves good citizens, having added to the wealth of this country, having paid your taxes, yet, by reason of a hard-and-fast law passed in this Parliament that recognizes nothing in mitigation of the accident of your birth, you are to be deprived of the right to have a single word to say in the government of your country. It does appear to me, and I want to speak as calmly and reasonably as possible, that in forcing such a measure through, the Government is only making trouble for itself in the future and creating a schism which ought not to exist. The whole civilized world to-day, now that the war is over, is trying to forget the past few years and to allay bitter hatred and animosity, yet we are attempting to open old wounds in Canada to-day. I say that this is bad legislation. It is an enactment that ought to be very seriously and carefully considered before it is passed. I care not one whit as to what the provisions of Imperial citizenship may be.

It has been said: You cannot derogate from your own Act. In so far as Canada is concerned, the Parliament of Canada is the only one to say who shall and who

shall not vote for the representatives of this country. I do not want to take away from that to the extent of one iota. We are practically, in that respect, masters of our own destiny. We should not pass that legislation, leave that schism, that breach, for a period of ten years and practically segregate a large portion of the people. The Acting Solicitor General has said, it is not a happy situation. I absolutely agree with him. It is a distinctly unhappy situation. It is not only an unhappy situation, but it is a situation that the Government is making more unhappy. Why could we not wipe out that Naturalization Act in effect by this Act? The Minister of Justice shakes his head. I suppose he means that we cannot wipe out that Naturalization Act without consent. I know not why. Surely we in this Parliament have power to repeal an Act that we have passed. If we cannot do that, the sooner we know it the better. With Canada's status to-day—and with Canada's status I thoroughly agree—if we cannot, in our own House, run our own internal affairs, or make our statutes and declare who shall be entitled to return representatives for making the laws and looking after the affairs of this country without the consent of some one else, the sooner we know it the better.

I make the appeal very earnestly, I feel sincerely about it, and I am doing it for no political purpose whatever. This is an Act which will only redound to the discredit, and not to the benefit of Canada. I therefore think that we should so amend this Act, section 29 of the Bill, that the classes whom I have mentioned shall be entitled to vote. They have shown themselves to be good citizens and they are the victims of a condition for which they are not in the least responsible. Although they are thrifty, although they are God-fearing, although they are doing their best to upbuild Canada and promote its prosperity, shall we say, merely by reason of the accident of birth: "We will have none of you. You may pay your taxes, we will take your money, but as to you having a voice in the affairs of this nation, away with you." That is not good policy. It is not a policy that is going to build up and bring about the unity and cohesion of the people of Canada. The Government that passes that legislation and adheres to it is not acting in the interest of the people of Canada. It may be acting for a section of the people. The Government that passes that legislation will yet rue it.

Mr. DOHERTY: Let me point out to the hon. gentleman that he did not quite grasp the point that I disagreed with him upon, although I am not prepared to say that I can endorse everything he said. The hon. gentleman says that the Act that we are dealing with now is taking the franchise away from these people. That is a mistake. This Act is giving the franchise to every British subject, with restrictions that have no bearing upon the matter at present under consideration. The difficulty that arises in the path of those on whose behalf the hon. gentleman has spoken with such force and eloquence is not to be found in this Act.

Mr. PARDEE: No, it is in the Naturalization Act.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is in the Naturalization Act.

Mr. BUREAU: Does the hon. gentleman say that subsection 2 does not disfranchise people who, under the Naturalization Act, are British subjects?

Mr. DOHERTY: Let us keep to one difficulty at a time; the hon. gentleman has mentioned another class of people, but we are trying to deal with the particular class of people in regard to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pardee) has spoken. They are a class of people who never were naturalized. That is conceded, I understand. All this discussion is in the interest of a class of people who were not naturalized, who would desire to be naturalized but who are blocked in that respect by the ten-year requirement of the Naturalization Act.

Mr. CANNON: Some of these persons were naturalized by the operation of law.

Mr. DOHERTY: Suppose that there is a class also which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cannon) is interested in, it will make for clearness if we deal with each class by itself. The obstacle that is in the way of the particular class we are concerned with is the obstacle in the way of their becoming British subjects. If they could get over the obstacle of becoming British subjects under the Naturalization Act there would be no obstacle in the way of their voting. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pardee) wants to remedy that condition, and he suggests, as I understand, that the way to remedy that condition is to be found in this Act. It means that he wants to do it by providing that all those people who continue not to

be British subjects shall nevertheless have the vote.

Mr. PARDEE: What I mean is that those people who have not been naturalized cannot be naturalized until ten years after the signing of the armistice.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. PARDEE: My contention is that this Act should provide that these people who are not alien enemies, without waiting for the period of ten years, should be entitled to become naturalized.

Mr. DOHERTY: The contention is that we should by this Act amend the Naturalization Act?

Mr. PARDEE: Quite so.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not going to suggest it cannot be done. I would like to suggest another possible alternative by which we could both meet the case of these people and at the same time avoid the complications which would result from our amending the Naturalization Act without having come to some understanding by which that amendment could not interfere with the Imperial nature of our naturalization. If we could get at that, if we could get the remedy in that way, it would seem to me that it would be possible to meet the situation by common consent.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What is the remedy?

Mr. DOHERTY: As the Acting Solicitor General has pointed out the subject is one of negotiation with the Home government at the present time. If one were quite certain that we were going to have an election tomorrow, or in six months, or at sometime that would cause this legislation to operate to the serious detriment of anybody, that might be an argument to be urged for not pushing further our endeavours to conciliate the two positions. But the matter is now actually being dealt with, and actively dealt with. My hon. friend, the Acting Solicitor General, is not as sanguine as I am. Perhaps he has not the sanguine temperament of the people of my race.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Of your youth.

Mr. DOHERTY: Very well, of my youth; but speaking frankly I do not myself see, why we should apprehend that we must wait until the Imperial Conference in 1921 to have this matter adjusted. Speaking in all earnestness I would be anxious, and I think I can say that on behalf of the Government—the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) quite some time ago undertook, at all events, to bring the matter up—to find a manner whereby, without having either to dislocate our Imperial naturalization on the one hand, or to provide that these people may vote if they are not British subjects on the other hand—which I think would not be a desirable alternative—we could get at such an adjustment of this difficulty about the Naturalization Act as would remove the obstacle that stands in the way of that class of people, as to whom at all events—those of them who have been described to us this evening—I think there would be a general agreement that they were deserving of sympathy in this matter; at all events for myself I would not hesitate to say that I think they are. After all, so far as they are concerned, all that we are doing by this Act is to adhere to the requirement that a man must be a British subject in order to vote. Seriously, I hardly think the House would consider it desirable—if it is possible to attain the result in any other way—to introduce the novelty into our system of saying that people who are not British subjects may be entitled to vote.

Mr. PARDEE: Let them be naturalized.

Mr. DOHERTY: Then you have got to deal with them by dealing with the question of naturalization; and I would think it is preferable to deal with that question of naturalization in connection with the Naturalization Act, and in such a manner—if that be possible—as to meet the difficulty that now arises without jeopardizing or prejudicing the effect which ought to be attached, and which is attached at present, to our naturalizations. It was only as the result of very long negotiations, and a good deal of patience and of perseverance, that we attained the result which we have attained without sacrificing the principle for which the hon. gentleman spoke so eloquently—the principle that nobody but this Parliament ought to decide who ought to vote in Canada, or to decide who ought to be a naturalized British subject in Canada. It was only after a good deal of patience and persevering action that we arrived at the result which we have attained to-day under which the naturalization that comes from no authority in this world but the Canadian Parliament is recognized as an effective naturalization throughout the Empire. Now that is a very desirable thing, in the interest of all Canadian citizens.

Mr. JACOBS: May I point out to the minister that we have to take it all or nothing; with its defects and faults we have to swallow it.

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. We took it after it had been modified in most important respects upon the representations of the Government of Canada.

Mr. JACOBS: Then we agreed to the ten years' disqualification?

Mr. DOHERTY: The ten years' disqualification did not come in simultaneously with our naturalizations becoming Imperial. There was no ten-year disqualification in the legislation of 1914; the ten-year disqualification came as a subsequent provision in 1919. Before 1919 we had a Naturalization Act fixing the conditions of naturalization which we agreed to. It is true they were not all of them what we originally suggested; but neither were they all of them what Great Britain originally suggested. Nevertheless we came to an agreement—and let me say in parenthesis in passing that it was one of the most effective and clear-cut recognitions of our right to determine for ourselves the question of naturalization which was one of the few questions that remained in dispute. When we started out in the negotiations it was assumed in Great Britain that they would pass a Naturalization Act and that by virtue of their Act of Parliament their naturalizations would be effective in this country, but that was not the way the legislation finally passed. Their naturalizations are effective in this country because a section of a statute of the Canadian Parliament confers the power upon the Secretary of State over there to grant certificates of naturalization which shall be effective in Canada, just as their Parliament gives to us power to grant certificates that shall be effective in that country. There is no more outstanding piece of evidence of the recognition of equality of status than that very naturalization legislation, but that was not the way in which the matter was put forward to us at the outset. We had a year or so of negotiation. Now what have we achieved? We had achieved that situation before this legislation of 1919 that on conditions agreed upon, which made our legislation similar, our naturalizations obtained this great advantage, and their naturalizations obtained the same advantage by our legislation. Then came this desire on the part of the United Kingdom, and apparently certain other of the Dominions, to enact this exceptional provision arising out of the war. Now, of course to maintain our naturalizations Imperial it became necessary that we should keep our legislation similar or at least it was so thought; and it was, as I understand,—as to this I am not speaking from my own personal knowledge, I was absent when the legislation was passed—to meet that requirement of obtaining uniformity that the provision as to the ten years which had been adopted in Great Britain was adopted in this Parliament. My suggestion would be that we should make our best endeavour to obtain a remedy for that without disrupting our Imperial naturalizations, before we resort to what the hon. gentleman points out it is perfectly possible for us to do—repeal the provision which makes our naturalization similar to that of the United Kingdom, and I believe with that of the other dominions; I think they have all passed it, at all events whether that be so or not, to make it similar to that of the United Kingdom. Before we resort to that, before we say. "We have this thing that we want to remedy and we will pitch our Imperial naturalization to the winds for the sake of remedying that." Perhaps it would be justifiable to do so, I am not going to discuss that question now. Perhaps the remedy of this thing is worth that but I do not think we have reached that stage yet—let us make, at all events, our best endeavour to see if we cannot find a proper remedy for this difficulty without jeopardizing or without sacrificing the Imperial nature of our naturalization. I am hopeful that we shall find an adjustment of this difficulty which will enable us to preserve the Imperial nature of our naturalization and at the same time to meet the deserving cases that have been pointed out. I do not know that it is necessary for us this evening to consider whether this ten-year clause might not be properly applicable to some class of people. I do not know whether it would be suggested, for instance, that as regards people coming in in the future——

Mr. PARDEE: The Minister intimates that he is hopeful of an adjustment. May I suggest that those who are being debarred from the right to vote under the Act by reason of the provisions of the Naturalization Act be placed in the same position as women are now placed in who become British subjects by operation of law, namely, the position under which they may, if they have resided five years in Canada prior to the passing of the Naturalization

Act, 1919, go before a judge, take the oath of allegiance, and, provided they are otherwise properly qualified, be granted the right to vote? Why should those whom it is now proposed to debar be placed in a worse position than the women?

Mr. DOHERTY: The women we are including are women who are British subjects and who, if they had not become British subjects by their marriage, for instance, would on their own qualifications have been entitled to become British subjects.

Mr. PARDEE: So would these men.

Mr. DOHERTY: The difficulty with these men is that they are not British subjects, and under the existing Naturalization Law cannot become British subjects; and if this Act is going to give them the right to vote it will have to do so notwithstanding that they are not British subjects. On the other hand, the women my hon. friend speaks of are British subjects by marriage, and without this legislation would have the right to vote.

Mr. PARDEE: They are British subjects, but they cannot vote unless they get this certificate.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is a different question.

Mr. PARDEE: It is not a different question so far as the purposes of this Act are concerned.

Mr. DOHERTY: They are a class of people from whom the vote to which they would otherwise be entitled is taken by this Act.

Mr. CANNON: And from the wives and the children.

Mr. DOHERTY: If this Act had not stepped in, these women, having become British subjects by marriage, or the children, having become British subjects by the naturalization of their fathers, would have had a vote. This Act steps in and says that people naturalized in that way, though they are British subjects,—it does not say they are not British subjects—

Mr. PARDEE: But it is the question of giving them the vote.

Mr. DOHERTY: This Act takes the vote from them.

Mr. PARDEE: But it gives it back to them if they get this certificate.

Mr. DOHERTY: Subject to certain conditions, it gives it back, but in doing both these things it is dealing with the right to vote,—granting or refusing, but always granting or refusing to a person who is a British subject. But as to the other class, we have to get over that other hurdle; perhaps it is only a sentimental thing—

Mr. PARDEE: I think it is.

Mr. DOHERTY: But I am not so sure that there are not some sentimental things that have value in the life of a nation.

Mr. PARDEE: Quite true.

Mr. DOHERTY: Surely the hon. gentleman will concede that it would be an undesirable thing to give the vote to a man who is not a British subject; that it would be better to find a way to make him a British subject than to try to find a way to give him a vote when he is not a British subject.

Mr. BUREAU: If you take the vote away from a British subject you may as well give it to one who is not.

Mr. DOHERTY: There are other British subjects who do not have votes.

Mr. CANNON: The minister's chief argument as against giving the vote to the first class, those who are not British subjects, was that that would involve an amendment of the Naturalization Law, and, as regards the second class, the wives and children, the electoral law says that they must secure from a judge a certificate before voting. According to the Naturalization Act, these people are British subjects. Section 1, paragraph 3 of the Naturalization Act says:

> Nothing in this section shall, except as otherwise expressly provided, affect the status of any person born before the commencement of this Act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That applies only to natural-born British subjects.

Mr. CANNON: No.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Read the heading.

Mr. CANNON: I have read it. So that according to this Act a woman is a British subject and her status can be changed by the Franchise Act. If we change it as is done in the Franchise Act, we are amending the Naturalization Act.

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall be glad, so far as it is in my power to do so, to throw any light I can upon the questions arising in regard to the women and the children under this section. But, as I said before, I would like to keep clearly distinct the two classes with which we have been dealing.

In that regard, it does seem to me that our best method is to exhaust every means of meeting the difficulty that results from the Naturalization Act, treating it as a naturalization question, before we resort to amendments to an election Act for the purpose of removing that difficulty—amendments that may cost us the very high price of loss of our Imperial naturalization or of putting upon us in the alternative of taking the position that though we cannot make these people British subjects, yet we give them the vote. This does not seem to me to be the proper origin of the grievance. The grievance is born not of this Act, but of the Naturalization Act. This Act itself, so far as these people are concerned, continues to recognize the principle that the right to vote applies to the British subject or citizen; that that is a sine qua non to the right to vote. All British subjects have not the right to vote, but up to the present no man who is not a British subject has had the right to vote. Now, it is a serious thing to suggest departing from that, and I think that hon. gentlemen might be satisfied to give us an opportunity to see whether we can meet the difficulty in dealing with the Naturalization Act, and to allow this Bill, which upon this question only stands by the principle that to be a voter you must be a British subject, to pass, so far as this particular provision is concerned.

Mr. EULER: I should like to make a few observations and to suggest what appears to me to be a very reasonable and logical remedy. At the outset I may repeat that it should be perfectly plain to the members of the Committee that there are two groups of people under discussion, and that the amendment itself only applies to those who are British subjects by operation of law.

I believe the amedment will give them the franchise if they fulfil a certain condition. But we have entered to-night upon a discussion of another matter, the status of another group of people in this country, who are not Canadian citizens because they are not naturalized, but to whom naturalization should be given. I think the Government itself is admitting that this second group of people, smaller than the first, is of a kind worthy of naturalization because they have for many years considered themselves British subjects. I admit that, in order that this second group of people may be permitted to vote, they must first obtain naturalization, and that the remedy must come through an amendment to the Naturalization Act or the enactment of a new law that will give them the franchise.

When the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) states that it is desirable that all Canadian citizens naturalized in future shall have Imperial naturalization, I agree with him entirely, and I believe that is a highly desirable thing. Last year when the new Naturalization Act was under consideration and the status of these people was being discussed, the Prime Minister at that time promised to take the matter up with the Imperial Government in order that a modification might be made that would permit of the naturalization of these alien people. The Minister of Justice to-night states that he is quite optimistic that that modification will be made. I am very glad to hear that; but I am just a little dubious about the rapidity with which that may be obtained, in the light of what has already taken place, or rather has not so far taken place, because the Naturalization Act of 1919 was passed almost a year ago and it is almost a year since the promise was made, quite honestly and sincerely I think, by the Prime Minister that he would attempt to obtain that modification; yet, to-day, so far as we know, we are precisely in the same position as regards these people as we were a year ago. I fear that if progress is not any more rapid than it has been, it may quite well come to the time of another election before justice is rendered to these people. It was not, apparently, the intention of the British Government, nor of the representatives of the Dominion when this matter was discussed at the Peace Conference, that the Dominions should be tied hard and fast to that ten-year clause. I think the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) will bear me out in that regard, because I think either he himself or the Prime Minister said on the floor of this House last year, when the Naturalization Act was under discussion, that it was intended and stated than that it should be possible for the Dominions, such as Canada, where conditions differed from those in England, to vary their laws with regard to people such as those whose case we have been discussing to-night. I think I am right in that. Yet when the Act was put through the British Parliament, it was so framed, inadvertently, that it became necessary for the Dominions to adopt that holus-bolus as their own. If it be true that it was not originally the intention to make the Act so stringent in this country, and if this slipped, if I may use that expression, inadvertently into the British Act so that it became neces-

sary to make ours the same in order to conform with it, then it should not be difficult to obtain the consent of the British authorities to such a modification, and to obtain it very quickly if it was not originally the intention that the Act should be framed as it is at present. I throw that out as a suggestion. I mean to convey the idea that it should be possible to obtain from the British Government a consent to the modification very quickly, if possible, before this House rises. I should like to make the further suggestion, that if the Government receives a negative reply from the British Government, it then surely becomes the duty of the Canadian Parliament to protect its people by giving them Canadian naturalization.

I want to make this suggestion also, which I think is fair and would solve the difficulty with regard to this group of people which I am free to admit is not as large as the other group which is being enfranchised under this amendment. Why could not this Parliament simply enact, for the purpose of these people, the old naturalization law giving them only Canadian citizenship? I do not mean to say that we should keep on our statute books two naturalization laws permanently; but in order to meet the fair demands of these people who have waited a long time, why should we not re-enact the law which would give them Canadian naturalization, and then, just so soon as you obtain a modification of the Act of last year, we can repeal the Canadian naturalization law? I do not see why that suggestion could not be accepted, and if it could, it would solve the difficulty.

While I am on my feet I should like again to make the suggestion that I do not see what possible harm could be done—and this would obviate the difficulty with regard to these British subjects who are British subjects by operation of law—if you simply strike out subclause 2 of clause 29 and base the vote on broad British citizenship instead of compelling women—and this is absolutely true as I showed the other night—who have had sons at the war, who have had sons killed in the war— to appear before a judge in order to prove that they are worthy of the franchise, when it is admitted that they are British subjects, and when their husbands can go to the polls without appearing before a judge. They are British subjects by operation of the law, so why should they have to appear before a judge to prove that they have a right to vote?

[Mr. Euler.]

Mr. FIELDING: I sympathize very warmly with the view of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) that we should, if possible, find a remedy for this grievance without interfering with the Naturalization Act which is, I think, of great value and importance to Canada. We had, as has been referred to in this discussion, a number of very distinguished citizens in Canada who thought they were British subjects, but who, while they were British subjects on this side of the Atlantic, discovered that they were not British subjects when they landed in Great Britain. After many years an Imperial Naturalization Act was enacted. The distinguished gentleman who is High Commissioner for Canada in London at the present time discovered when he got over there that he was not a British subject although he was a minister of the Crown in Canada. He was born in the United States; he was naturalized in Canada; he was a British subject for all our purposes, but he was not a British subject in Great Britain. It was to remedy that case and other cases of a like character that the Imperial Naturalization Act was passed. I think, in the main, that law is a good one. The Minister of Justice and the Acting Solicitor General have repeatedly referred to negotiations that have been in progress with respect to the naturalization law. I wonder if my hon friends could tell me what was the objective of which the Minister of Justice is so hopeful but of which the Acting Solicitor General is not so hopeful.

Mr. DOHERTY: The difference in our hopefulness is only as to period of time and not as to ultimate attainment. What we had in mind was to endeavour to have an agreement whereby this particular provision of ten years should not be insisted upon as being essential of application in all of the Dominions concerned in order that the certificate of that Dominion should be accepted as meeting the essential requirements for Imperial naturalization. Speaking for myself it seems to me it ought to be possible that, while you might insist upon certain fundamental things as being essential to the legislation of all the countries concerned, in order that the naturalization be effective throughout all those countries, there might fairly be left a certain play of discretion for each country to make additional requirements which it considers necessary to meet its own peculiar conditions.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Who will make the decision as to that?

Mr. DOHERTY: The decision, like all other decisions where you are trying to get concurrent action, would have to be by agreement.

Mr. LAPOINTE: A conference?

Mr. DOHERTY: You may do something by correspondence, you may do something by getting together, but I would hope that such a decision might be arrived at without calling a formal Imperial Conference to discuss the matter. I cannot promise, I do not know how it will strike other people. The hon. gentleman asked what was the purpose we had in view. The purpose we had in view, having this particular thing in mind, but not confining ourselves absolutely to that, was, speaking for myself, just what I have stated, that it ought to be possible. We have laid the foundation, we have got all these essential conditions which everybody was agreed should be the conditions of imperial naturalization, and it seems to me it ought to be quite within the bounds of possibility to continue to recognize all round the naturalizations as imperial as long as those fundamental things are adhered to, but still leave some opportunity for making suitable provisions in each country to meet conditions that may be peculiar to itself, those conditions taking the form of additional requirements.

Mr. FIELDING: The ten-year clause, I understand, is the real cause of the trouble; that is the snag. I understand that what my hon. friend has in mind is that they shall induce the British Government and the other parties to agree to reduce that period either generally or as respects Canada. Am I right?

Mr. DOHERTY: That is the object.

Mr. FIELDING: I understand that the hon. gentleman suggests that it might be reduced. Well, I know enough about the slowness of making changes over there to be a little less confident than my hon. friend is as to an early solution along these lines. The desire for uniformity in a naturalization law is very strong, and a proposal that you vary that uniformity and provide that there may be one condition for one Dominion and another condition for another will be objected to very strongly. I am inclined to think that the British Government will be slow to agree to a change. If I could feel it was coming very quickly, perhaps I would not feel there was any need of doing anything else. But why should we not in the meantime act on the suggestion of my hon. friend from North Waterloo and provide that these people who should be qualified, being naturalized under our hitherto law, so to speak, shall continue to be deemed British subjects in Canada for the purpose of voting. My hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) has said they are not British subjects. He assumes that now we have adopted this naturalization law a man can only be a British subject when he is a British subject recognized by the Imperial Act. But we have had two kinds of naturalization law in Canada for fifty years. We have had a naturalization law for Great Britain, and we have had a naturalization law for Canada. I agree that it is desirable that there should be uniformity, but we have had two kinds of naturalization law for half a century, and when we find that by this sudden change we are shutting out a worthy class of our people from the privilege of the franchise I can see no difficulty in passing an Act not touching naturalization law for imperial purposes, but providing that these persons, being otherwise properly qualified, shall be deemed to be British subjects in Canada so far as to entitle them to vote. I see no difficulty in doing that at all.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend is in error in his statement that we have had two classes of naturalization under our Canadian law for the past fifty years. Speaking from recollection, we only had the one Act relating to naturalization in force prior to the recent imperial naturalization going into effect.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend sees what I mean.

Mr. ROWELL: It is quite true that a man born a British subject had the rights of a British citizen in all portions of the Empire. In that respect he stood in a different position from the man naturalized under our Canadian law, who did not have the right of British citizenship outside the Dominion.

As my hon. friend from North Waterloo has referred to the proceedings of the Imperial Conference when these and kindred questions were under consideration I desire to make just a brief reference to that, because I think it will throw some light on the present situation and on the prospect of reaching an understanding with the British government in reference to it. There are in the Imperial Naturalization Law—I am now referring to the Act passed by the British House of Commons in 1919 amend-

ing the existing naturalization law—two parts. One part of that Act relates to British citizenship throughout the whole Empire, and in order to secure the rights of British citizenship in all portions of the Empire the provisions of that portion of the Act would have to be complied with. There is another portion of the Act which relates particularly to procedure and practice in Great Britain. When the matter was before us at the Imperial Conference, speaking for myself, I understood that this ten year limitation was to go into the section of the Act that related to practice and procedure so far as Great Britain was concerned. It was a provision which, I understood, they considered it necessary under the existing conditions of public sentiment in Great Britain to incorporate in the law. So far as we were concerned we did not consider such a measure at that time was necessary, having regard to the conditions prevailing in Canada. I know that we did not assume at that time that we were assenting to that proposal as part of the general Imperial naturalization law. When the Act was passed, however, it was found that that section was in the portion of the Act that governed Imperial citizenship, and therefore when the Acting Solicitor General introduced the Bill last session, in order to bring our law into harmony with the general Imperial Act so that naturalization under our law would carry the right to British citizenship throughout the Empire, it was necessary for him to incorporate that provision also in our law. This matter was fully explained to the House when the Act was before us last session. I believe it will be possible—I may be wrong. I appreciate what my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has said, it does take time and sometimes a great deal of time, to reach an understanding but I belive it will be possible—to reach an understanding on this point. For two reasons: First, I doubt if they have any such conditions prevailing in England as we have in Canada in relation to the particular class of citizens whose position has been under consideration to-night, namely: those who have come and lived here for years as citizens, and many of whom have been exercising the rights of citizenship, without technically having those rights. Therefore, I do not believe there will be objection, or should be objection on the part of Great Britain to a modification of the general law so as to permit of the naturalization of the class of citizens my hon. friend has referred to, to give them under the general law British citizenship throughout the world. Secondly, prevailing public opinion in Great Britain on this question is very different to-day from what it was in the midst of the war. Hon. members will realize that passing a naturalization law while the war was still on under the conditions that existed in Great Britain in June and July of the year 1918, is quite a different matter from passing a similar law under the conditions that exist in 1920. I think it is well within the range of possibility, even probability, that if the Imperial Parliament were passing that law to-day they might make a somewhat different provision from the one now in the Act. But having regard to the two considerations, first, that it is doubtful whether there exists in Great Britain, or possibly in any portion of the Empire, a situation such as we have in Canada, and secondly, the change in public sentiment and public temperament from the war situation in 1918 to the condition existing to-day, I believe we have good grounds for hoping that we may secure such a modification of the law as will permit the naturalization of those whose position has been discussed to-night. It is quite true that we could revive Canadian naturalization. That law has been repealed, but this Parliament could re-enact it and we could grant Canadian citizenship to those classes of people who have been referred to to-night. But I do not believe that it is desirable to re-establish a special class of Canadian citizens at this time if we can meet the situation in the other way; and until we have a refusal from the British Government to consider those proposals which the Minister of Justice is working on, we should not depart from the principle that is already recognized of having one citizenship throughout the Emprie.

Mr. EULER: Does the minister think that it is within the bounds of probability, at any rate, that we may get that reply from the British Government before the House rises?

Mr. ROWELL: It is possible; I cannot say that it is probable.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would it not be possible to take up this matter by cable through the High Commissioner in London at once with a view to obtaining some answer that could be given to Parliament in a day or two?

Mr. ROWELL: I doubt whether we could get an answer in a day or two. My hon. friend will realize that in connection with

matters of this kind you are not likely to get a reply in such a brief space of time. I may say, however, that it is the intention of the Minister of Justice to use the cable, and so far as lies within our power, we shall secure the earliest possible reply.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad to hear the minister say that it is the intention of the Government to take this matter up by cable. I should think that if the Government were to represent to the British authorities that this Parliament is in session and is anxious to have this matter settled before prorogation, there would be every tendency on the part of the British office to facilitate matters. It is just a matter of the Government making their representations strong enough.

Mr. EULER: Will it be possible for the House to amend the Naturalization Act before the British Parliament has amended its Act in this particular?

Mr. ROWELL: I think the Act would have to be amended by the British Parliament before our naturalization could be made effective. All we could get by cable would be the answer of the British Government that they would or would not submit legislation to Parliament to cover the matter; but I should think that if they submitted legislation to Parliament that legislation would go through.

Mr. EULER: But it would not be possible for this Parliament to enact legislation at this session, under the best circumstances, according to the statement of the minister. If before we can legally do anything in this matter it is necessary for the British Parliament first to make their change, then, if they are not now in session, it would be impossible for us to enact legislation at this session.

Mr. ROWELL: One cannot, of course, say anything so far as that is concerned until one knows what answer the British Government will make as to what they are prepared to do.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I would not presume to follow the more or less involved legal discussion that has taken place to-night; but it seems to me, if I have been able to grasp the trend of the debate, that it is in the mind of the Government and of those who have been discussing this subject that the enactment of 1919, under which enemy aliens of German, Austrian, Bulgarian or Turkish origin cannot be granted the franchise in Canada or be naturalized for ten years after the signing of the Armistice, is to be amended and we are going to go back to conditions that prevailed before 1914 under which all these classes, without any effort being made to determine their qualifications for Canadian citizenship, might be naturalized and, as I heard an hon. member say to-night, be made Canadian citizens by the hundred overnight. I realize that what my hon. friend from North Waterloo has said with regard to certain individuals who have lived in this country for a long time may be correct; there may be some people of that class. But I would say to my hon. friend in this connection that if, as I understood him and as I think I understood the hon. member for West Lambton to say, there are men who have lived in Canada for twenty, thirty or forty years, having come to this country from Germany, Austria or Bulgaria, and who had not become British subjects up to 1914, then having lived in Canada all these years prior to 1914 without having manifested any desire to become British or Canadian citizens willing to share the full responsibilities which Canadians had to bear during the years of the war, they can very well wait for the period of time which it has been deemed wise for men of enemy countries to wait following the signing of the Armistice.

Mr. EULER: Is the hon. member aware that some of the men of whom he speaks actually had sons in the war who cannot get naturalization now?

Mr. NICHOLSON: I appreciate that fact, and if a means can be found to remedy that condition without opening the door wide, as is the apparent desire to-night, to all of these people of enemy origin so as to allow them to become enfranchised citizens, then I would be willing to go all the way in the interests of those men who had seen service in the war. But the whole trend of the discussion has implied a desire on the part of hon. members, not to rectify such specific defects as mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Euler), but to go back to conditions under which we were having dumped into sections of this country, night and day through a slipshod form of enfranchisement, hundreds of people who knew absolutely nothing of Canadian ideals and who evidenced the fact that they lacked all sense of Canadianism; for if they had Canadian ideals they would have become Canadian citizens before 1914. I am not considering this question from any partisan

standpoint, but I say that it is absolutely unfair to those Canadian citizens who bore the burden of the war to say, now that the war is over, that we are going to open the door wide to Germans, Austrians, Bulgarians and Turks, and tell those people: "You can come to Canada and get identically the same privileges as are enjoyed by those citizens who palyed their part in the war and whose sons stood face to face with men of your origin in the trenches in France and Flanders and elsewhere". Before the Government goes very far in the direction of throwing the door wide open let me warn them that they are going to raise a question in this country that will not be easily settled.

Mr. FIELDING: I would like to call the attention of the Government to the difficulty of getting an answer from the British Government. Before an answer can be given it will require a decision of the British Government and decisions of governments, even of this Government, are not obtained very quickly. Having obtained the decision of the British Government, you require to have an Act of the British Parliament and that is something that will be attended with much difficulty. The minister has told us that negotiations were conducted between the British and Canadian Governments before this Act was framed. I take it that there were similar negotiations with the governments of the other British dominions. This Act has been something in the nature of a Treaty between Canada, Great Britain and the various overseas dominions and they will all have to be consulted before a change takes place. Taking all these things into account I am not in the least bit sanguine that a measure of immediate relief can be obtained in that direction. If there is a grievance, and the minister thinks there is a grievance, I think it will be better to seek the remedy in another way.

Mr. JACOBS: This section requires a few amendments in order to be acceptable. I think the Gordian knot ought to be cut by the minister who has the Bill in charge by striking out subsection 2 completely. That would give satisfaction all round. I consider subsection 2 a blot upon the Bill. To my mind it is nothing but arrant nonsense. I have stated this several times before when Franchise Bills similar to this were before the House, and I see nothing so far to cause me to change my view. We have not heard a word this evening in justification of the second part of subsection 2 which makes a distinction between people born on the continent of North America and people born in other parts of the world. The minister has not so far enlightened us as to why this distinction is being made. Before proceeding any further I should like to know why it is found in this Bill.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Because we recognize that people born on this continent are very similar in their ideas, laws, customs and habits to our own people and we can very quickly assimilate them to our ways, and that therefore we permit them to vote without any injustice to ourselves and without as long a period of probation as we require of people from central Europe or from other parts of the world.

Mr. JACOBS: Not central Europe. This takes in the whole of Europe, and includes France and Belgium.

Mr. GUTHRIE: From Europe. They are not accustomed to our ways, language, laws and political institutions. That is the reason for the distinction to be found in the Bill. Perhaps there may be other reasons, but that is the main reason. I think I can assure the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) that the Government has no intention whatever of indiscriminately opening wide the door to permit all the classes of people that we have been discussing to-night to come in and obtain naturalization as British subjects. There will be investigation and inquiry. There may be some worthy and some unworthy ones and I do not for a moment say that all the fathers of the boys who served in the war should vote. Certainly they will never vote in my riding with my consent. I could cite the concrete case of two young men of German parentage who went to the war, one of whom won the military cross. The father would not allow them to come home to bid good-bye to their mother; he threatened to shoot them. Do you think that man should have a vote? I would keep that man ten years on probation. I do not say that is the general thing but I do say that no government would be justified in indiscriminately throwing open the door and admitting everybody. There would be an inquiry so that the worthy ones may be rewarded and the unworthy ones put on probation.

Mr. JACOBS: The Acting Solicitor General is a very skilful lawyer. He skated over thin ice with regard to the question I asked him but he was very precise about what he would do to the man who wanted

to shoot his sons. The official reason is the one he gave but there are unofficial reasons which he has not given why people from France or Belgium, speaking the same language as a third of the people of this Dominion, are placed in a category beneath that of people coming from Mexico. I am not satisfied with the explanation given by the hon. gentleman and I feel certain that none of the hon. gentlemen on this side are satisfied either.

I cannot understand why it is that a person becomes a better citizen by obtaining from a court a certificate that he is entitled to vote. How does that affect the party who obtains the certificate? The object of this law is a very simple one. It is to put as many stumbling blocks and objections as can be thought of in the way of foreigners casting their votes on election day. We may camouflage it under the garb of patriotism, but the object is very plain. In my own division there will be 5,000 women affected by this Act in the next election. They will have to obtain a certificate from a judge that they are entitled to vote. Just imagine 5,000 people in one division of the city of Montreal alone! The court house will be besieged, it will be impossible for the judges, working eight hours a day, to give the certificates out in two months before the election. And that is only in one division of the city of Montreal, to say nothing of the other places throughout Canada where they have a large foreign vote. I would ask the Acting Solicitor General if that is fair, right or just. He came before the House when the Bill was originally introduced and said that he wanted to be fair, just and impartial in this particular case. Why did he protest so much that he wanted to be fair, just and impartial in introducing this particular Act. When it was introduced before the House I pointed out one of the most glaring pieces of injustice that we have ever had in our statutes. If the Government has a sense of justice it should see to it that this section is struck out. Surely if the Minister of Justice does not want to do justice to the people in my riding he at least wants to do justice to the people in his own. Then the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) whose constituency adjoins my own, has a large number of people who will be affected in the way I have indicated. Is it because the Minister of Marine thinks that these people do not appreciate his work that he will sit quietly by and allow this law to go through? What is the reason he does not rise to protest against it when so many of the voters in his constituency are affected this way? As to the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) he is not here, and therefore I do not want to say anything about him in connection with this matter. He is a gentleman for whom I have a very great deal of regard but, as I said before, he is probably not interested because he has gone to his reward. De mortuis nil nisi bonum.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to learn that the gift of prophecy with which my ancestors were endowed has fallen upon me. Last year when this Naturalization Bill was before the House I predicted what would happen by the abrogation of our local Naturalization Act, and the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) stated that nothing that I predicted could happen. But it has occurred. It was a case, Mr. Chairman, where we grasped at the shadow and dropped the substance. We had an Act that was workable. It was made in Canada, and for that reason ought to commend itself to good Canadians. But we were not satisfied with it. We wanted to go abroad to obtain our legislation, and we went to London and we got this legislation from them; and as I said before they told us, "You have to take it in its entirety or else not take it at all." We were so anxious for it that we took it with all its faults, and as soon as it appeared upon the statute books—on the very day this foreign piece of legislation was placed upon our statute books—we dropped our own local Act. Now we are casting about in the dark and discussing with ourselves what we are going to do to give relief to these people who are affected, and for whom so much sympathy has been so eloquently expressed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) this evening. Had that Act which we had on our statute book for many years, our own local Act, not been abrogated, there would have been no difficulty at all; the people who are affected by this Bill could have voted under the local Naturalization Act. Then we could have what I might call our "Sunday" Act, our "window dressed" Act, on the statute books, and every one would have been satisfied.

Mr. BUREAU: The swallow-tail-coat Act.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes, the swallow-tail-coat Act as my hon. friend has said. But the trouble, Mr. Chairman, is that we always like to worship something from afar; we like to worship false gods; and we find ourselves in this condition purely because we dropped and wiped off the statute books

an Act that would have given satisfaction all around, and took on this legislation which gives satisfaction to none. I do not know how the Government are going to explain to any respectable body of foreign-born what they had in mind by putting on the statute books this subsection 2 of section 29. The hon. gentleman thinks he has improved it with amendments. I remember when the weakness in the armour was discovered by the hon. member for North Waterloo on the occasion of the second reading of the Bill. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) rushed to the rescue and pointed out that the section did not mean what it said it meant. Now the Acting Solicitor General has introduced an amendment which he says, in effect, is going to correct the difficulty. The hon. member for North Waterloo, however, says that the Under Secretary of State agrees with him and disagrees with the Acting Solicitor General with regard to the meaning of certain words in this section when these are read with the words of another section of the Act. Now all this difficulty we can rid ourselves of by simply striking out the section which pleases no one, and which cannot please the Acting Solicitor General —to my mind it does not, because he is too good a lawyer to believe that any section such as that would meet with any commendation from lawyers or the community generally. It is bad in its inception, it is unjust in its conception; and for that reason I could have hoped that it had been stifled in its birth. I am satisfied to accept the other sections of the Bill, which I read over very carefully, and which I think are fairly just.

An hon. MEMBER: Not all.

Mr. JACOBS: Not all, but as much as we could expect from gentlemen who do not think as we do in some things. I scarcely believe the phrase, "nothing good can come out of Nazareth." Sometimes something good does come out; and I would be willing to give my unqualified praise if the hon. gentleman will consent, now that he is in an amending mood, to strike out this obnoxious clause from the Act. I may say that so long as I am a member of the House —this is not in the way of a threat, but it is a prediction—I will introduce, year after year, Bills to amend this obnoxious section, if it becomes law, until it is finally taken from the statute book. In other words I intend to picket the Government—I trust the Minister of Justice undertsands what I mean by that—I intend to picket the Government until this obnoxious section is removed.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. BUREAU: No. This important amendment has not been half discussed yet, we are only getting started. I move that the committee rise and report progress. It is one o'clock. The Railway Committee meets in a few hours, and there are important measures to be brought before that committee. I think we have done a good day's work. Sitting from three o'clock in the afternoon till one o'clock the next morning is a longer spell than my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council, at the International Labour Conference, agreed to allow the people to work in this country, and we do not want to set a bad example.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We have not done very badly to-night, we have done fairly well, and were we to sit for another hour we would have done even better. I have no objection under the circumstances to ask the committee to rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Doherty, the House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. (Thursday).

Thursday, May 6, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON BATTLEFIELDS MEMORIALS.

Hon. S. C. MEWBURN (Hamilton East) presented the first report of the special committee appointed to consider and report upon the question of what memorials, if any, shall be erected on the battlefields of the late war.

Mr. MEWBURN moved:

That the first report of the Special Committee appointed to consider and report upon the question of what memorials, if any, should be erected upon the battlefields of the late war, together with the statements and evidence attached thereto, be printed for the information of members of the House, and that rule 74 be suspended in reference thereto.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the absence of the requisite notice for such a motion, it can, of course, be entertained only by unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY—STANDARDIZATION OF PARTS.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (Kent, Ont.) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 112, to provide for the standardization of parts of agricultural machinery.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not seen a copy of the Bill and, therefore, I do not know what it contains; but from the title, as it appears on the Order Paper, there may be some question whether the subject matter has reference to trade, and if it has, the hon. member could proceed only by resolution. Subject to that consideration, the Bill may receive its introduction.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. McCOIG: The object of this Bill is not as some hon. members seem to think. We are asking for the standardization, not of agricultural implements, but simply of some of the interchangeable parts, and that can be very easily done without any great expense to the manufacturers and with great convenience to users of agricultural machinery throughout the country.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 110 (letter Z2 of the Senate), for the relief of Nellie Adeline Wallace.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 111 (Letter A3 of the Senate), for the relief of Marion Olive Booth.—Mr. Blake.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SALARIES OF THOSE RECEIVING BONUS.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What is the total yearly amount of salary paid to those who are to receive bonuses of $12,500,000?
2. What will be the average percentage per $1,000 of salary?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: The preparation of an answer to this question would involve a computation in all branches of the Government of the salaries of those receiving a bonus, as distinct from all who are paid current rates of pay, and the average percentage on the basis of $1,000 of salary, one would think, would not have any particular value, because the bonus is not based on percentages. If the hon. member who has propounded the question has any particular information he desires to get, I should be glad to assist him in getting it, but it would involve a great deal of time and trouble to prepare an answer to this question as it stands.

REVEREND A. E. BURKE.

*Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Was the Reverend A. E. Burke connected with the Chaplain Service of the Canadian Expeditionary Force in the late war?
2. If so, when did such connection cease and why?
3. Prior to, during, or after his connection with the said chaplain service, did Dr. Burke visit Bermuda or the West Indies?
4. If so, for what purpose?
5. Did Dr. Burke present a bill or account to the Government or to one of its departments for the said trip?
6. If so, what was the amount, when and by whom was it paid?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. Yes.
2. 21st September, 1917. Surplus in his rank to establishment and requirements.
3. Yes.
4. While on leave with permission to proceed to Washington, D.C., he appears to have visited the West Indies (Cuba).
5. Yes; to the Department of Militia and Defence.
6. $882.20. Payment refused by the Department of Militia and Defence.

MILITIA DEPARTMENT PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. POWER:

1. Are arrangements being made for the making of a number of permanent appointments throughout the Department of Militia and Defence?
2. If so, how many returned soldiers have been recommended for permanency by the department?
3. How many civilians?
4. Of the civilians recommended, is there in each case no returned soldier presently employed by the department possessing the minimum qualifications for the position being filled?
5. What is the guiding principle in the selection of men for permanency?
6. If length of service is considered, will the military service of a returned man be reckoned against the clerical service of a man who did not proceed overseas?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE: A classification of the Department of Militia and Defence has been submitted to the Civil Service Commission. In every case where a returned soldier is holding a position which it is proposed to make permanent, his name has been submitted for appointment.

With regard to the other positions, it has been suggested to the Civil Service Commission that these positions should be thrown

open to competition, thereby giving returned soldiers an opportunity of obtaining appointment to the same.

TORONTO SUBURBAN RAILWAY—PAID-UP CAPITAL.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. What was the actual paid-up capital of the Toronto Suburban railway on the 27th September, 1918?
2. Who were president, vice-president, directors and general manager of said company on said date?
3. What amount was paid to this company for (a) actual costs, (b) other rights and privileges?
4. When were said sums paid?
5. Did the Canadian Northern Railway buy only the stock of this company or did it buy the movable and unmovable property of this company?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. $1,500,000.
2. President, Sir William Mackenzie; directors, Mr. L. W. Mitchell, Mr. F. H. Phippen, Mr. C. G Royce; general manager, Mr. C. G. Royce.
3. As the Canadian Northern Railway acquired all the assets of this company by assuming the liabilities there was no actual cash transaction between the companies.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. Answered by No. 3.

TORONTO EASTERN—PAID-UP CAPITAL.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. What was the actual paid-up capital of the Toronto Eastern Company on the 27th September, 1918?
2. Who were president, vice-president, directors and general manager of said company on said date?
3. What amount was paid to this company for (a) actual costs, (b) other rights and privileges?
4. When were said sums paid?
5. Did the Canadian Northern Railway buy only the stock of this company or did it buy the movable and unmovable property of this company?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. $250,000.
2. The provisional officers were: President, Mr. W. H. Moore; vice-president, Mr. A. J. Mitchell; directors, Mr. R. G. O. Thompson, Mr H S. Gausby, Mr. E R Gosset. As this railway was not in operation there was no general manager.
3. As the Canadian Northern Railway acquired all the assets of this company by assuming the cost of construction there was no actual cash transactions between the companies.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. Answered by No. 3.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed on the staff of the Civil Service Commission?
2. What are their names?
3. What are the respective salaries of said persons?

TAXATION OF MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANIES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. FERNAND RINFRET (St. James): I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to an item in this morning's Gazette, in the third column of page 4, regarding the proposed taxation of unlicensed mutual fire insurance companies. I shall summarize the article before putting my question. It is headed "Mutuals Face Taxation—Probably by Government Bill; Hope Less than 15 P.C.," and goes on to say that a committee of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association waited on the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries yesterday regarding this proposed taxation and were very courteously received—

Mr. BUREAU: Something new.

Mr. RINFRET:—but were not given much encouragement to hope that these companies would not be taxed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Cannot the hon. member put his question?

Mr. RINFRET: I am coming to it. The report goes on to state that any proposal in this connection would probably not be brought down in the Budget, but later as a Government Bill, and the tax may not be 15 per cent. I would ask the Minister of Finance if this report is accurate? My reason for asking is that I put a question on the Order Paper with reference to this matter and I simply got the reply that the information would be given when the legislation was brought down. I should like to know if this information was given to a private delegation and refused to a member of the House.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): I do not know whether the hon. member is satisfied with what was told the delegation, but if he is, I am afraid he is satisfied with very little. The Government are looking for revenues. They are considering revenues at every possible point. It has not yet been determined what will be done in connection with the matter to which my hon. friend has referred. As I stated

yesterday, the Government's intention will be made known when the appropriate legislation if any, is brought down.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—PENSIONS COMMITTEE.

STATEMENT BY MR. HUME CRONYN, CHAIRMAN OF THE PENSIONS COMMITTEE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. HUME CRONYN (London): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. The Ottawa Citizen in this morning's issue publishes the letter of resignation of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) from the Committee of Pensions and Re-establishment. In that letter the following statements are made:

I therefore resign, not only to protest in the name of the widows of the hundreds of brave men whom I had the honour of leading in the late war, but as a protest against a deplorable attempt on two successive days to camouflage the incident, and also as a protest in the name of common honesty and decency. I cannot bring myself to believe that actions such as have taken place are a credit to the committee or Parliament.

With the consent of the Pensions Committee, I desire to state that at this morning's session, on the written request of Mr. C. S. Blue, the official reporter present when the statements complained of were uttered by the hon. member for Royal (Mr. H. H. McLean), the whole question was fully investigated and the original stenographic notes—

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand the hon. member rises to a question of privilege on behalf of the committee, or on behalf of himself? In either case, I have to point out that it is a well-established rule of the House that there can be no reference in the House to the proceedings of any committee of the House until the report of that committee is before the House for consideration. Bearing that in mind, it is somewhat difficult to know how the hon. gentleman could properly refer to the proceedings before a committee, that committee not having reported.

Mr. CRONYN: The question of privilege is one in which I as chairman of the committee, am distinctly involved. I make this explanation on my own behalf, although I make it with the consent of the committee.

The whole question was fully investigated and the original stenographic notes were transcribed under oath by Mr. Blue.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret very much to have to interrupt the hon. member, but if he desires to take exception to some statement with reference to himself which has been made in the public press, and to give a denial thereto, he would be in order on a question of privilege. On the other hand, if he wishes to set right a proceeding which took place before a committee of the House he certainly would not be in order in doing so at this stage.

Mr. CRONYN: I would ask the unanimous consent of the House to put this statement on record.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): In view of the position which this matter has assumed, both for members of Parliament and the public, it seems to me it would be well that an explanation of it should be heard, and I hope that the unanimous consent of the House will be given.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, the House can give its unanimous consent, and under the circumstances I have very great pleasure in putting the question whether the hon. member shall have the unanimous consent of the House to make his statement.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): If it be in accordance with the rules might I ask the hon. gentleman who leads the Government to repeat the remarks he has just made. I did not hear a syllable of them, and therefore I could not possibly act intelligently on a question based on any argument he delivered to the House.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What I intended to say was this: Inasmuch as this matter has assumed a good deal of prominence and is of interest both to members of Parliament and to the public outside, I think it would be well that an authoritative statement should be made and go out to the country, and in that sense I think it would be a wise proceeding for us to give unanimous consent to hearing a statement from the responsible chairman of the committee.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU: Is the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) present?

Mr. M. CLARK: If the hon. member is allowed to make a statement by unanimous consent, I should like to know how far the House will be allowed to go into the whole question. I should like to know exactly how far we are going against what is the rule, as stated by yourself, Mr. Speaker.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Where we would seem to get would be this: Instead of having conflicting statements first from one side and then from the other, we should have what I suppose might be considered a disinterested authoritative statement from the chairman of the committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh no.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no debate upon the calling of the Orders of the Day. I take it that the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) does not give his consent to the statement being made by the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn).

Mr. M. CLARK: I do not want to put myself in opposition to any sentiment that is general all over the House, but I should like to know on what ground the leader of the House can call the statement of the chairman of the committee the authoritative statement. The statement of the hon. member for Skeena, if it differs from the statement of the chairman, is just as authoritative to members of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see how we can have debate on this question. It seems to me the House must either give or refuse unanimous consent. If any one member objects, unanimous consent, of course, cannot be given. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member (Mr. Cronyn) should have leave to make his statement?

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): The hon. member for Skeena is not present this afternoon and I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, the propriety of discussing this question on a motion for the adjournment of the House, to-morrow, for instance, when the hon. member for Skeena may be present and explain his side of the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall have to ask the hon. member, in view of the fact that he cannot obtain the unanimous consent of the House, to refrain from making any further statement at the present time.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order being called for the second reading of Bill No. 108 to amend the Exchequer Court Act:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Bill has not been distributed and I do not know whether the leader of the Opposition will object to our proceeding.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: I would point out to my hon. friend that we did not conclude yesterday's business until one o'clock this morning and this measure was given its first reading only yesterday. I would therefore ask that this order stand.

Motion stands.

DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT.

The House resumed, from May 5, consideration in committee of Bill No. 12 (Hon. Mr. Guthrie) respecting the election of members of the House of Commons and the electoral franchise.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When progress was last reported upon this Bill all of the clauses and schedules had been read and considered. Paragraph (k) of clause 2, clauses 29, 32, 37, 44, 45, 63 and 101, the amendments proposed by the hon. member for Gloucester to clause 37 and by the hon. the Acting Solicitor General to clauses 29, 44 and 101 have been allowed to stand for further consideration. The other clauses have been adopted. Clauses 19 and 76 which provide for the expenditure of money cannot be adopted until the House has concurred in the required resolution. The question is upon the amendment proposed to clause 29. Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. LAPOINTE: What is the amendment, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Guthrie moves to amend clause 29 by adding to the said clause the following words:

> Provided that no disability imposed by paragraph (b) of subsection 4 of section 8 of "The Naturalization Act," chapter thirty-eight of the Statutes of 1919, (first session) shall disentitle a person on that ground alone to the said certificate.

Mr. BUREAU: Last night when we had a discussion on this clause the Acting Solicitor General intimated that it was not the intention of the Act to disfranchise any one, but when my hon. friend from Lambton urged that those who had been in this country for a certain number of years and had proved themselves good citizens should be afforded some means whereby to acquire citizenship in order to enable them to vote at elections, the Naturalization Act was raised as the bar sinister to any such proposition. I gathered from the remarks that were made in that respect that the Naturalization Act was regarded by a great many hon. gentlemen on the other side as something sacred. British citizenship, in the minds of those hon. gentlemen, is a holy ark that ought to be surrounded by every safeguard and precaution so that its purity

may remain absolutely inviolate. Now, Mr. Chairman, accepting that high moral creed of my hon. friends, I do not see why, when the Naturalization Act says that the wife of a British subject is a British subject and the wife of an alien is an alien, we should give to male British subjects the right to vote but deny their wives, who happen to be alien, the privilege their husbands enjoy. We cannot contend that these women have been remiss in the duties of citizenship because they have not personally claimed naturalization. By law they have the same status as their husbands in regard to citizenship. But to-day we are saying to them that unless they were born on the American continent they must go to a judge and get him to certify that they are entitled to vote, in spite of the fact that the law says they can. Among those voters who are naturalized by law there are many Italians and Belgians who are married to French women; and the conclusion has forced itself upon me that the Government is introducing the Naturalization Act in this case because they are afraid of the votes of these women. They know that the women are more sensitive to injustice than perhaps men are, and they are afraid that the uses and abuses to which Orders in Council have been put, and the nefarious ways in which the business of the country has been conducted, will be keenly felt by the women. If this ark of British citizenship is so profoundly sacred to my hon. friends opposite, why in reason's name should they desecrate in order to deprive certain inoffensive and innocent people from a right which belongs to them? If the Government are afraid of the female vote let them be manly enough to come out and say so and eliminate entirely the enfranchisement of the other sex. If they are afraid that the women will go against them let them say outright that no women shall have the vote. But if the women deserve full citizenship by way of recognition of all that they have done in behalf of the country and the intelligence they have shown, then I say that they ought to be put on the same footing as men. I for one cannot support a measure that will tend to make the franchise more difficult for women who are entitled to it than for men, merely by reason of their sex.

Mr. CANNON: Clause 29 which gives the qualification of electors reads:

(1) Save as in this Act otherwise provided, every person, male or female, shall be qualified to vote at the election of a member who, not being an Indian ordinarily resident on an Indian reservation,

(a) is a British subject by birth or naturalization; and,

(b) is of the full age of twenty-one years; and,

(c) has ordinarily resided in Canada for at least twelve months and in the electoral district wherein such person seeks to vote for at least two months immediately preceding the issue of the writ of election.

If I understand the first paragraph correctly, every man and every woman in Canada who is a British subject, twenty-one years of age, and has resided in the electoral district for at least twelve months prior to the election, will be given a vote. This first paragraph establishes a very broad basis for the electoral franchise. When the minister introduced the Bill about a month ago he said that he and the Government generally wanted a fair, broad and generous franchise. His wishes would have been more completely carried out if paragraph 2 had been omitted and the section confined to the first paragraph. Paragraph 2 is as follows:

For the purposes of this Act, the allegiance or nationality of a person, as it was at the birth of such person, shall be deemed incapable of being changed, or of having been changed, merely by reason or in consequence of marriage or change of allegiance or naturalization of any other person, or otherwise than by personal naturalization of such first mentioned person. Provided, however, that this subsection shall not apply to any person born on the continent of North America, nor to any person who in person applies to and obtains from any judge having jurisdiction in naturalization proceedings, a certificate under the hand of such judge and the seal, if any, of his court, to the effect following:

Then follows the certificate. As I understand it, this second paragraph limits and restricts the basis upon which the franchise is granted in the first part of the section, having the effect of excluding the wives and children of naturalized British subjects in Canada—wives and children who have not personally been naturalized, but who are British subjects on account of the naturalization of husband or father.

When this clause first came up for discussion before the committee, the member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) pointed out that its effect would be to disfranchise a considerable number of persons; that if the electoral law was read in conjunction with the Naturalization Act, persons who were not at present naturalized would have to wait ten years before they could obtain their certificate of naturalization, and would therefore be unable to obtain the franchise until 1928. The Acting Solicitor General

yesterday brought in the following amendment to section 29:

Provided that no disability imposed by paragraph (b) of subsection 4 of section 8 of "The Naturalization Act," chapter 38 of the statutes of 1919 (first session), shall disentitle a person on that ground alone to the said certificate.

That amendment has reference to the following subsection in the Naturalization Act:

No certificate of naturalization shall, before the expiration of a period of ten years after the termination of the present war, be granted in Canada to any subject of a country which at the time of the passing of this Act was at war with His Majesty, but this provision shall not apply to a person who,

(1) having served in His Majesty's forces or in the forces of His Majesty's Allies or of any country acting in naval or military co-operation with His Majesty was not discharged from such service by reason of his enemy nationality, sympathy or associations; or,

(2) is a member of a race or community known to be opposed to the enemy governments; or,

(3) was at birth a British subject.

As I understand it, the Acting Solicitor General's amendment relates not to the case of women and children, but simply to the case of the men. But the men are in no way affected by section 29, so that the amendment does not in any way improve that section. The amendment provides that even though certain persons may not be naturalized for ten years to come, they are not debarred from obtaining a certificate. Women and children do not need to be naturalized, Mr. Chairman. Section 11 of the Naturalization Act provides that the wife of a British subject shall be deemed to be a British subject—not by birth, not by naturalization; simply a British subject.

Take the case of an American who came to Canada and was naturalized and became a British subject after having lived in Canada the necessary length of time; the wife of that American becomes a British subject by the mere fact that her husband has become a British subject. An Austrian crossed over to America, came to Canada and was naturalized and became a British subject under our law. In accordance with the provisions of the Naturalization Act, the wife of that Austrian is a British subject. It cannot be denied—and the statement of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) last night bears me out—that the wife of a British subject by naturalization or by birth is a British subject no matter whether her husband is an Austrian, a German, an American, a Frenchman, or a Belgian.

[Mr. Cannon.]

Now, what about the children? Section 13 of the Naturalization Act, subsection 1, provides that the children of a man who is a naturalized British subject are themselves British subjects unless the father chooses subsequently to change his own nationality. Therefore I say that according to the Act as it reads now, the wife and the children of a British subject by naturalization are British subjects. The argument brought forward yesterday by the Acting Solicitor General, by the President of the Privy Council, and even by the Minister of Justice, was to the effect that section 29 had to be put in the law on account of the Naturalization Act as it now reads, and that it would be impossible for this Parliament to amend, change or alter that Act because it was the result of an agreement between the Canadian Government and the Imperial Government. I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is no argument at all, because even if the Naturalization Act remains as it is to-day, these women and children are British subjects, and should and would be given a vote under our Franchise Act if paragraph two of section 29 was not added to the law.

As to the amendment which is proposed by the Acting Solicitor General I think it has no bearing on the case. Section two is an amendment to the Naturalization Act. The ministers and the supporters of the Government have contended that we should not touch the Naturalization Act—that if we did so it would be a breach of faith with the Imperial authorities. Well, what did the Government do? They introduced a paragraph in clause 29 of this Franchise Act which in itself is an amendment to the Naturalization Act, because it expressly says that people who are British subjects according to the existing law will not be treated as British subjects at election time but will have to follow special methods and follow a special process before they are given a ballot. It says, Mr. Chairman, that a woman who, according to section eleven, is a British subject in every way, shape or form, will have to go before a tribunal, and will have to be given a certificate, and that a judge who refuses to give that certificate will have the right to debar that person who is a British subject by law from casting her vote at an election. Paragraph two has also the same result and the same consequence as regards the children. According to the Naturalization Act these children are British subjects. The first paragraph of clause 29 of the franchise law says that all Brit-

ish subjects aged twenty-one years, and having a certain period of residence in Canada, are entitled to vote. Notwithstanding the fact that these children may have lived in Canada for thirty years and, that they are British subjects for all other purposes, despite the fact that they are British citizens cannot be denied or challenged, the Government introduced into this law a subparagraph to clause 29 which means that those children will have to go before a judge or a tribunal and will have to obtain a certificate before they are placed on the same level or the same standing as every other British subject in this country. I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is altogether unfair and altogether arbitrary, and that this subparagraph ought to be struck out of the Bill altogether. The Minister of the Interior, speaking in the name of and on behalf of the Government, rose in this House the other day and said that the remarks made by the member for Waterloo (Mr. Euler) "have shown that there is such a condition and such a state of things in Canada that we ought to bring in an amendment." The amendment was brought in, but I ask the Minister of the Interior—or any other member of the Government, or any supporter of the Government—to explain how the amendment brought in yesterday can help these wives or help these children to whom I have referred. The amendment simply refers to a clause saying that within ten years after the termination of war no naturalization certificate shall be issued. These women and children do not need these naturalization certificates. According to the law of the country they are British subjects; and the Government by this law is simply withdrawing from them rights which were guaranteed to them—firstly when they were naturalized through the operation of law; and secondly—rights which were guaranteed anew when the Naturalization Act of 1919 was passed by this Parliament.

I assert that the present debate is one of the most important that ever took place in this House. Are we, once and for all, going to lay down the rule that this country will make a contract with people and respect that contract, or are we going to lay down the rule that we can bring people into this country under false pretenses, and break the contracts that we made with those people and the laws which protect them when it suits our purposes, and treat our existing law—our existing certificates of naturalization and the sovereign rights of citizenship in this country—as an ordinary scrap of paper? I think the Government has no right to do that, and that the House should exercise such a pressure upon it that the clause will be changed and every man, woman and child in Canada will know justice and fairness shall prevail when it comes to the rights of the franchise.

Mr. COWAN: When did we enter into a contract with the wives of aliens to whom the hon. gentleman has referred, that they would have the right to vote when they came into Canada?

Mr. CANNON: The law of our country says that if the hon. member for Regina comes from Belgium, settles in Regina, lives there for a certain period of years, and behaves himself in such a way as to show himself to be a good citizen, he is to be given a certificate of naturalization, and he becomes a British subject, enjoying all the rights and privileges of British citizenship, and that his wife and children also have the same privileges and the same rights. That is the law.

Mr. COWAN: We are only giving that privilege to them now. Consequently we never had any previous contract with the parties to whom my hon. friend refers.

Mr. CANNON: I am awfully sorry to disagree with the hon. member but I know something about the law of my country and the rule—which is just as old as the naturalization law itself—is to the effect that the naturalization of a British subject carries with it the naturalization of his wife. So much is this the case that I might quote to my hon. friend the old French saying which declares as regards the wife, "Qui prend mari prend pays," "She who takes a husband takes his country." Who ever heard, Mr. Chairman, that in any properly organized country the husband can be of one nationality, and that the wife in the same household should be of another nationality?

Mr. GUTHRIE: You will find it in the United States.

Mr. CANNON. Who ever heard that in any properly politically organized country the husband could be of one nationality, the wife of another nationality, and the children of a third nationality? Laws are based on rules of common sense. But what is the position created by this law? The Government, afraid of what they call the foreign vote, have taken, I may say, a circuitous means of excluding from the polls people

who are British subjects and who have a right to record their votes at the next election.

The other night I heard the member for Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) discussing this question. I have great respect for that gentleman, but to tell the truth, Mr. Chairman, I have more respect for his opinions on railway matters than I have for his opinions on naturalization laws. The member for Algoma was basing his arguments on this question: Are we going to admit on an equal footing at the polls our enemies of yesterday. Then with his usual fluency the hon. member made a very patriotic appeal to this committee. But that is not the question at all, Mr. Chairman. We do not want to take our enemies of yesterday and put them on an equal footing with Canadian citizens we are only asking that those who are British subjects should remain so not only when it comes to making private contracts, not only when it comes to paying taxes, but that they should be British subjects even when it comes to exercising the franchise. That is what we want.

There is a principle of constitutional law, which is well recognized in every country living under the British constitution—the principle of no taxation without representation. We were told yesterday that people who died a hundred ye .rs ago should not be quoted in this House. I think that that ruling is very hard on our Lord who died two thousand years ago. But I will refer to the history of England, and that history records that the greatest constitutional struggles were fought to establish that principle of, no taxation without representation. To-day in this House we may be divided as Liberals on the one side and as Tories on the other, but the Tories of to-day were the Liberals of a hundred years ago. There are no such Tories either in Canada or outside as there were in England only a hundred or a hundred and fifty years ago.

Mr. McMASTER: They are a couple of generations behind.

Mr. CANNON: I say that every public man ought to support the principle for which John Hampden fought, the principle which brought about the English Revolution, the principle which brought Charles the First to the scaffold—a principle which is not only radical and liberal, but which should be respected by every man who knows anything about the history of England or appreciates constitutional liberty. To-day the wives and children of these British subjects are treated as citizens of Canada, and as such they have to pay their share of taxation into the public purse. They were British subjects yesterday, they are British subjects to-day, and they will be British subjects to-morrow notwithstanding the provisions of the Franchise law, and I contend that we have no right to exclude them from the franchise.

I admire the way in which the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) has conducted this Bill through committee. He was always willing to accept every fair suggestion whether made by hon. members on his own side or by hon. members on this side of the House. And the question that I put to him to-day, through you, Mr. Chairman, is one that should appeal to a member of the Bar and to a legal mind. I ask the Acting Solicitor General, through you, Mr. Chairman, to say: Is it a fair legal proposition to say, on the one hand, that a woman is a British subject, enjoying all the rights and privileges of British citizenship and, on the other hand, to say that, notwithstanding her British citizenship, she will not be allowed to vote, or will be allowed to vote only after having gone through certain formalities that no other British subject in Canada is obliged to go through? Is it fair, is it legal, is it logical? I say that it is not fair, and I think I have proved that it is not fair. I say that it is not legal, because the status of a person cannot be changed by one law and re-established by the other. To-day either I am a British subject or I am not; and if I am a British subject in the one sense, I am a British subject in every other sense. Therefore not only is it not fair, and not legal, but it is not logical.

How can you expect these people to understand that Canada is a land of democracy and of freedom if you treat them in this way? How can you expect them to have faith in the future of our country if to-day, to suit the whim of a small faction on the Government side that represents the prejudices of a small section of the people of this country, these British subjects are turned away from the polls as if they were not worthy to cast their vote and help decide our political issues?

I do hope that the Acting Solicitor General will reconsider this clause and will see to it that every British subject in Canada be given a vote. When this Bill was introduced the Acting Solicitor General declared from his seat that the franchise was to be given to every British subject of the age of twenty-one years having the requisite qualifications as to residence. Here are British subjects—British subjects according

to the law passed in 1919, yet notwithstanding that law, notwithstanding the declaration of the Acting Solicitor General, these people will be deprived of their right to vote unless they have previously obtained a certificate.

4 p.m.

I have seen examples of the most intricate pieces of legislation introduced by this Government, but I assert that this particular legislation is without parallel, and I challenge any hon. member to cite similar legislation passed by any democratic country which claims to be guided by ideals of freedom and liberty. We are not asking—and I repeat it, Mr. Chairman—we are not asking that our enemies of yesterday be given the vote and be put on the same footing as British subjects but we are asking that justice be done to people who were British subjects yesterday, who are British subjects to-day, and who will be British subjects to-morrow. That is our whole case. It is a case of fairness, it is a case of justice, and it is a case that ought to be favourably considered by the Government. What remedy is proposed by the amendment drafted by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen)? None at all. The amendment has no bearing on section 29.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Just to clear that matter up—if there is any question about that, we are not going to press the amendment.

Mr. CANNON: The point I wish to make is this. The Acting Solicitor General says in this House: "What we want is fairness." The hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Euler) gets up—

Mr. GUTHRIE: I understood it was the hon. member for Waterloo North who wanted this.

Mr. CANNON: I do not know who wanted it, but I will explain what I think of it. My hon. friend (Mr. Euler) makes certain declarations in this House. The Government, officially, through the mouth of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), says: "we shall see that that condition of things disappears and that a proper remedy is brought in." This is the remedy, and I defy any member of the Government to prove that the remedy, as drafted, and as introduced by the Acting Solicitor General, has any bearing whatsoever on clause 29 concerning women and children. There is another class, a class of people who are not British subjects, or who have lost their certificates of naturalization. The hon. member for Algoma East (Mr. Nicholson) said that those people who are not British subjects, who never cared to be naturalized, although they may have lived for years in Canada, showed that they did not deserve to become British subjects. The hon. member may be right in certain cases, but this is not the case of all the persons referred to. At the time of Confederation in 1867—this is political history known to every member of the House—it was agreed between the two existing parties at that time that foreigners living in Ontario would be given the right to vote without their being sworn in any way. What was the result? Those people went to the polls; they were admitted as electors; they were granted every right and privilege of British citizenship, and they naturally never thought of going before a court or a judge to obtain a certificate, as the Government of this country were giving them all the rights and privileges of British citizenship. Most of those people are now dead; some, but only a few, still live. But what about their children, born outside of Canada, people who may be now forty, fifty, sixty years of age, who have lived in Canada practically all their lives? If their fathers were not British subjects, strictly speaking, according to the law, if those boys or girls were born outside of Canada, they are not British subjects. Could not something be done for those people, who are not foreigners who arrived in this country only two or three or five years ago, but who are people who have lived in Canada, for twenty-five, thirty or forty years and who are good citizens, in some cases the best citizens of this country?

Shall Canada refuse to do something for them? We are answered by the statement that the Imperial Act adopted by the Parliament of Canada cannot be amended. Let that be so; but why not add to clause 29 of this Bill a very simple paragraph stating that people who have lived in this country for ten or fifteen years, who had formerly been given the ballot, should have a right to vote, just as we did for the Indians last night, for the purposes of this Act? That would not be giving naturalization. We would not be putting aside the Naturalization Act of 1919; but we would be fair and just; we would be giving to those people something to which they are entitled. It was very simple for the Acting Solicitor General last night to amend the Indian Act as regards the franchise. He simply proposed the insertion of a clause whereby an Indian under certain conditions would have a right to vote. The Indian Act says expressly that no Indian has a right to vote in this country.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is my hon. friend quite right in that statement? Since last night, I have looked into that, and either I am wrong or he is right.

Mr. CANNON: There is no doubt about that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, I agree on that. We cannot both be right, I mean.

Mr. CANNON: But the Acting Solicitor General by that clause amended the Indian Act as it exists in this country.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, I did not.

Mr. CANNON: That is, an Indian ordinarily living on an Indian Reserve, being a ward of the Government, has no right to vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is not in the Indian Act.

Mr. CANNON: I say that the law as it exists to day is to the effect that an Indian, ordinarily resident on an Indian Reserve, being a ward of the Government, has no right to voe. Notwithstanding that law, notwithstanding the express provisions of it, the Acting Solicitor General says in this House: "If an Indian has served in the Canadian army or the Imperial army or in any of the Allied armies, he will be given the right to vote." The amendment is good and I supported it; but if it be as easy as that for the Acting Solicitor General to go through the Indian Act—

Mr. GUTHRIE: That does not conflict with the Indian Act, as my hon. friend must see.

Mr. CANNON: That is exactly the point I am making. By giving, under our electoral law, the right to vote to an Indian, although the Indian Act expressly says that an Indian, ordinarily resident on a reserve, being a ward of the Government, has no right to vote,—

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Indian Act does not say that. That is where my hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. TRAHAN: The law says so.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, there is a misapprehension.

Mr. ROSS: Has not the Franchise Act always said that?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The franchise is not something that is born with us; it is something that is conferred. Heretofore we have not conferred it on the Indians; now we are conferring it on certain Indians, but there is no disqualification as regards the franchise in the Indian Act. The enfranchised Indian in the Indian Act,—I learned this only last night—is an Indian who has been given his liberty, not the vote. That is the sense in which the word is used in the Indian Act.

Mr. CANNON: The Acting Solicitor General is perfectly right, but we are not discussing the same thing.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Perhaps that is so.

Mr. CANNON: My point is this, that according to the existing law in Canada, an Indian, ordinarily living on an Indian Reserve, being a ward of the Government, has no right to vote at an election.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is right.

Mr. CANNON: We shall soon understand one another. The Acting Solicitor General says that that is the law. Therefore, an Indian living on an Indian Reserve, being a ward of the Government, who was a member of the Canadian army or the Imperial army, or an Allied army, has no vote according to the franchise law. So, I say that the Naturalization Act says that unless a man is a naturalized or a born British subject, he has no right to vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is nothing in the Naturalization Act about voting.

Mr. CANNON: I say that in the Naturalization Act a British subject is a man who is a British subject either by birth or by naturalization, and the Franchise Act says that only British subjects will have a right to vote under certain conditions. Why not put into our Franchise Act a clause covering a class of people who have lived in Canada for a certain number of years, who have been peaceable, dutiful citizens of this country for, say twenty or twenty-five years, but who are not British subjects on account of circumstances that I have explained and that other hon. members have explained to the committee better than myself? It is just as easy for this committee to insert this special clause as it was for the committee to adopt that special clause in connection with Indians. We shall not interfere with the Naturalization Act which will remain as it is now, but for the purposes of the franchise, we shall have a special clause covering the case of those people. As regards clause 29, if the Acting Solicitor General wishes to give to this House a token of his fair-mindedness, which we all appreciate, he ought

to move first that subclause 2 be struck out altogether, and second, that there be substituted for subclause 2 a clause covering the case of the people whom I have just mentioned. He ought to move first that subsection 2 be struck out, and secondly, that in its place there be inserted a paragraph covering the case of the people I have just mentioned.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend (Mr. Cannon) has made a very elaborate argument upon entirely false premises. Speaking broadly, my hon. friend based his argument upon this principle, that the fact of being a British subject absolutely entitles one to the franchise.

Mr. CANNON: A British subject is entitled to the franchise if he has the necessary qualifications as to age and residence. That is the law.

Mr. STEVENS: The correction does not alter the point I am going to make. In support of his contention he proceeded to argue that the principle was based upon hundreds of years of practice under the British constitution, and he cited the revolutions at the time of King Charles and at other periods of British history, when certain vital principles respecting taxation and other matters were contended for by the people. Upon the principles which, as he alleged, were then at stake he bases his argument to-day for the enfranchisement of the particular class he refers to. He forgets, however, that the franchise as we have it to-day is a comparatively modern institution. Universal franchise was certainly unknown and most certainly was not accepted or practised at the time he refers to, when these great principles were fought out. The universal franchise comes within the memory of most members of this House. It is a comparatively new proposition. Furthermore, if my hon. friend wishes to base his argument on constitutional procedure he should remember that the franchise has been extended from time to time by Act of Parliament. The franchise is a gift; it is something that is granted to the subject. I would also point out that while the fact of being a British subject certainly entitles an individual to the protection of the laws of a country it does not necessarily follow that it entitles him to vote. I carry my hon. friend a step further, and he will correct me if I quote him wrongly. He suggests that we should incorporate in this Bill a clause that if a person has been resident in this country ten or fifteen years, whether he is a British subject under the Naturalization Act or not, he should be entitled to vote. That is an extraordinary doctrine, and I know of no precedent for it in British constitutional history.

Mr. CANNON: I made two different propositions. First, as regards the wives and children. I said that as British subjects they should be given the franchise. Secondly, as regards the men who have lived here in Canada for quite a number of years, but who for certain reasons are not British subjects, I said there should be a clause to cover these special cases, giving them the right to vote.

Mr. STEVENS: Can this House imagine a more extraordinary proposal than that an individual, simply because he has been resident in the country and obeying the laws of the country for a certain length of time, should be entitled to the vote, although he is not a natural-born or naturalized British subject? I have never heard of such a doctrine, and certainly no democratic or autocratic country either on the face of the globe ever heard such a proposal made seriously in its legislative assembly.

Let us look at this particular class. I think my hon. friend has beclouded the issue entirely. The point we are discussing is whether or not we shall extend the franchise to the wives of men who came to us from foreign countries, the men having been resident in Canada. Under the old laws of citizenship a woman from Austria, for instance, could come here and if on the day she landed, she got married to a British subject, by law she became a British subject that very day. I am taking an extreme case perhaps, but it is only by taking such a case that we can appreciate the point my hon. friend is trying to make. His proposal is that women, when naturalized by law, should at once be entitled to vote. I submit that that would be a preposterous proposition. Let us take a case that is not so extreme or so specific. By the progress of events and by recent legislation the franchise has been generally extended to women in this country. That is looked upon as the most progressive step in enfranchisement that we have taken in the past five years. Now what are we doing here? We are simply saying that the women aliens who came to our country and who married British subjects should show that they have the qualifications which their husbands must have in order to be naturalized. It seems to me that is a common sense proposition. More than that, if we

were not to exercise some care in extending the franchise, I believe we would be derelict in our duty to the country at large. We must be very careful to see that the franchise is exercised only by those who have an intelligent understanding of the affairs of the country. I think in the past we have been altogether too careless in naturalizing people. We have naturalized persons who did not understand either of the two languages spoken in this country, and who had no knowledge of our democratic principles and institutions. They came perhaps from countries where they had never at any time exercised the franchise, and consequently did not appreciate the privilege that was given to them. I contend that before any person secures the franchise they should have an intelligent grasp of what the franchise means.

Mr. CANNON: A negress comes to Canada with an American husband. The American husband is naturalized, and she is therefore entitled to vote. A French woman from Paris, highly educated, comes over with her husband. The husband is naturalized a British subject. This woman has no vote, while the negress has. Does my hon. friend think that fair?

Mr. STEVENS: It may possibly be that there are some anomalies in the working of the law, but I would point out that the whole principle of the Franchise Bill is to extend the franchise. By this Bill we are not taking away from anybody anything they now have, but are simply extending the franchise to some. We are extending a means by which these people can exercise the franchise if they comply with certain conditions. My hon. friend (Mr. Cannon) said that the Bill as it stands is not generous enough. My hon. friend the Acting Solicitor General has agreed to an enlargement by the amendment which he proposes, and I think that in that regard he has done well. I for one would not advocate that we should enter into any reactionary policy in connection with the franchise. I think we must be broad and generous in the construction of our franchise law. Nevertheless, Sir, I believe that it is the duty of this Parliament to safeguard the rights conferred by the franchise so that this greatest privilege of citizenship may be exercised wisely and intelligently. I wish to point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Cannon) that he is not quite consistent, because, if I mistake not, there is in some of the provinces of Canada to-day a property qualification for voters. In other words, the principle which he enunciates, namely, that the fact of your being a British subject entitles you to vote provided you are twenty-one years of age and can comply with certain other requirements, is not applicable generally throughout the country. In provincial matters, there are property qualifications in some of the provinces. I think that Nova Scotia a few years ago, if not to-day, had such qualifications, and it is not many years ago since the other provinces had them. Generally speaking, we have passed that stage in the Dominion arena; we have virtually reached the point of universal franchise, although there are some classes that are still restricted, and I think Mr. Chairman that we are exceedingly wise in imposing the restrictions that exist. And I am reminded—I intended to state the fact—that these restrictions are imposed upon persons who are undoubtedly British subjects in every sense of the term. We enforce in a very marked sense the resident qualification. A man must have been for a certain time resident in the electoral district in which he votes. He might have been born in this country and have lived here all his life; he might have been prime minister of a province for a dozen years; but if he has not been a resident in the electoral district for a stated period he cannot vote. We look upon that as a necessary qualification, and this and other restrictions are eminently wise, notwithstanding that they apply to British subjects born or naturalized. The point I am driving at is simply this, that you cannot lay down the principle that because a person is a British subject either by birth or by naturalization he therefore necessarily is entitled to the franchise. The franchise is a right that exists altogether independently of the naturalization law, and in this Act we are not violating that law at all. We are dealing with a separate matter which is of the greatest importance in itself, and so long as this Act deals fairly with the people of the country and gives them a reasonable opportunity to exercise the franchise it discharges the function which is supposed to attach to it.

I desire to say a word or two in regard to the disfranchisement of certain classes of people. Now, Sir, I feel very strongly with the hon. member for Red Deer and one or two other hon. gentlemen whom I have heard speak on this question, that we should as early as possible in Canada allay the bitterness that has been engendered

by the late war and endeavour to establish a new relation with our enemies. That is desirable, and I should be the last person to say anything now that might tend to open old wounds. But, Mr. Chairman, while we entertain that feeling—and I think it is genuinely entertained throughout the country—nevertheless there are certain things which common sense demands that we shall recognize. Although perhaps a large proportion of the people disfranchised by reason of enemy alien origin may wish to be good and loyal citizens of this country, still we have had ample experience to know that there are designing persons who even to-day, after all the bitter lessons of the war, are quite willing to use their influence among this class of people to the detriment of the country. We cannot shut our eyes to that fact; I do not think we dare. As I say, Mr. Chairman, I would be the last man to stir up any rancour or ill feeling, but the fact must be apparent that—

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Would the hon. gentleman mind naming the agitators who are creating the disturbances or who are bringing any influence to bear on people in this country?

Mr. STEVENS: —it is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that I am speaking in a general sense, and I think my hon. friend knows that perfectly well. But it would be entirely beside the question for me to mention any names at this time.

Mr. EULER: Does the hon. gentleman not know that in such cases as he has referred to it would be the duty of the judge to examine the persons who appeared before him and to decide whether they were worthy of naturalization, and that if he found that they were not worthy he would be in duty bound to refuse the credentials?

Mr. STEVENS: I presume the hon. gentleman is referring to this clause under discussion?

Mr. EULER: Exactly.

Mr. STEVENS: Well, let me say that I am supporting the clause and I agree with my hon. friend so far as this clause is concerned. But what I do say—I think it is well that I should repeat it, and I can assure hon. gentlemen that I have no desire whatever to stir up trouble—is that it is unwise for us to close our eyes to the fact that there are individuals in Canada to-day who are quite willing to exploit the bitter feelings that arose during the late war in order to create discord and trouble in the country. The same thing has been experienced to the south of us, perhaps to a greater extent than in Canada. So that in the framing of this Franchise Bill, Parliament must take care that it shall not carelessly or recklessly extend the privilege of the franchise. One other point, Mr. Chairman, and I shall conclude. As years go by these disabilities which we have, as I think, very wisely imposed may be removed as present unsettled conditions subside and become normal once more, but I do not think that it is wise at this time to go to any extreme that may involve us in danger.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I do not purpose to discuss the question of the disfranchisement of certain British subjects, because I am well satisfied with what the minister said last night, if I understood him correctly. He said:

> The object of the present amendment is to make definite and certain that every one who is actually a British subject shall enjoy the right to vote, and if the amendment that I have moved does not make that clear, we shall make it clear if a better method can be suggested.

I assume that the minister was referring to cases of the kind under discussion: that is, the wives and families of naturalized British subjects from alien countries. I think I can quite agree with him in that, if he is prepared to change his amendment in such a way as to carry out what he says he has in mind.

In one or two respects the amendment as drawn will not, in my opinion, accomplish what I assume the minister desires to accomplish; and I assume he desires to accomplish what he says he desires. The wives and children of naturalized Germans and Austrians in our country are, in cases where the husband or father is naturalized, British subjects. I assume that my hon. friend's desire is to give all these people the right to vote; if he does not mean that, his statement of last night will require a good deal of explanation. Anything I have to say in this discussion will be with a view to directing the minister's attention to some things which I believe would prevent him from carrying out his desires as expressed last night. In the first place, the applicant for certificate must show that he or she is of good character and has an adequate knowledge of the English or French language. That is not the most important matter on which I wish to speak, but let me dwell upon it for a moment. I think I

am right in saying that the section as proposed to be amended by the minister will mean that every person applying to a judge for a certificate such as is required under the section must satisfy that judge that he or she has a good knowledge of English or French and is of good character. Now the good character requirement we can hardly object to. In a great many cases, however, wives of naturalized British subjects will be debarred on the language test. Is that the minister's intention? The amendment means that any barrier placed upon a person by reason of section 8 of the Naturalization Act shall not disentitle him or her to receive that certificate from the judge. Has it occurred to the minister that in order to carry out the spirit of the Act the judge must in many cases give an absolutely false certificate? He must certify that the person is a person naturalized by operation of law, who, but for such naturalization "is qualified and would be entitled at the issue of this certificate to be personally naturalized in Canada." Now, the wife or child of a naturalized German or Austrian would not be qualified under these circumstances and would not be so entitled to naturalization. While the spirit of the amendment proposed would, perhaps, justify the judge in granting that quasi false certificate, I am satisfied that I know a judge who will not grant it under the circumstances; he will not give the certificate to the wife or the child of a German or an Austrian. I would not blame him for that, because we have no right to ask a judge to issue what is evidently a false certificate, even though it may be in keeping with the spirit of the law. What are you going to do with the judge who, on that ground, refuses to issue the certificate?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That brings us to the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Euler). My view is, and I am pretty strong in it, that the certificate is right in the form in which it appears in the Bill. The member for North Waterloo does not take that view; he doubts whether that is correct. Mr. Mulvey, the Under-Secretary of State, who has the administration of the Naturalization Act, is also inclined to think that there may be some doubt, and if a judge in the West has cast a doubt upon it, there is all the more reason why it should be made clear. Mr. Mulvey suggests that it can be made clear by inserting two or three words in the certificate, and when we come to it I propose to move an amendment.

Mr. L. THOMSON: I would like the minister to note the objection that I have taken; I do not know whether it is the same as that made by the hon. member for North Waterloo.

There is another point. Those who have had to do with naturalization know that the foreigner, as we call him, is not likely to apply for naturalization until he has some particular object in view, until there is some particular reason for his doing so. My experience is not exactly in line with what the member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) says was his experience and that of the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder). I know that in the old days a great many of these people used to apply for naturalization before an election. In fact, that was about the only time they wanted it, unless it was when they wanted their patents. Now, what will be the result of that practice under present conditions? Large numbers of these people will not bother about this certificate until they are pretty sure an election is coming on, and in some of our western districts the judges will have their hands full if they properly carry out the idea which, I take it, the minister has in mind. I assume that the minister will expect the judge to require those who go before him for this purpose to establish that they are able to read and write the English or the French languages and also that they are of good character. How is the judge to satisfy himself on the point of character? I do not know what the rule followed by all the judges in the West is, but in the Moosomin district a judge, when he wants to satisfy himself as to the character of an applicant, must have before him two persons who know the applicant and whom the judge also knows. He will pay no attention to any person coming to swear as to the character of the applicant unless it is some one whom he himself knows. These applications must be made only before him in chambers at Moosomin. Now the judicial district of Moosomin is one of the oldest and most densely populated districts of Saskatchewan, and many of these people live seventy-five or eighty miles from the town of Moosomin itself. The requirement seems to be that such persons must go to Moosomin with two witnesses who must know the applicants, and must be known to the judge. With these special persons to vouch for them the applicants must go all that

distance, in each case we will say, to Moosomin. Now there are a great many of such people that will require those certificates and the time of the judge will be pretty well occupied in hearing these applications. I would like the minister—sometime later, when he is on his feet—to relieve my mind as to whether there would be any limitation on the right of the judge to make a ruling as to the evidence that must be submitted before him, as to the persons by whom it shall be submitted, and also as to where the hearings can take place. It seems to me that there can be no proper reason why the judge should not be able to hear those applications at any place where he holds a district court. Even that would not be very satisfactory, for the reason that in most of the places outside of the judicial centre court is only held twice a year; and when an election is in view, at the time these people would be coming forward with their applications, there is no district court being held at that particular place and the parties desirous of making the application would either have to go to Moosomin or abandon their purpose altogether. If the section is passed, with the amendment suggested, a very large proportion of these people will be British subjects by operation of law—that is the wives and children of naturalized persons who were former Germans or Austrians—but only a very small number of them would be qualified to vote when an election takes place.

I would also make one further suggestion to my hon. friend who states that he is willing to receive suggestions—whether it is advisable or not I leave to himself—if he insists on some such certificate being granted, would it not be possible to have some persons appointed for this purpose in each important town or village throughout the district? For instance, take my own district, if half a dozen or a dozen men at the most important points were given the right to issue those certificates I would be quite willing to allow my hon. friend to appoint those men himself, because, in my opinion, he will choose men that are honest and thoroughly reliable. Let such persons as those issue the certificates. They know far more about the character of the applicants than the judge possibly could. After all that is the important point, and I think my hon. friend will agree with me as to that—such persons will be in a very much better position to give a certificate than any judge would. Therefore I would like my hon. friend to consider that suggestion.

Mr. EULER: It has been stated this afternoon by the Acting Solicitor General—and reference to it has been made by the member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon)—that this amendment has come as a result of certain representations I made some time ago, and the minister intimated that the amendment was in some sense to meet my wishes. That may be true. So far as I am concerned I feel that the amendment which has been submitted, and which we are now discussing does, in a measure, meet the views that were placed before the House at that time. But I was rather surprised to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cannon) state that it has absolutely no effect in the direction desired. If that were the case I would say, either that the work of the man who drafted the amendment is very bad, or that the amendment is an attempt at the worst betrayal of which any Government could possibly be guilty. I would hesitate to believe either of these conclusions; I do not view the amendment in that way.

I do not want to be placed in the position of opposing the amendment because I am in favour of it so far as it goes; my only objection to it is that it does not go quite far enough. It must be apparent to every member who has followed the course of this debate that a great deal of confusion exists as to exactly what the clause and the amendment mean. I am pretty sure that at least ninety per cent of the members of the House do not yet appreciate the distinction—and this is casting no reflection on any hon. member—that should be made between those people that are not naturalized and who we think should be allowed the franchise by naturalization, and that other group of people who were discussed on the second reading of the Bill, and whose grievance this amendment is supposed to remedy. I am not now going to discuss the status of those who are not British subjects. I shall do what I did the other night—refer to the rights of those women and men who are actually naturalized British subjects, and who, in my opinion, should be given the vote without being put to the necessity of going before a judge and once again proving that they are entitled to, and are fit persons to exercise the franchise. Now if the whole question has been so confusing to the members of the House, it is not to be wondered at if the same condition exists throughout the country, and it will certainly exist in the minds of the people who are most intimately affected by the condition in question. But I submit, Sir, that it is entirely unnecessary that

any such confusion should exist. This amendment is not the best that could be offered. The existing confusion will vanish if we simply follow the law as we have it already in the Naturalization Act, entirely apart from this clause and which a much simpler amendment will accomplish. The whole difficulty, to my mind, arises from the fact that an attempt is here being made to enact a law which is in direct contradiction to the law which already appears on the statute books of Canada. When the Government realized the unfortunate effects of the proposed new law, they undertook to remedy the defect—not by removing the clause which is in direct opposition to an established principle of law already on the statute books of Canada, but by trying to reconcile two irreconcilable things, and thus they complicated and confused the whole question more than ever. I believe, Sir, that is stating the absolute fact. The whole difficulty arises by trying to enact a law which will be in direct contradiction to a law which already exists, and nothing but confusion can result from such an attempt.

First, we have the principle laid down in the Naturalization Act, that the wife of a British subject is herself a British subject. We may regard that, I think, as a definite axiom. It is not only enacted in the naturalization law of 1919, but it has been affirmed in every previous naturalization law since Confederation. Therefore I say it is an accepted axiom that the wife of a British subject is herself a British subject.

Then, quite inconsistently, in subsection 2 of section 29 we say in plain English that in so far as voting is concerned she is not a British subject. That is the extraordinary statement in that paragraph. In our naturalization law we say that the wife of a British subject is a British subject; but in this proposed election law we say in so many words that she is not a British subject. The two terms are absolutely contradictory, and that is why the confusion arises.

Now, when the difficulty is noted, along comes this amendment which tries to reconcile what I submit are two unreconcilable things. How can a person be a British subject and yet not be a British subject?

In my opinion, Sir, the remedy is very plain. Choose which of the two principles —the one already in the Naturalization Act under which the wife of a British subject is herself a British subject; and the other principle enunciated in this Franchise Act, that she is not a British subject for the purpose of voting—I say choose which of these two principles is the right one, and then destroy the one that is wrong. That seems to me to be the logical course to follow.

These women and these men who, as minors, became naturalized by operation of law are British subjects, as has been pointed out again and again, and I assert that it is absurd to say that right here in Canada—where after all this Parliament should have full control—those men and women shall be British subjects for one purpose and not for another; that for example, the men shall be put in the dual characters of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: The whole thing is an absurdity and should not be placed upon the statute books.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma East): Might I ask the hon. member a question? How would he treat British subjects who come to this country from British India?

Mr. EULER: That is a very easy question for me to answer. I would say that a person who is a British subject in Canada should be given the vote, regardless of colour, creed or racial origin. That is my personal opinion.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, these women are British subjects and their husbands are British subjects. I declare, and I know something of what I am about to say, that these husbands are probably no better and no worse than their wives so far as fitness for the franchise is concerned. These men, and quite properly so, are now permitted to cast their ballots, though of alien origin. Then the franchise having been extended to our women, and quite properly so, why should it not follow that as these men are granted the franchise, their wives—who are just as much British subjects as their husbands—should also be granted the franchise? Why should they be put under the necessity and the humiliation of going before a judge and showing once again that they are fit and proper persons to be given the franchise?

Mr. STEVENS: Will the hon. member permit me a question? He speaks of the wives going before a judge and showing once again that they are fit and proper persons to exercise the franchise. Is it not true that they have never before shown that fitness, nor have they ever established that they have the qualifications which their husbands had to have in order to be granted naturalization? And while I am on my feet, let me ask another question. Before the husbands could secure the fran-

chise they had to comply with the Naturalization Act; the women never were naturalized under that Act, but by law, which law was based upon certain principles before women were enfranchised. Now that women are enfranchised, is it not fair that these wives should be asked to qualify up to the standard of their husbands?

Mr. EULER: The hon. gentleman tries to introduce a principle that has never been introduced before. The franchise has now been given to all women who are British subjects, except this particular class of whom we are speaking. There has been no intimation given that the Government is going to make certain that other women are to be tested before a judge as to whether they are fit and proper persons to exercise the franchise. If we are going to be consistent, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to make these people who have lived in the country for many years, to say nothing of the men who have voted in past years, and whom you are now going to make go before a judge to show their fitness to exercise the franchise—if we are going to do that, we should make certain that everybody who in future casts his ballot is a fit and proper person to be granted that privilege. Why not go back and make every woman who will now vote show that she is a fit and proper person to cast the ballot? Why confine it to the alien-born if the present law as to naturalization is to be satisfied? It seems to me that that is the only logical course to take if you want to be consistent. I contend that to-day there are men in this country—and many women too, who could not possibly fulfil the requirements of the Naturalization Act, as it is at this moment. Are we going to shut them out from the vote? We are not, and I think it is quite right that that we do not, because it would be a mistake to make that provision retroactive in respect to a privilege which they already have. The alien-born British subject should not be discriminated against.

5 p.m.

I contended last evening that this law should not be made to apply to people who are already living in this country and are British subjects, but that, if desired, we might apply this law to those who come here in the future. They come then with their eyes open, knowing what is expected of them. I for one am quite in sympathy with the principle that in future, men and women alike, should be made to show that they are fit subjects for naturalization, and thus for the franchise.

Peculiarly enough, I have not heard any real defence of this subsection 2 of section 29 or any real reason given for its adoption. No real argument has been adduced as to why these women in particular should be segregated from their husbands, than whom they are no better and no worse—perhaps the wives are a little better; I am willing to admit that. Then why should they be put to the necessity of going before a judge and proving that they are fit persons to vote? I have heard no argument that convinces me of the necessity for this provision; in fact, all hon. members on the other side who have spoken, have practically avoided that point.

I was alluding a few moments ago to the fact that a great deal of confusion exists, and I listened with approval to what was said by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Levi Thomson). He stated that in his opinion the inclusion of this paragraph in the Bill will result, in a practical way, in the disfranchisement of a great proportion of these people. In that I think he is absolutely correct. I gave some of the reasons for my belief last night. In the first place, many of these women, especially those who are aged—and many of them are elderly women—will absolutely refuse to go through the ordeal of appearing before a judge and submitting themselves to a series of questions. They will prefer to remain at home and lose their vote. It may be said that that is not the proper attitude on their part; but it is a very natural one. On the other hand, I think a great many of these people, particularly the men, may be placed upon the voters' lists by those who think they ought to be there legally, and perhaps placed there by others who think that they have a moral right to be there—a great many of these people, knowing that their names are on the voters' lists, will go to no further trouble to get the certificate required by law, and when they appear at the polling booth they may be challenged by those opposed to them politically with the result that they will be deprived of their votes. I believe that will be the practical result of the inclusion of this clause in the Bill. All the confusion, all the injustice and all danger from a wrong interpretation of the Act; all danger that a judge even may make a partisan use of his power, and refuse the certificate to perfectly worthy people, British subjects, will disappear, if you will take the law as it stands to-day in the Naturalization Act and say that when a person is a British subject, he is a British

subject for all purposes, including the franchise, if he fulfils the other requirements. As I said last night, I believe earnestly if a man or a woman is of the age of twenty-one years and is of good character, he or she should have the franchise as the direct result of British citizenship, and this clause which imposes on those people the necessity of going before a judge and proving to his satisfaction—and perhaps failing to prove to his satisfaction—that they are fit and proper persons to exercise the franchise, should be struck out.

Surely this should appeal to the Government as the only logical, fair and reasonable way in which to cure the wrong that flowed out of the Act as it was originally framed. I should like to press home on the Acting Solicitor General and the Government that by so doing they will be the means of saving many worthy people from difficulties and inconveniences which they do not deserve to have placed upon them. Believing that, I shall move an amendment to the amendment of the Acting Solicitor General and I hope he will accept it and withdraw his own, because I believe my amendment will meet the sense of fairness of most of the people of this country when they know the facts free from misrepresentation. I move in amendment to the amendment:

That subclause 2 of clause 29 of the Bill be struck out in its entirety.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton): The legal effect of the Franchise Bill as now proposed has been given very well this afternoon by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) and other hon. gentlemen, but I believe they have exaggerated to a certain degree the evils which may crop up under this measure. The amendment to the amendment undoubtedly meets the situation which both the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Euler) and myself had the honour of suggesting to the House on the second reading, and if hon. gentlemen opposite will take the trouble to study the amendment to the amendment carefully, they will see that it meets that situation. I said on that occasion that the Government can have only one purpose for that clause, namely, that it desires to raise the standard of the voter. My hon. friend (Mr. Euler) has, I believe, struck the proper key-note this afternoon along with the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. L. Thomson), when they say that, whereas you are endeavouring to raise that standard by this legislation, you are making it possible, first, that persons applying for a certificate will be denied that certificate by reason of the prejudice unfortunately existing at present in the country, and second, that those who will be denied a certificate because they do not come up to the qualifications required of them under the Naturalization Act, shall be deprived of casting a vote in the elections in this country when, as a matter of fact, there are, in Western Canada as well as in Eastern Canada, very many persons who have to ask their friends in the polling booth how to mark their ballots. I am entirely in accord with the motive of the Government, and I do not believe the accusations of hon. gentlemen opposite against the Government are well founded. I am entirely in accord with the desire of the Government to establish a higher standard of education in the matter of voting, but I believe this is not the proper occasion on which to deal with that matter. I would rather see a law which would contain a provision stating that hereafter unless you can speak or write the English or the French language, or unless you have an adequate knowledge of one or the other or both languages, you may not vote. Then, we would have the whole population on an equal footing. I know, for instance, that in the western provinces there are a large number of men and women who will not be able to get their certificates, not because of their fault, but because of the circumstances in which they are situated and of their age, it will be impossible for them to qualify unless a judge is willing to take the broad view that he used to take at a time when such men came before him for naturalization papers for the purpose of securing patents to land. Under those circumstances, a judge was lenient, because he realized that it was necessary for a man to get his naturalization papers for the purpose of getting patent to his land. If such a man could say a few words in English or French and could express the balance of his meaning by gesticulation with his hands or by some other method, the judge would say: All right, I will give you your naturalization papers. But when such a man comes before a judge to obtain qualification to vote the judge may not be so lenient, and I know of some judges who have refused such people naturalization right along. Even now I have received letters from some of my constituents stating that they have made application and that they have been turned down because they do not know enough of the English lan-

guage. This is one method of disfranchising those people, and they should not be treated in this way, unless you go further and treat every one in the same manner. What about the half-breed population we have in Western Canada? I attended one poll at Fort Chippewyan where there were 90 voters, not one of whom himself marked his ballot, but whose ballot was marked for him by the deputy returning officer when they told him for whom they wanted to vote. I doubt if they understood the issues in the provincial election; but they were entitled to vote, althought in the light of this provision in this Franchise Bill, they would not be permitted to vote.

Another feature which I should like to discuss for a moment is this. In Western Canada, there is a large population from Galicia. One portion of Galicia has to-day passed under the dominance of Poland; the other portion has been separated from Austria, but it does not belong to any country in particular, except that Poland has been given a sort of mandate temporarily until the League of Nations decides the issue whether eastern Galicia shall go into independent Ukraine or whether it shall form part of Russia as a whole. These people in the meantime are being looked upon as alien enemies, as Austrians, although they are detached from the Austrian Empire, and all of those people, by reason of the fact that the League of Nations has not yet determined what country they are in future to be nationals of have been refused naturalization papers. I have a number of letters from the Under-Secretary of State stating definitely that these people would be refused their naturalization papers until such time as the League of Nations shall decide where they belong. Assuming that this Government will finish the terms and that two more years will elapse before an election takes place, if the League of Nations shall have settled by that time the destiny of these people, they will then be entitled to make application for naturalization. If not, there will be out West a very large number of people who will not be able to vote at all, because they cannot be naturalized in Canada for the purpose of acquiring citizenship, and certainly they cannot be naturalized for the purpose of voting.

I would point out the advisability of supporting the amendment to the amendment and treating these people on the broad lines we have been accustomed to in the past in dealing with all the people of this Dominion. If there is to be any high standard of citizenship required before a vote can be cast let the Act state, that from now on certain classes shall not be allowed to help to determine public questions in Canada unless they have a certain educational status. I would support such a proposal if it were made to apply to all alike. But at the present time I should think that we are discriminating, because we are allowing a large number of people to vote who have no greater learning or education than those from foreign countries who have been brought to the western provinces. Let a standard be fixed from now on; let there be no discrimination. I would also ask the Acting Solicitor General to take into consideration the fact that in the three western provinces that large population from Galicia will not be able to secure the franchise unless the League of Nations decides within the next two years what shall happen to them.

Mr. JACOBS: I feel as if I were playing a return engagement here this afternoon, because I was the last to speak on this question last night. But I cannot allow the question to be put to a vote without saying a final word in the hope that the Acting Solicitor General may have had his heart softened in the meantime. This matter is of vital importance to the people in the large cities, where we have, as the House knows, an exceptionally large foreign population. I said last night that I estimated there were at least 5,000 of these foreign born people in my division who would be affected by this Bill. In the other divisions of Montreal there are at least as many, so that in the city of Montreal we have 10,000 foreign born who will be affected by this legislation. Last night when I asked the Acting Solicitor General why he sought to introduce this distinction into our law, he said:

> Because we recognize that people born on this continent are very similar in their ideas, laws, customs and habits to our own people and we can very quickly assimilate them to our ways.

That being the case you would expect that a judge who was going to pass on the applications brought before him would look into the question whether the applicant's ideas, laws, customs and habits were similar to ours or otherwise. Let me invite your attention to the form provided in section 29:

> This is to certify that from evidence submitted before me I am satisfied that A. B. of .....in the province of.....(occupation).....is a person naturalized as a British subject by operation of law, who, but for such naturalization, is qualified and would

be entitled at the date of the issue of this certificate to be personally naturalized in Canada.

Is there anything said there with regard to the ideas, laws, customs, habits and character of the applicant? Not a word. The object of this certificate, as can be seen from the form, is identification pure and simple, and I challenge the Acting Solicitor General to show me where it applies to anything outside of identification. Why should the judges of the high court in the city of Montreal, for instance, be put to the trouble and inconvenience and annoyance of merely passing upon a question of identification when that could be very well done by the enumerator or by the deputy returning officer?

I say that the object of this section is to prevent as many as possible of the foreign born from voting at the next election. That is the object, camouflage it as you may, and I challenge the Acting Solicitor General to say that it is for any other object. He spoke of the ideas, law, customs and habits of our people, and contrasted them with those of the people coming here from Europe. Does the Acting Solicitor General know that under this Act people from Mexico, from Haiti, and from the Central American republics will have the right to vote? Every negress, every mulatto, and every quadroon in the United States who comes here and marries a British subject will have the right to vote. In what way I should like to know will that contribute to elevating our ideas, our customs, and character, and habits, and the mental and moral welfare of the people of this country? The women from Belgium and France, many of whom took part in the war, are not to be allowed this privilege but have to submit to this humiliating application which the minister intends to thrust upon them. I admire consistency and frankness in any one, as much in a government as in a private individual, and I say it is rank hypocrisy on the part of the Government to attempt to tell us that the object of this law is to see to it that the people who are voting under this law conform to the customs and ideas of the native born.

I would draw the minister's attention to the fact that when the Military Voters' Act was put on the statute books there was no such wild attempt to see to it that the ideas, the customs and habits and morality of the women who voted under that Act should be as carefully investigated as they are supposed to be under this Act. Women voters under that Act were taken wherever they could be found. If a man in the trenches had nine or ten sisters at home, he had eleven votes, no matter whether the women were from Belgium or France or Timbuctoo. The Government needed those votes, and they made use of them. To-day they think they do not need them. In fact in a very negative way, they do not need them because the Government knows how the women are going to vote so they bring before Parliament a measure to see that as few as possible will vote at the next election. This giving the vote to the women and then taking it away from them is very much in line with a good many other so-called philanthropic acts of the Government, but when you examine it you find you have very little. It is another case of, the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away, but in this case we cannot say, Blessed be the name of the Lord. I would like to have the Acting Solicitor General pinned down to a statement regarding the form attached to section 29, and to ascertain from him how a judge by giving a certificate identifying a party as the party entitled to vote is going to give us any assurance as to the character of the voter. The thing is absurd. It is simply another piece of hypocrisy on the part of the Government, who under the guise of seeing to it that the people who come to this country are respectable and law-abiding citizens are depriving many of their right to exercise the franchise which they would have, but for this section.

I cannot add anything to what I have already said on this matter. When the By-elections Bill was before the House in July, 1919, I opposed it as vigorously as I could. When the Naturalization Act was before the House I opposed it, I opposed this Bill on its second reading and I intend to oppose it at every turn until it finally becomes law and as I hinted last night I intend to oppose it even then. The Government, I fear, in its own interests is making a mistake in attempting to place on the statute books laws of this kind. After all, what reason have they to feel that all these women whom it is sought to prevent from voting at the next election are going to vote against them? The Government claim that at the last election about 250,000 or 300,000 women voted for them. How is it that such a change has come about in the mentality of the women of this country? It is said that women sometimes, by intuition know who are their friends and who are not; and probably the Government

has come to the conclusion that the women are going to vote against them en masse on that account. In this Bill there is a distinction which ought not to exist. We do not want to have one law for the stranger and another law for the British born subject. The law that exists in the land should be the law for all persons who live in the land, and any attempt to derogate or deviate from that well established principle is bound to meet with the reprobation of the citizens of this country. The Government may think that they are going to succeed by putting on the statute book a law of this kind, but I warn them that it will recoil upon their heads. There are a large number of foreign born people who will be permitted to vote under this Act, but their relatives will be precluded from the privilege, and I want to warn the Government seriously, that many of these people whose relatives are to be prohibited from voting at the next election are certainly not going to cast their votes in favour of a Government that puts on the statute book of the country a measure as iniquitous as this one.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Will the minister be kind enough to tell me what good reason there is and what good purpose will be served by compelling these British subjects to travel miles from their homes to obtain certificates? I represent in this House a purely rural constituency in which there is not a judicial centre, and the women who will be affected in that constituency will have to travel many miles at great expense, and will be absent from their families for one or more nights if they desire to obtain the necessary certificate. The law says that these people are British subjects. It gives to their husbands, who are British subjects, the right of the franchise, and I cannot see any good reason why these women should be compelled to apply to a judge or any tribunal for a certificate. Will the minister be kind enough to make a statement in regard to that point?

Mr. MYERS: Will the hon. gentleman say who he thinks will grant the certificate if not the judge?

Mr. JOHNSTON: I have asked the minister a question and I should like to have an answer.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The question asked by the hon. member is practically the same as one submitted by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. Under this Bill as drawn it is provided that a person who has become a British subject by operation of law, in order to vote, shall obtain a certificate from a judge. That certificate is not for the purpose of identity, as my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier suggested a few moments ago; it is for the purpose of satisfying the judge that the woman has such qualifications that in any event, though she may be a British subject by operation of law, she would be entitled to naturalization. I do not know the riding which my hon. friend represents, but I know that under this Act it is not only one circuit judge that can give a certificate. Any of the Superior Court judges can give it, and I assume that courts are held at regular intervals in these outlying districts. In the dense settlement of Montreal, according to my hon. friend (Mr. Jacobs), some ten thousand women will have to procure certificates, but I am satisfied even that large number can be accommodated for there are some thirty or forty judges in Montreal who will have the power to grant these certificates. One can easily magnify the difficulties under this Act, and no doubt there will be some inconvenience imposed. It has been pointed out that some judges may take exceptional views of the matter. Well, we are supposed to have judges who will take reasonable views of the law and administer the law as it stands; and I think that if there are judges who will not do so their conduct should be reported to the proper authorities. I cannot understand that any judge would say: "I will hear applications only at one point in my district." There is nothing in the Act that limits his jurisdiction in any way; there is nothing that imposes such a limitation upon him. I think myself that the judge is bound to hear an application wherever it is made, in any part of the territory under his jurisdiction, and I see nothing to prevent any judge from any other part of the province from coming in. This can be done in Ontario.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: Is that true in regard to an application for naturalization? Is the judge bound to hear an application for naturalization from any point?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The judge is bound by the language of this statute, and there is nothing to say that he will hear applications only in one particular place. He must hear them wherever they are made in the territory over which he has jurisdiction, and there is nothing in this law that says he can name particular places.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: The minister has not caught my question. I want to know

if the same thing applies to an application for naturalization. Is the judge bound to hear that application at any place; if not, what is the distinction?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think he is bound to hear it at any place. The application has to be filed, in the case of naturalization, in the office of the clerk of the court. In this case the judge has jurisdiction over every portion of his territory, and it is not for him to say that he will hear applications only in this or the other place, and if a judge takes that ground his conduct should be reported to the proper authorities, and I am satisfied he would not continue in such a course or the law would speedily be changed.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Will any fee be charged for the certificate?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, there is no fee for the certificate. I do not know that I can give any further information to the committee. I know that there are two views in regard to this amendment as there probably are in regard to the original clause. My hon. friend from Dorchester took forty minutes this afternoon to denounce my amendment and to show that it was, in his opinion, absolutely worthless. Yet my hon. friend from North Waterloo approved of it; he evidently thinks that half a loaf is better than no bread.

Mr. EULER: I thank the minister for expressing the very thought I had in mind. I was just about to say the same thing.

Mr. GUTHRIE: As I said last night and repeat now, if there is anything uncertain about the amendment which my hon. friend can make clearer by other language I am willing to give every consideration to his suggestions. If the language of the Under-Secretary of State meets the views of my hon. friend we may consider it. The amendment I have submitted meets with the approval of the Government, and it is the desire that it be passed.

Mr. J. F. REID (Mackenzie): In my riding there is a judicial centre and the resident district judge hold sittings of the district court throughout that territory. Suppose an application is filed with the court in one part of that territory and the judge is sitting somewhere else, could the party who filed the application appear before the judge where he is sitting and ask for the certificate?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Undoubtedly.

[Mr. Thomson.]

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): I understood my hon. friend (Mr. L. Thomson) to say that a similar request had been refused in his constituency.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then the matter had better be referred to the proper authorities. It has always been believed that judges of this country hold office for the convenience of the public as well as for the administration of law. If they get the other idea into their heads, the sooner we pass some law on the subject the better.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Subsection 2 of clause 29 states:

> For the purposes of this Act, the allegiance or nationality of a person, as it was at the birth of such person, shall be deemed incapable of being changed . . . by reason of . . . . naturalization of any other person or otherwise than by personal naturalization.

Now, section 33 of the Naturalization Act reads, in part:

> Where in pursuance of this Act the name of a child is included in a certificate of naturalization granted to his parent, or where, in pursuance of any Act repealed by this Act, any child has been deemed to be a naturalized British subject by reason of residence with his parent, such child shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be a person to whom a certificate of naturalization has been granted.

Under the Naturalization Act of 1919 a minor child becomes a British subject on account of the naturalization of his father and is deemed to be personally naturalized; is deemed to have received a certificate of naturalization. How do you reconcile the two Acts?

Mr. GUTHRIE: He gets it by operation of law. He does not actually get a certificate.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He is deemed to have had a certificate.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is the operation of law; that is what is referred to. He gets no actual certificate, but by operation of law he becomes a British subject and is deemed to have received a certificate.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think my hon. friend is not right as to that. The wife becomes a British subject by operation of law. There is no section that says the wife is deemed to have received the certificate. Minor children are placed in the same situation as the wife; they are deemed to be naturalized by the operation of law, but there is a special section which states that they are considered as having been personally naturalized, as having themselves received certificate of naturalization. How can you reconcile these two provisions?

Mr. GUTHRIE: They never have been personally naturalized and they never have received a certificate. The law says they shall be deemed to have been personally naturalized; consequently it is by operation of law that they are such.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That only serves to show the absurdity of legislation which makes persons half British subjects and half aliens. If personal naturalization is required of a person in order that he may be a British subject, then change the naturalization law. I read in an American magazine some days ago an article which stated that changes in the naturalization law of United States are being advocated to provide that personal naturalization only shall be valid. Change the law if you like, but as long as the naturalization of the husband carries with it the naturalization of the wife, the wife should be deemed a British subject for all purposes, not for some purposes only. People seem to be under the impression that this provision is designed only to meet the case of persons whose parents were of enemy origin. Well, that is a mistake; this provision applies also to persons coming from friendly countries. As was stated this afternoon, persons of French, Italian and Belgian descent, persons from other countries which were associated with Great Britain in the war, even though they are British subjects by the naturalization of husbands or fathers, would, under this provision, be deprived of the right to vote. This is a point of view which should be considered before section 29 is adopted in its present form. We have the disability clause providing for the ten year period of disfranchisement because that provision was first enacted by the British Parliament. The British electoral law never required personal naturalization on the part of women to entitle them to vote. Under the Representation of the People Act, 1918, women who are British subjects by birth or by naturalization are entitled to vote. Why should we have any different provision in this country? It is arbitrary to ask people to get a certificate from a judge before they shall have the right to vote. The right to vote should be made clear by Act of Parliament; it should not be subject to the whim of any person, a judge or any one else. Judges have varying rules in connection with the application of laws, especially when it is a question of administration, as will be the case under this Act. Some judges are more strict than others; some insist upon the furnishing of more particulars by applicants than others do. The law will not be uniform in its application, and for that reason and for all the other reasons that have been given this afternoon, I shall support the amendment of my hon. friend from North Waterloo.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, all these new troubles and difficulties that we have in connection with the franchise arose out of the war. We had no such difficulties before the war. Any man who came to this country obtained his naturalization, and there was no further trouble about it—he was entitled to all the privileges of a British subject. For that reason I cannot see why troubles which have arisen out of the war should be visited upon those nations which were friendly to us and fought side by side with us during the conflict, and why we should, by reason of the disturbing elements of war conditions, place at a disadvantage and disfranchise all these people who were friends and allies in the struggle. That is something I cannot very well understand. I notice, Sir, that in subclause (B), of subclause 4 of section eight of the Naturalization Act that we passed last year that when we were to inflict punishment upon a certain class of people we confined that arrangement to our enemies during the war. The subclause referred to states:

> No certificate of naturalization shall, before the expiration of a period of ten years after the termination of the present war, be granted in Canada to any subject of a country which at the time of the passing of this Act was at war with His Majesty, but this provision shall not apply to a person who—

and so forth. The idea of subclause (B) is to inflict that punishment and that disability upon subjects of a country who opposed us in the war. What I cannot understand is this: If an Italian came to this country to-day he would not require to be here ten years before he got naturalization; he got it in the ordinary way and perhaps he was never in the country before. But there may be an Italian woman who has been in Canada for perhaps twenty years. Our law ordinarily confers the franchise upon women; but that Italian woman will not be permitted to vote unless she goes perhaps a distance of sixty or seventy miles, states her case to a judge, and from that judge obtains a certificate. I submit, Sir, that the Acting Solicitor General should particularly consider that phase of the case. I am unable to understand why this disability has been placed upon friendly—foreigners, if you like; but those are

not friendly or unfriendly foreigners, they are British subjects. Nothing has been alleged to their detriment, no charges have been made against them, and why should they be disfranchised and why should these impediments be placed in their way? I really cannot see the purpose of it. On the 24th May, 1918, we were just as wise as we are now. We had no greater reason on that date to be influenced by war difficulties than we are to-day—in fact, we were closer then to war conditions, and those conditions were more closely affecting us than they are at the present time. Nevertheless by an Act passed at that time, Chapter 20 of the Statutes of 1918, we said:

1. (1) Every female person shall be entitled to vote at a Dominion election who,—
(a) is a British subject;
(b) is of the full age of twenty-one years and upwards—

and so on. I could very well stop there, Mr. Chairman, and say that on the 24th day of May, 1918, we solemnly reached the conclusion that any woman in this country who was a British subject was entitled to vote. We had gone so far in that Act as not only to make them British subjects—those who were British subjects before—but to confer the franchise upon them. The hon. member for West Vancouver said a few minutes ago that we were not taking anything from these women which they now possess, and the House seemed to concur in the statement. But that cannot be the case, because by the Act from which I have quoted we conferred the right of voting on these very women from whom we are now taking it. Therefore we are depriving them of something which they now possess, a thing which we should not do. Now the Act from which I have quoted goes on to state as to the qualifications which a woman should possess to be entitled to vote:

(c) possesses the qualifications which would entitle a male person to vote at a Dominion election in the province in which said female person seeks to vote: Provided that a married woman or an unmarried daughter living with her father or mother shall be deemed to have any necessary qualification as to property or income if the husband or either of the parents is so qualified.

We propose to repeal that Act by the Bill now before the House, and I think it is a serious matter for a deliberative body such as ours to coolly and deliberately say that we were wrong in 1918 when we conferred this right upon these women, and that we are now going to take it away from them. There certainly ought to be some grave reason before we do anything of that kind. If women should come to this country—French women, Italian women, Syrian women, Polish women—if any of these foreigners should come here, settle down, help to develop the country, and live happily and faithfully with their husbands bringing up their families, what reason is there for depriving these people of the right we conferred upon them a little over a year ago. I cannot see the reason of the justice of it, and I would be sorry that we should do anything so harsh and drastic in this Parliament unless we were moved to do so by the very best of reasons.

The hon. member for Dorchester this afternoon presented the legal nature of this question in a manner so perfectly clear that there seems to be no necessity of dealing further with that phase of it. Section eleven of chapter 28 of the statutes of 1919 states:

The wife of a British subject shall be deemed to be a British subject, and the wife of an alien shall be deemed to be an alien.

There is a contradiction here. We say in one breath that this woman is a British subject, but in section 29 of the Bill that is now before us we say that it was impossible for her ever to be so. I ask the committee to consider the language of subsection 2 of section 29 of the Bill that is now before the committee:

For the purposes of this Act, the allegiance or nationality of a person, as it was at the birth of such person, shall be deemed incapable of being changed—

We say there that it was absolutely impossible for the woman, or the children who are affected by this legislation to be what we say they are under the provisions of the Act we passed last year. As I said before, I submit that only very grave reasons indeed should cause us to put ourselves in such a position. I can understand this Parliament passing drastic legislation during the war, but now that we have signed Treaties of Peace with our leading enemies, why should we attempt to perpetuate the war spirit for the rest of our lives and inflict these disabilities on people who were friendly to us during the war? The hon. minister says that we can get over these difficulties by obtaining the certificate mentioned in this subsection. As a rule when a judge is called upon to grant a certificate, certain things are laid down which must be proved before the certificate can be granted. I must confess that were I acting as a judge I would be entirely at a loss to know what kind of

evidence it was necessary to present to me to qualify an applicant for a certificate. If the minister is determined to force this thing through, I would suggest that he add a clause stating specifically what a lawyer appearing for an applicant for one of these certificates would have to prove, so that he would know how to proceed before a judge. As the clause stands, everything is left absolutely to the discretion of the judge, and no lawyer can tell upon what grounds a judge will exercise that discretion. I submit further to the hon. minister, that in a district of probably 100 miles in length and 50 miles in width with only a single judge there will be no accommodation to meet the requirements of the thousands of men and women who will have to apply for these certificates. When our men had to make application for exemption from military service we had a military tribunal at every turn of the road.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I understand other business will be taken to-night. I therefore move that the committee rise and report progress and beg leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

SUPPLY.

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

Ocean and river service—to continue subsidies for wrecking plants—Quebec and British Columbia, $35,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it was understood the other evening that we might refer to some of the items that had already been carried. There is just one matter that I wish to speak to the minister about, and while it does not pertain wholly to his department, I think he will be interested in it. I refer to the car ferry between Cape Tormentine and Port Borden, Prince Edward Island. I understand that some dredging work was carried on at the car ferry terminals a little while ago and then it was discontinued. I am informed that a possible consequence of the discontinuance of the dredging may be that the car ferry will, one of these days, suffer an injury that will necessitate rather costly repairs. As the minister has to do with the repairing of these vessels, I should be glad if he would take the matter under review, and also have it taken up with the Department of Railways and Canals which, I think, co-operates with his department in this work. If this is a matter exclusively for the Department of Railways and Canals, I will bring it up when the Railway Estimates are before the committee.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As this is a matter that pertains exclusively to the Department of Railways and Canals, I would ask my hon. friend to bring it up when the Railway Estimates are before the committee. In the meantime, I shall be very glad to speak to my colleague about the matter.

Mr. McISAAC: As we have the privilege of referring to some matters that came up before, I wish to make a few remarks regarding the item of $2,000,000 to provide for the construction of an icebreaking steamer to be used on the river St. Lawrence. When this matter was under consideration before, some remarks were made to the effect that this icebreaker might be so constructed as to be used, on occasion, as an auxiliary to the Prince Edward Island car ferry plying between Port Borden and Cape Tormentine. I am particularly desirous that no improper impression may be made regarding this icebreaker. If I understand this item aright, the appropriation asked for is for the construction of a large icebreaker to ply on the river St. Lawrence to facilitate shipping by keeping the river open in the winter season, and also for the purpose of assisting ships that may be in distress, and things of that sort. Should she be equipped with rails on her deck so as to be able to carry cars across the Strait as is done by the Prince Edward Island car ferry, and so be able to assist that car ferry if necessary, I shall be extremely pleased; but there is nothing in the item to indicate that such is the case. Last winter, I remember well, some ships were in distress in the St. Lawrence and urgent requests were made that the car ferry should leave her route and come to the rescue of those ships. For the car ferry to undertake such service would be a very great inconvenience, as it would completely tie up traffic between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. If I am not properly informed and do not properly apprehend the meaning and intention of this appropriation, I shall be pleased if the minister will put me right.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The icebreaker will be used primarily for the breaking of ice in the St. Lawrence at the end of the season and towards the opening of navigation.

It will also keep the ice bridge open at Cap Rouge. It will be so powerful that it will be able to go to the assistance of ocean vessels leaving Montreal or Quebec late in the season. Last year, as the hon. member says, two of the Government steamers got stuck in the ice, and if we had had an icebreaker, there would have been no difficulty whatever in at once rescuing both these steamers from the ice pack in which they found themselves.

The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) the other evening asked if I would look into the question of having the icebreaker so constructed that it would also serve as a car ferry. I do not know whether that is possible or not, but as I promised my hon. friend, the other evening, I shall take technical advice on the point when tenders are being called for. I cannot make any more definite statement at the moment. I know that all hon. members realize the importance to navigation on the St. Lawrence and on our east coast of having an icebreaker of this great strength. We only have two icebreakers at the present time, the Montcalm and the Lady Grey, neither of which is strong enough to cope with thick ice at certain seasons of the year. During the war an icebreaker similar to the one we are going to have constructed was sold to the Russian Government. The Earl Grey and the Minto were also sold, leaving us with only the Montcalm and the Lady Grey.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Inasmuch as I made the suggestion the other evening to which the minister has been kind enough to refer, I should like to say just a further word in regard to it. As the minister is aware, there is at the present time simply one car ferry between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Since that car ferry has come into use the people of the Island have become dependent on it to a degree that is almost exclusive. The result is that if anything should happen to the ferry at any moment, the Island will be shut off and there will not be available the variety of smaller craft that there would have been before people had come to rely so much on this car ferry. It is generally felt on the Island that there ought to be two car ferries, because if anything happens to the present one the people will be left without the accommodation to which they have become accustomed, and at certain seasons of the year that might prove very embarrassing indeed. It was for that reason I asked the minister to consider, at the time this great icebreaker is being constructed, whether it would not be possible to have it so designed that in off seasons and in times of emergency it might be used to accomodate the people of the Island, just as a second car ferry would accommodate them if it existed. I would not have made the suggestion if it had not been that one or two marine experts have themselves expressed their opinion to me that this large icebreaker could be constructed in that way. It is perfectly true that its main purpose will be to break ice in the St. Lawrence, but I would point out to the minister that it will only be doing icebreaking work during the winter season. In the summer it will be lying idle, and it could then very well be used, I should think, as a car ferry while the present car ferry is laid up for a month or a couple of weeks for repairs, as it always is during the summer months. If this icebreaker were constructed in the way I have suggested it would not only serve that purpose but would also be available in time of emergency. What is wanted by the people of the Island, and those who are being served by the people of the Island is a two-car-ferry service, and just as soon as the Government feel justified in making this provision I think that such a service should be commenced. But in these days of much needed economy, if anything can be done, in the interval to fill in, if we can find a way to "kill two birds with one stone," I believe it will be very much in the interests of all concerned.

Mr. DUFF: The ice in the St. Lawrence attains such a thickness that I am very doubtful if any icebreaker can be constructed that will be able to break the ice during the entire winter season. There is no question, however, that an icebreaker would be of very great service in the St. Lawrence during part of the season, and perhaps that is sufficient reason for the minister going ahead and getting built the most powerful icebreaker that can be constructed.

My object in rising, however, was not to discuss icebreaking on the St. Lawrence so much as the ice conditions on the Atlantic coast during the winter months. We endeavour to do a good deal of business from Sydney to Yarmouth and right up to the Bay of Fundy all the year round, but we are sometimes handicapped during the months of December, January and February by the ice conditions encountered on that coast. During the past two or three years

we have endeavoured to get the Department of Marine or the Department of Naval Affairs to help us out when ice conditions were such that we could not get along without help, and the department have always been willing to give us any assistance they could. But I have one complaint to make, and it is this: During the present season practically the only ice steamer which the department owns was tied up at the dock at Dartmouth from November till April. I refer to the Stanley, and I say it was bad business on the part of somebody to so arrange for the repairs to that steamer that she was tied up at the dock during all that time. If the Montcalm or some other icebreaker had been available the department would have been quite justified in having the Stanley laid up for repairs. It is well known that the Nova Scotia and Atlantic coast is very dangerous in the winter season. Nearly every week some vessel will be sending in S.O.S. calls for assistance from Sable island or the Atlantic ocean. Whenever a call came last winter there was no steamer of the department to send out to vessels in distress. On one occasion this year when the steamer Powattan owned by the United States, was crossing the Atlantic with troops, she lost her propeller and for ten days was at the mercy of the waves. It was only by an act of Providence that the steamer did not founder, perhaps with all hands on board. The Government at last did send the Lady Laurier to her assistance, and this vessel under the captaincy of Captain Travis, did good work, in company with United States tug boats, in helping to get the vessel to port. But my complaint is that the Stanley should have been available during the winter months to go to the assistance of steamers in distress. The only steamer which the department could send to the assistance of vessels off the Nova Scotia coast was a little steamer called the Petrel, which is one of the fishery protective service boats. I may say that the captain and crew of that steamer did everything possible for the people at Shelburne, Lockport, Liverpool and Lunenburg, but the trouble was the steamer was not large enough to do the work that was required of her. If the Stanley or a steamer of that class had been available, and the Stanley should have been available, business men along the coast of Nova Scotia would not have had to suffer the inconvenience they did during those months. I am not finding fault, so much as pointing out to the minister that next year he should provide a steamer for this service so that business men along the coast of Nova Scotia need not be put to the inconvenience they were this winter. I understand the Department of Naval Affairs has a steamer called the Acadia which could have done this work, but she was laid up at Halifax. I would suggest that next year the steamer be stationed at Lunenburg or Liverpool to serve the people along the coast of Nova Scotia.

Mr. COPP: I want to ask a question of the minister with regard to the icebreaking steamer.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not want to interfere with the liberty of the committee, but it must be understood that this discussion which is not relevant to the item before the committee, takes place by unanimous consent. Is it the unanimous consent of the committee that the items already agreed to be again discussed?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. COPP: I understood we were discussing this item by agreement.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out that no agreement can bind the committee. Any agreement must be confirmed by the unanimous consent of the committee.

Mr. COPP: I understood the minister to say that this icebreaking steamer was to replace one built two years ago and sold to the Russian Government. I should like to know when that steamer was sold, what she cost, and what was received by the Government for her.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The icebreaker in question was the J. D. Hazen, which cost, in round figures, $1,000,000. She was sold for the same sum to the Russian Government, and I understand that payment was made promptly.

Mr. COPP: The minister says he understands that she has been paid for?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. COPP: I suppose he knows it to be so.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: Is this the steamer which Vickers built?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: I am informed that Vicker's Limited sold this steamer for over a million

and a half dollars; that is to say, they made a profit, over and above the cost price, of $600,000. Is that correct?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I was not a member of the late Government, and I have no knowledge of the transaction. All I know is that this steamer cost $1,000,000, and was sold for that sum to the Russian Government. The Canadian Government has been paid, and I had no knowledge of any profit which any outsider may have made out of the ship.

Mr. DUFF: Does the minister mean to say that the contract which the Dominion Government had with Vickers was for a million dollars, or that that was the sum which the Russian Government paid Vickers for this steamer?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Vickers did not sell the steamer. This icebreaker was sold through the British Government to the Russian Government. If it passed into any other hands afterwards I have no knowledge of the fact.

Mr. DUFF: It seems strange to me that if the Canadian Government made a contract with Vickers to build a ship Vickers should have sold the ship to the Russian Government or any other government. My information is that the Dominion Government, instead of carrying out the transaction themselves when inquiry was made with reference to the ship by the Russian Government, left the matter in the hands of Vickers, who made a profit of $600,000 more than the contract with the Canadian Government amounted to. Now, is that information correct or not? It seems to me that it is bad business on the part of the previous Minister of Marine. I wish my hon. friend (Mr. Ballantyne) to understand that I am not casting any reflections on him, because I know that he is too good a business man to stand for such a transaction. I am informed that through gross negligence on the part of the former minister the Canadian people lost $600,000 in this one transaction, the British or the Russian Government, whichever it was, having paid that sum to Vickers more than the amount of the contract which they had with the Government.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I can only say again that I have no knowledge of this alleged transaction. I am very well acquainted with my predecessor in office, and I am sure that the transaction was proper so far as he was concerned. The icebreaker was sold at cost price to Russia, through the British Government, and we were paid for it. The statement of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) is news to me, and I am not in a position to say anything further than I have already said on the matter.

Mr. DUFF: The matter might have been done by Order in Council. I do not blame the former minister personally. It is likely that an Order in Council was passed, and therefore the whole Government would be responsible.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) who was a member of the late Government, tells me that the icebreaker was not sold through Vickers but direct to the Russian Government through the British Government.

Mr. DUFF: I understand that the Government had a contract with Vickers to build the icebreaker, and that about the time she was completed the Russian Government made inquiries for such a steamer, and instead of the Canadian Government doing the business themselves and selling the icebreaker direct to the Russian Government they allowed Vickers to sell it, with the result that Vickers obtained from the Russian Government some $600,000 more than the contract price which the Canadian Government had agreed upon with them. I desire to know whether that information is correct, because if it is not I certainly should like to get some explanation of the matter. I do not want to accuse the previous Government of having done something which they did not do, but I have stated the information which has reached me from a reliable source, and I think the minister should clear the matter up.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is rather difficult for me to understand how the hon. gentleman could get such information, because this icebreaker was sold to the Russian Government in the way I have stated. The transfer was made from the Canadian Government to the Russian Government, the British Government having merely acted as an intermediary, and I cannot see where Vickers came into the transaction at all.

Mr. DUFF: That is just what I want to know. My information is that they got $600,000 which should have gone into the Canadian treasury. How did that happen?

Mr. McKENZIE: I shall not insist upon the minister giving us any information about this icebreaker, the J. D. Hazen. I

remember that the question was up before an inquiry, in 1916 I think it was, before the Public Accounts Committee some time ago, but I have not sufficiently taxed my memory with what took place to make any precise statement in regard to the matter at the present time. I know however that it was not just the simple proposition which the minister says it was. My purpose in speaking on this question is merely to say this: The minister cannot escape responsibility by saying that the transaction took place before he became a minister. I would be sorry to say that the changes in the Department of Marine were somewhat akin to apostolic succession, but there is in the department a sufficient succession for the minister to be absolutely responsible for what took place in the department before he took charge of it, particularly while his own party was in power. But whether it was his own party or not, under constitutional ministerial responsibility, he must account to this committee for everything that took place in his department. While I do not wish to press the minister for information, I do not want him to get off with the excuse that this took place under some other minister and that consequently he is not responsible.

Mr. COPP: When I asked the minister a few moments ago about the icebreaker that was sold to the Russian Government, I had in mind the following statement which the minister made on April 23, in reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Robb):

> I cannot give any more information than I gave last year. The icebreaker J. D. Hazen, which cost approximately $1,000,000, was sold to the Russian Government. The officers of my department have made every effort during the last few months to get trace of her, but have been unable to do so.

Why were the officers trying to get trace of the J. D. Hazen if she had been bought and paid for by the Russian Government?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the Canadian Government had been able to get trace of the vessel, we thought that we might be able to buy her back at less cost than would be involved in building a new one. My department, therefore, instituted inquiries to that end through the High Commissioner in London, but without success.

Mr. COPP: The answer is quite reasonable, Mr. Chairman. The minister did not make this explanation at the time; consequently I did not understand why his department wanted to get trace of the vessel.

Mr. BOYS: The matter to which my hon. friend (Mr. Duff) refers was the subject of the Public Accounts Committee, and at that time the matter was fully gone into. The late Auditor General, Mr. Fraser, was disposed at one time to criticise the department, but as will be seen by a reference to the testimony which he gave before the committee on that occasion, in the end he absolutely exonerated the department. The whole thing is set out in quite a number of pages of evidence. I refer the hon. gentleman particularly to the evidence of the Auditor General, who, I think, first brought the matter to the attention of the committee.

Mr. DUFF: I am obliged to my hon. friend (Mr. Boys) for his explanation. But I think it would be better if the minister would lay the information and papers on the Table.

Mr. BOYS: It is on record now.

Mr. DUFF: Personally I would be willing to look the matter up, but that would not furnish other hon. members with the information which they may desire. I suggest, therefore, that the minister lay on the Table all the papers connected with this transaction.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I shall be glad indeed to do that.

For the maintenance and improvements of the Sorel shipyard, shops and offices, as well as operating expenses—$65,000.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, I was not here when some of the other items were discussed, and if you will permit me I would like to make a few remarks with regard to one or two of them.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may discuss them under this item. The committee has given its unanimous consent that reference be made to items already agreed to.

Mr. DUFF: The Border City Star, published at Windsor, Ontario, in its issue of April 26 last, contained a statement to the effect that the Marine Department were cooperating with the provincial authorities of Ontario in preventing the carrying of liquor from the Canadian side across the Detroit river to the American side, and that to that end the department had placed a number of swift motor cruisers on the Detroit river. Is that statement correct? And, if so, why is the Federal Government interfering with the shipment of liquor from Canada to the United States? If we have prohibition in Canada, it seems to me that

the more avenues of escape there are for this liquor, the better; instead of preventing its shipment to the United States, we should use every effort to get it out of the country.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sure that the hon. member does not believe everything he reads in the columns of the press,—with all due respect to the press. I assure him at once that the Department of Marine did not place any motor boats at the disposal of the liquor authorities—was that what my hon. friend said?

Mr. DUFF: Provincial authorities.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Or the provincial authorities, either. There is nothing whatever in the report to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. DUFF: I am sure the minister is glad that I brought this report to his attention. I myself did not believe it, but I wanted to give the minister and his department a chance to deny it. With regard to item "Registration of Shipping, $6,000" may I ask the minister, who are the registrars of shipping in Nova Scotia?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not the names at hand, but the registrars are really the collectors of customs. There are eighty ports of registry in Canada, twenty-two of which are in Nova Scotia.

Mr. DUFF: Who is the registrar at Lunenburg?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry that I cannot give his name, but he is the collector of customs. Perhaps the hon. member will recall his name.

Mr. DUFF: Is he the registrar, or the acting registrar?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: He is the acting registrar, I understand.

Mr. DUFF: Last year the gentleman who had acted for a number of years as collector of customs and registrar of shipping resigned on account of ill-health. After I heard that a certain gentleman had been appointed as acting collector of customs and acting registrar of shipping, I took the matter up, first with the Customs Department. After lengthy correspondence I was able to get information as to how the appointment was made. I understood from the legislation recently passed by Parliament that all appointments to the Civil Service had to be made by the Civil Service Commission, and was relying upon that fact, but was surprised to receive the statement from the Department of Customs that the appointing of the Acting Registrar of Shipping was not made by the Civil Service Commission but by a gentleman known as the Commissioner of Customs. I do not yet know who that gentleman is, nor do I care; but I want to say that the Government should not come here and tell us that the appointments are made by the Civil Service Commission, and then go outside and make them through the Commissioner of Customs or anybody else. I have no objection from a personal standpoint to this appointment and it might be quite proper for the Commissioner of Customs or the Minister of Customs to make the appointment—although I think the Commissioner of Customs is the "goat" in this case because the Acting Minister of Customs was the gentleman who actually exercised the power and not the commissioner. I do find fault, however, upon the ground that the Minister of Marine, in my opinion, is just as capable as the Minister of Customs and should have the selection of his own officers. When I found this gentleman had been appointed Acting Registrar of Shipping I first took the matter up with the Customs Department, but could get no satisfaction there. I then applied to the Civil Service Commission, and I have a letter from the chairman of that body in which he definitely states that the Civil Service Commission had nothing whatever to do with this appointment. I then wrote the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), who at that time was Acting Minister of Marine, and he expressed considerable surprise that the appointment had gone through without consultation with him, either as the Acting Minister of Marine or as the godfather of the Civil Service Commission. When the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) himself returned to his office last winter I wrote him a letter and asked him how and why the appointment was made, and received a letter from him to the following effect:

OFFICE OF THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES OF CANADA,

OTTAWA, 31st December, 1919.

DEAR SIR,—In answer to your letter of the 18th instant, I beg to inform you that the practice which has obtained in Canada since Confederation has been that the collector, or other chief officer of Customs, at a port of registry is ex officio the Registrar of Shipping, and the Canadian Order in Council passed on the 26th March, 1874, instituting Lunenburg a port of registry, appointed the collector of Customs at the port Registrar of Shipping.

When Mr. Mack, therefore, was appointed acting collector of Customs at Lunenburg, he ipso facto became acting registrar of shipping. I am not, as you may well understand, familiar with the manner in which Mr. Mack and Mr. Anderson were appointed to the Customs Service.

I gather from your letter that no permanent appointment as collector has yet been made. Following the previous custom and the requirement of the Order in Council creating Lunenburg a port of registry, whoever becomes the permanent officer will be the registrar.

Yours very truly,

C. C. BALLANTYNE.

You will see, Mr. Chairman, that neither the Minister of Marine nor his officials had anything whatever to do with the appointment of this official. Yet if there is one port in Nova Scotia where the office of registrar is an important one it is the port of Lunenburg, not because the business is so large but because there are so many transactions. The business done is on a co-operative basis there being sometimes as many as sixty-four owners in one ship. I do not think any such condition exists in any other port of Canada as exists there, and for that reason there are more transfers of ships or shares in ships by the registrar at Lunenburg than perhaps anywhere else in the world. The appointment of the officer in question was a very important one, and it seems to me that the Minister of Marine should certainly have had something to do with it. For this reason: If the Registrar of shipping does not act in conformity with the law, the Minister of Marine or his officials here will get the blame. Therefore that minister should not for one moment longer allow the Minister of Customs, or any officer belonging to the Customs Department, to make such an appointment. It is time the Order in Council passed in 1874 was repealed, and the Minister of Marine given the power to select his own officials. I repeat that the office of registrar in the town of Lunenburg is an important one, and if the present incumbent is only acting registrar, the Minister of Marine should be very careful before he allows the Minister of Customs to make that appointment permanent.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Possibly the hon. gentleman is aware that the Minister of Marine has not the authority, under the Shipping Act, to appoint registrars of shipping. That power is vested in the Minister of Customs only.

Mr. DUFF: That is what I said.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The passage of an Order in Council would not be sufficient to meet the situation. I would have to bring in legislation repealing clause 11 of the Shipping Act which vests the authority in the Minister of Customs.

Mr. DUFF: The minister did not grasp the purport of what I said. Perhaps I did not make myself sufficiently clear. I did not say the minister could remedy matters by passing an Order in Council. I said that the minister was acting at the present time under an Order in Council which was passed in 1874. I further said that it was high time that that Order in Council was repealed, and that it was a shame that the minister at present did not have the power to appoint his own officials.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I understand that at present the registrar of shipping charges fees, and that the owner of a ship has to pay all the expenses of a survey and of registry. Is this money spent at the head office or is it expended in the several ports?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The money is spent at the head office. Owing to the large increase of Canadian registered tonnage there are far more ships being registered now than has ever been the case in past years. On the 31st December, 1919, there were 8,615 vessels registered at ports in Canada; therefore the hon. gentleman will see how the number of ships under Canadian registry has grown.

Mr. FIELDING: Is any portion of this money applied to augmenting the salary of the collector of customs—is that the way it is done, or does the collector of customs receive an extra salary for these duties?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The various registrars throughout Canada are paid by a scale of fees as follows: For vessels under fifty tons net register, $3—

Mr. FIELDING: That is the fee which a shipowner pays?

Mr. DUFF: While the minister is getting that information will he permit me to say that the owners of the vessel pay all the fees in connection with the registry of vessels when they are built. Is it also a fact that the vessel owners when they transfer the ships or shares pay $1 for getting a bill of sale and fifty cents for a declaration of ownership. This money is paid to the registrar of shipping, and he puts that amount into his own pocket. This is a special amount which he receives and keeps, apart from his salary.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I find that I confused the fees for surveys with the registry

of shipping. There are no fees charged for the registry of a ship.

Mr. DUFF: The owner pays the cost.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Agencies, rents and contingencies—$198,000.

Mr. DUFF: I would like to bring to the attention of the minister a matter concerning the agency at Halifax. Mr. Harvey, who is in charge of that agency, is, so far as I am aware, a capable official. For a great many years the Department of Marine and Naval Affairs has been paying for a telephone in his house, and this telephone was a very great convenience to the business men of Halifax or of any other part of Nova Scotia when there is any trouble along the shore and they wish to communicate with Mr. Harvey. But I notice that that "great family journal," the Halifax Herald—the minister will know what paper I am referring to—publishes a cartoon headed, "Cutting the life-line." I do not know if the minister can see this cartoon which I am holding up for his attention, but it refers to the fact that the Marine Department has ordered Mr. Harvey to discontinue his house telephone or they would hold him responsible for the expense. It is as important to have a telephone in Mr. Harvey's house as in his office for the purpose of looking after the work on the Nova Scotia coast, and I feel sure the Halifax Herald was mistaken when it circulated that report all over the province to the worry of a number of our business men who appreciate the importance of being able to keep in touch with Mr. Harvey in case of emergency. I would like to know if this statement is correct.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member is quite correct when he surmises that the article is unwarranted. The telephone is not going to be taken out of Mr. Harvey's house.

Salaries and allowances to lightkeepers—$650,000.

Mr. LEGER: I would like to call the attention of the minister to the salaries of the lightkeepers. When the items for bonuses were before the House I called to his attention the inadequate salaries paid to these men, and I was told that the bonus regulations did not apply to them. I find from the Auditor General's report that the salaries range from $84 to about $300. These salaries were small enough when the cost of living was normal, when, for instance, a barrel of flour could be purchased for $3 or $4, as against the current price of $14 or $15,—and so with other commodities. On a former occasion I urged the necessity of helping these men, and I hope that the minister will now see his way clear to give their case his favourable consideration, for these men perform splendid service at various isolated places on the coast.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think the hon. member is aware that at the last session $60,000 was voted for additional salaries to the lighthouse keepers, and a like amount was voted in the previous session. I quite agree that these men perform splendid service at isolated points. I find that there are nineteen grades or classes of lighthouse keepers, No. 1 grade being paid $2,900, and this amount will go up to a maximum of $3,240 under the new classification. The remuneration goes all the way from this maximum amount down to as low as $80 a year. The lighthouse keepers who do not give all their time are of course paid these smaller salaries, but a general increase will be made to all lighthouse keepers under the new classification.

Mr. STEIN: Will these lighthouse keepers share in the bonus we voted the other day for the Civil Service? I put that question to the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), and I received a very nice smile from him, but no answer. So I expect the smile was affirmative, and that these men will share in the bonus.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The $60,000 voted at the two previous sessions represented bonuses to these men, but there will be no further bonuses granted from the vote my hon. friend refers to. As I said in answer to the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Leger) a new classification has been made by the Civil Service Commission, and all grades of lighthouse keepers will now receive higher salaries.

Mr. GAUVREAU: If I am well informed, a delegation from the lighthouse keepers came here some time ago, and they left entirely pleased with what they were told, fully expecting that what they asked for would be granted to them. While I am on my feet I would call the attention of the minister to a request for a cable between Green Island and the mainland in the County of Temiscouata. I am sorry to say that, according to a letter I received from the department, no record is kept of the understanding arrived at many years ago between the Hon. Mr. Brodeur and myself. It was understood at that time that connection would be made between Red island in

the St. Lawrence and Green island lighthouse and then with the mainland by means of the Kamouraska Telephone Company. The understanding was that the Government would provide the cable and the company would pay all expenses for laying the cable and the cost of operation. It was found at that time that that was too much for the company. The company now ask me if there is any way of getting 8,000 feet of cable to connect Green island with the mainland. Everybody who knows the river St. Lawrence opposite the river Saguenay realizes the difficulties that exist in that part of the river. It is one of the most dangerous spots on the river St. Lawrence, and if the department can afford the expense of providing a cable to connect Green Island lighthouse with the mainland, a great deal of expense will be saved to the department, and vessels going up or down the St. Lawrence will be afforded greater safety. I was told the other day by the deputy minister—and I think he is right—that it would be hard at the present time to ask for an appropriation for 8,000 feet of cable; but in view of the fact that if 8,000 feet of cable could be provided to connect Green Island lighthouse with the mainland, great aid will be given to navigation on the river St. Lawrence, I hope the minister, who received so well the deputation of lighthouse keepers, will see his way clear to grant that request. It is only for 8,000 feet of cable, and the company will lay the cable and pay all the cost of operation in the years to come. The amount is a small one after all, and the minister would be wise in granting that request, thereby ensuring greater safety to vessels plying on the river St. Lawrence.

Mr. BUREAU: What does the hon. member mean by Green island? Does he mean Ile Verte?

Mr. GAUVREAU: Green island is an island in the centre of the St. Lawrence and Ile Verte is the parish on the north side.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it called Green Island or Ile Verte?

Mr. GAUVREAU: On the map it is called Green island, but we can say either Green island or Ile Verte. I think the minister will understand me, all right. I would not like him to think I came from a "green" part of the country.

Mr. BUREAU: No, the hon. member is all right. I am asking this question merely for the purpose of information because I know that island is designated in our local statutes as Ile Verte. I know that a Geographical Commission was appointed to rebaptize certain localities, but I had occasion to look up some matters in connection with this island, and in the local statues I found it is designated as Ile Verte. That is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not as perfect a knowledge of both languages as my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) has, but I do not see any difference between Ile Verte and Green Island. I will find out whether it should be officially called Green Island or Ile Verte. Personally, I should prefer the French name.

Mr. BUREAU: This is not a question of knowledge, and I do not want the minister to think I am trying to read him a lesson in either French or English. That has never been my custom and I am not going to start now, but I want to know how the name "Green Island" occurred on the map when the property is designated in our statutes as Ile Verte. If the change has been made by the Geographical Commission, well and good; but as this may lead to confusion, I want to find out whether Green island is the same piece of land as is designated in our statutes as Ile Verte.

Mr. GAUVREAU: What about my cable, now?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In reply to the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau), I am informed that no record can be found on the files of the Marine Department that my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, made any such arrangement. I cannot make a definite promise to the hon. member to-night. I have already informed the members of the committee that we must practise economy, but I shall be glad to look into the matter, and if there is any possible way of meeting the views of the hon. member, it will be a pleasure for me to do so.

Mr. McISAAC: I am not sure whether or not I understood the minister aright regarding the increase of $50,000 in the whole appropriation for salaries and allowances to lighthouse keepers, whether it is for the purpose of increasing the salaries or whether it is to be applied by way of bonus. I understand that for the past two or three years certain of the lighthouse keepers—I do not know about them all—have received a bonus. Is this all the increase, or will any of those lighthouse

keepers participate by way of bonus in the proposed appropriation of $12,500,000 for bonuses to civil servants?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They will not participate in the bonus, part of which has already been voted. A moment ago I referred to the fact that at the last session of Parliament, and the previous one, $60,000 had been voted on each occasion. The Civil Service Commission have gone over the salaries of the lighthouse keepers; I have the reclassification here, and if it passes the House, there will be a substantial increase in salaries for all of the lighthouse keepers. If the hon. member wishes me to let him know what the increase will be for any particular class of lighthouse keepers, I shall be very glad to give him the information.

Mr. DUFF: I think every member of the committee will agree with me that if there are any public officials in Canada who deserve to be well paid for their services, they are the men who look after the lighthouses on both coasts and on the St. Lawrence and other rivers. Most of these men have to live on islands away from their friends and relatives; they deserve every consideration on the part of this Government, and I feel sure that the minister had that in mind in increasing the appropriation by the reasonable amount of $50,000.

I rose particularly to refer to the item for maintenance and repairs to Dominion steamers and icebreakers, which item was discussed in my absence. I should like to refer for a moment to the salaries or wages paid to the crews of Government steamers. The men on our Government steamers, many of whom I know very well, are the poorest paid men in Canada. Let me take, for instance, the Government steamer "Lady Laurier," which has done excellent work on the Nova Scotia coast. I find, looking at the Auditor General's report, that Captain Travis, captain of this vessel, received last year only $1,600, or in round figures about $135 a month. That is disgraceful. No captain of a small hundred-ton boat receives a smaller wage than Captain Travis of the "Lady Laurier," and a man with his experience and ability should receive at least $200 a month. I do not know Captain Travis personally, except to meet him perhaps once in two years, but it is a shame that a man of his experience should be receiving only $1,600 a year and $100 of a bonus from the people of this country for his services. On the same page, I find that the first officer of that boat received only $100 per month.

A mate on either a small steamer or a sailing vessel receives $150 a month, and it seems to me that a mate on a Government steamer should receive a larger salary than a mate on a small ship. I would suggest to the minister that he go over the salary schedule of his officers and see if something cannot be done towards compensating adequately these hardworking men. They have to go along the coast of Nova Scotia and out in mid-Atlantic in all kinds of weather. In the summer they encounter fog, and in the winter cold weather and storms, and it seems to me they are certainly deserving of an increase. One thing I cannot understand is why they stay in the Government service for such a small salary. Any time during the last five years it would have been no trouble for Captain Travis to get $200 or $250 a month. The same thing applies to the captain of the icebreaker Montcalm, Captain Hearn, who is one of the most capable navigators in Canada. There is no question that he is a first-class man, yet he only receives $135 a month. Why, any ordinary nigger gets almost that much on board a ship. I might say that on little fishing schooners cooks are receiving $250 a month. Captain Hearn's cook gets only $80 a month. That is a scandalous state of affairs. The same is true of the steamer Stanley. The Stanley is an absolute necessity on the coast. Her captain is very much underpaid. Captain Slawenwhite, the mate, has lived in Halifax for ten or fifteen years. He has no vote in my county, he votes in Halifax, so it cannot be said I am trying to catch a vote or talking for political purposes. He possesses a master's certificate and is paid only $110 or $120 per month. When he was at sea before he got into the King's uniform, and when wages were much lower, he was receiving perhaps $150 in wages alone, and if he left the Government service he would get at least $200 a month. I bring these matters to the attention of the minister because I have received several communications from men on the Government steamers within the last few months asking me to point out to the minister and to the committee when the Estimates were up how inadequate their salaries were. The minister should certainly do something to give these men a decent wage, for they cannot live on the wages they get. Captain Slawenwhite lives in Halifax, and I do not see how he can live there and raise his family on $110 a month. I appeal once more to the minister to see if something cannot be done to pay these men a decent wage.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member has been quoting the salaries. The blue-book does not show the bonuses.

Mr. DUFF: I mentioned bonuses.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Captain Hearn of the Montcalm gets $140 a month and a bonus of $19. The captain of the Stanley gets $135 a month and $17 bonus. When the re-classification goes into effect both of these officers will receive $160 a month. I must say that I do not know what steamship owner pays a cook $250 a month.

Mr. DUFF: Fishing vessels.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am glad to know there is so much money in the fishing business that they can afford to pay a cook $250 a month.

Mr. DUFF: The crew pay half and the owners half.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They must have first-class chefs on those vessels. While I am in sympathy with doing everything that can be done to pay as good salaries as possible to the crews of the Government ships, I would certainly not be prepared to recommend to the committee a salary of $250 a month for cooks. We have very good cooks on our ships, and we get them for very much less than that. We pay the chief cook $70 a month, and the second cook $45 a month. There is a great deal of difference between $70 and $200 a month. Under re-classification all the members of the crews of the Government ships will have an increase in salary, but we cannot hope to compete with the very fanciful salaries paid by fishing vessels.

Mr. DUFF: This $250 is only paid by fishing vessels with a crew perhaps of nineteen men. A vessel with a crew of perhaps six or seven men would pay their cooks $100 a month. If the owners of sailing vessels in Nova Scotia can afford to pay their cooks $100, surely the people of Canada will be willing to pay their cooks an equal amount, if not a little more.

The minister has referred to the re-classification of the Civil Service. I would not advise him to pay his officers according to the re-classification schedules. If I were minister, I would kick up my heels if anybody asked me to go by that classification. It provides for able seamen, for instance, a salary of only $60 a month. The minister must know that it is impossible in this enlightened age to get able seamen for that amount. While the Arthur Young Company might be able to get them, nobody on the Atlantic or Pacific coast could hire his sailors for $60, and if the minister had to hold his ships in port until he got them at that price they would be tied up much longer than they are at present. Under the re-classification, a first-class master is to get $160 a month, a second-class master $140, third-class $120, and fourth-class $105. A first-class mate is supposed to get $100, and a second-class mate $80 a month. The minister ought not to be willing to pay the rates set out in this classification, or to continue to pay the wages he is now paying to the men on these steamers. These men should be paid for doing Government work just as much as they would be paid by any private corporation.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I notice an increase of $50,000 in the item for salaries for lighthouse keepers. I should like to know if this increase applies generally to lighthouse keepers and whether they will all participate in the increase. I understand there is to be a classification. Will every class of lighthouse keeper participate in some degree in the increase?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The increase of $50,000 applies only to certain classes, only to the more important lighthouses, not lighthouses in minor waters. It applies to lighthouses that are running all the year round.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I understand that the keepers in the smaller lighthouses were poorly paid, and I hardly think that it was a proper adjustment to spend the money altogether on the larger lighthouses while the smaller ones do not participate.

Mr. LALOR: Does this increase apply only to Nova Scotia? Are we on lake Erie and lake Ontario to expect an increase for lighthouse keepers as well?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The classification of the Civil Service applies to all lighthouse keepers throughout Canada. In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) I may say that the minor lighthouse keepers give only a portion of their time to looking after lights. I admit that their remuneration is small, but their duties are not very onerous. However, they also will come in for an increase under the re-classification.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I suppose it is true that the lighthouse keepers on the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes, which are frozen up part of the year, have considerable spare time during which they can add

to their income. But that is not true as regards the Maritime Provinces and the coasts where the lighthouse keepers work all winter, night and day. They have always to be on hand to light the lamps, and some of these men are poorly paid indeed. In the increase of $50,000 I trust they will participate.

Mr. EDWARDS: I desire to add a word or two on behalf of the small lighthouse keepers. It may be true that those on the inland waters where the lakes and rivers are frozen part of the year have that portion of the winter months to themselves to do something else, but I should like to know what there is for them to do during that time. There is very little opportunity for them to make any money during the winter months, and practically speaking they have to depend entirely on the salaries they get for that work. I can see no reason why men occupying these important and responsible positions should be treated any differently, so far as bonuses are concerned, from any other men in the Civil Service. Where men who occupy clerical positions in the departments in Ottawa and perform their duties faithfully and well, receive salaries on which it is considered they cannot live, we unanimously agree that it is right that they should share in the bonus. Why, therefore, should the bonus not be given to those men who are tied down to such responsible duties as these men have to perform? In a city like Ottawa civil servants are in a position to combine their forces and press their demands in a way in which those who occupy isolated government positions cannot; but that does not strengthen the claim of the urban civil servants, nor does it weaken the claim of those who are not fortunate enough to be able to join forces and urge their case upon the Government. It is merely a question of fair play and just treatment, and I want to place myself on record as being of the opinion that if the bonus can be justifiably paid to civil servants in Ottawa and elsewhere it can just as reasonably and justifiably be extended so as to supplement the very small salaries which these lightkeepers have hitherto received.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I am not quite clear as to the division line between the large and the small lighthouses. Perhaps the minister can tell us what class of lighthouse keepers will get the increase.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There are nineteen classes in all. The bonuses voted for the past two sessions of $60,000 each were distributed among all lighthouse keepers, except certain men who can hardly come within that definition, such as men who hang up lights at the end of wharfs. They of course would not share in this additional $50,000, but all the lighthouse keepers in the Maritime Provinces and on the Great Lakes will. Those men who hang up lights would not participate in the increase.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: As a matter of fact they are not lighthouse keepers.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, but we have no other name for them.

Mr. McKENZIE: I desire to say something about St. Paul's island which is an important station on the Atlantic coast. It happens to be part of my riding and I would ask the minister how many lightkeepers and other employees of that kind there are on that island, and whether they are all in permanent appointments. I should like to know also what their present salaries are and what are their prospects under the new classification.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The question which the hon. gentleman asks is a poser. For the time being, I regret to say, I cannot answer it. I shall look up the information, and in the meantime, in order that we may make some progress, I would ask, with the consent of the hon. member, that we proceed to the next item.

Maintenance and repairs to lighthouses—$750,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Some two years ago I made application to the Department of Marine for the erection of a light at Grand Etang, Inverness. I have endeavoured to keep in touch with the matter up to now but I have not received very much information or encouragement. May I ask what has been done in connection with the matter?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am afraid I have to tell the same old story. Owing to the expenses of the war, the large public debt, and the necessity for rigid economy, the matter will have to stand in abeyance as a great many other important items have had to stand. But as soon as I can get a sufficient vote I shall be glad to see that it is attended to.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I am just as anxious as the minister that we should practise all the economy possible, but I am afraid that things have come to such a pass in the department that their economies are rather destructive than constructive. The port is

a new one; a lot of shipping goes on there, and there is one light. What we want is a range light which will enable our vessels to come at night, because the coast in that vicinity is very rough. If any of our fishing vessels were wrecked on the coast, it would be remembered that the minister and those associated with him had destroyed the only means of safety we have, that is, our life-saving station at Cheticamp, in this fever for economy in small matters, while most extravagant in large matters. I for one cannot see where the economy comes in when the lives and property of the fishermen are at stake. It is economy to preserve the lives and property of the fishermen and to encourage them in their industry. But that has not been done. I propose to discuss on a later occasion some of the things that have been done during the last three years along the coast of Inverness which have been against the interests of the fishermen; are without any regard for their lives and property. But, so far as this small item is concerned, I wish to put myself on record as not accepting the argument of the minister based on the ground of economy. I cannot accept it, because it is not reasonable and without a thought for our great industry.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In pre-war times the Department of Marine had an item in the Estimates each year for new construction and maintenance of lighthouses, sometimes as high as $1,000,000. I do not think that I shall be divulging a State secret when I say that I had a very much larger amount than $400,000 provided for this year, but I was not able to persuade my colleagues to see the matter in the same light that I did, and I was asked to keep the amount down to $400,000. While I regret that, I am in hearty accord with the other members of the Government in accepting the principle that our ordinary expenditures must be in keeping with our ordinary revenue. While I would like to do more, we really have not the money, and we must cut the coat according to the cloth.

Mr. DUFF: I wish to emphasize what my hon. friend (Mr. Chisholm) has said; aids to navigation, whether on the St. Lawrence or in the Maritime Provinces or on the Pacific coast, should not be neglected. The minister's argument with regard to economy while it is not without some force, is not a sufficient reason why, if a lighthouse or range light is necessary at Grand Etang, it should not be put there. The minister said that he had proposed a much larger amount than $400,000 for lights and aids to navigation in his original Estimates, but that Council did not accede to his request. Well, it is quite evident that the Minister of Marine has not as much pull with his colleagues as the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) has, because, if my memory is correct, the Minister of the Interior succeeded in getting his colleagues to agree to the appropriation of $100,000 more for parks in the West this year than was voted last year. It seems to me that there is more necessity for expenditure on lighthouses than there is for expenditure on parks in the West. It would be better if the Minister of the Interior would turn this $100,000 over to his colleague the Minister of Marine so that the life and property of people on both coasts of this country may be properly protected.

Mr. McCOIG: There is a great deal in what the hon. member (Mr. Duff) has just said. Complaints of this kind are being made by marine men not only in Nova Scotia, but also in Ontario. Considerable complaint has come from captains who are navigating on lake Erie with regard to the conditions at Erieau. Representations have been made to the department with regard to the danger to life and to vessels which are worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, but the reply has been that no accidents have taken place there, and that consequently there is no necessity for further action. While those who are thoroughly conversant with that section of the country and who know the difficulties that they have to contend with in making port with such valuable cargoes as go into Erieau state that further aids to navigation are necessary, hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent in other departments upon works or enterprises which are not necessary. On stormy nights when heavy seas are rolling it would be a great comfort to those who are responsible for the navigation of vessels to know that they may enter harbour in safety. I hope that the minister will afford to the captains who are sailing on lake Erie, particularly those who go in and out of Erieau harbour, those facilities which can be provided at a cost of only a few hundred dollars and which would ensure the safety of many lives and the protection of much valuable property.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I see by the Auditor General's report that this item also includes buoy service. We have a large number of very valuable buoys on the coasts of the Maritime Provinces on which the coun-

try has spent a great deal of money. Many of these are taken up and stored during the winter season and put out again in the following season. Last year we had numerous complaints from captains that most of the summer had passed before these buoys were put out. I hope that the same thing will not happen this year. I do not know why it happened; we have the equipment for the putting out of these buoys. There must be some lack of efficiency when they are not set out early in the spring so that vessels may have the advantage of them during the season when they are most needed.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is a great deal in what the hon. member says, but the department is very short of ships. The Earl Grey and the Minto, when we had them in that service, assisted in placing the buoys, as did the Aranmore, which, unfortunately, was wrecked last fall. The shortage of ships causes the delay, but we shall do the very best we can.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What ships have you in this service?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Stanley and the Lady Laurier. We hope that we may get the Aranmore off the place on which she is stranded so that she too may be available.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Will the minister say if any of the buoys have been put out this season yet?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Certainly a very large number but I am not prepared to state what the exact number is.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The inquiry of my hon. friend has reference to larger buoys. I want to get some information respecting the smaller buoys that are taken up in the fall of the year when the ice makes along the coast. I would like to know if there is any scheme in operation as a result of which these buoys are placed by somebody. There are a great many points in my own county where the buoys were not placed until I looked after the matter myself. Now somebody ought to be in charge of this duty, but there appears to be nobody who is held responsible for placing the buoys. Will the minister tell me who is really responsible for placing these smaller buoys leading to the ports?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Will my hon. friend state what particular port he has reference to?

Mr. CHISHOLM: I would say Margaree, for instance.

[Mr. J. H. Sinclair.]

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That particular port was under the Halifax agency until this year, but there has been a redistribution of the territory covered by the agencies, and it is now under the Charlottetown agency. I will write to the agent there and find out the cause of the delay that the hon. member refers to.

Mr. CHISHOLM: There is an officer down there who is responsible for the placing of these buoys. Why does not the department give him instruction to look after them in the fall and put them in place in the spring, all along this coast? Then there would be no trouble about the matter. There is a contractor, I understand, who is paid so much to do the work, but he does not take the responsibility, he receives no instructions until he reports to the department, or somebody does, that the buoys have not been placed. Then some official of the department will send instructions to him, but such a procedure involves delay, and may result in very disastrous consequences.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The agent at Charlottetown has certainly been very remiss in his duties if what the hon. gentleman states is a fact.

Mr. CHISHOLM: It is true.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have no right to doubt what the hon. member states. The responsibility rests upon the agent at Charlottetown to see that all these buoys are placed, and if the work has not been done I must hold him responsible for the delay. I will see that a letter is promptly sent to him, and I will communicate a copy of the reply to my hon. friend, when I receive it.

Mr. McKENZIE: What has been done to repair the present South Bar lighthouse in the harbour of Sydney, which is a very important light? I understand the foundations were damaged a short time ago, and it is imperative they should be repaired and the lighthouse opened as speedily as possible.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Doubtless the hon. gentleman is aware that the department has a lighthouse board that studies all these questions pertaining to the future need of new lighthouses. I will bring the matter to the attention of the board at their next meeting.

Mr. McKENZIE: There has been a lighthouse on the South Bar for seventy, or perhaps one hundred years. A new light-

house was built a few years ago but the department thought it advisable to erect it further out at the point of the Bar than where the old lighthouse was. However, the foundations gave way, I suppose owing to the action of the sea, and the lightkeeper had to leave the new structure and make use of the old lighthouse. That must be very embarrassing to shipowners, or seamen, entering the port, and it is very desirable that the new lighthouse should be repaired and put in shape as speedily as possible.

Mr. DUFF: I would ask how many lighthouses there are on the Newfoundland coast the up-keep of which is paid by the Dominion Government as well as the salaries of the keepers.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Seven is the number.

Mr. DUFF: I understand the Dominion Government pays the cost of upkeep and the salaries of the keepers?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, we do.

Mr. DUFF: I would call the minister's attention to a very important matter in connection with the condition of the lighthouses existing on that coast. The Cape Race lighthouse is perhaps one of the best, if not the best, on the North American continent. That lighthouse is of the utmost importance to navigators in both coming and going across the Atlantic. As the minister is well aware, for the last number of years—in fact ever since vessels have sailed the waters—there have been a great many wrecks either on the east side or on the west side of Cape Race lighthouse. Many steamers have been wrecked, and in some cases numerous lives have been lost. In conversation with a number of captains of steamers they made a suggestion to me which they asked me to bring to the attention of Parliament and the minister, and this is the suggestion: Just west of Cape Race, at the entrance of Trepessey Bay is Mistake point, and a little farther west is Cape Pine or St. Shotts. If a powerful gas buoy with a groaner were placed about five or ten miles from the shore, half-way between those two capes, the steamers passing this area would either see the light or the gas buoy or hear the groaner, and know their position. It would be the means of saving a great many ships and a great many lives. As the minister knows, the shores of Cape Race are very rugged and precipitous and the water is very deep. Vessels cannot tell, by soundings exactly where they are until they place their jibboom, or bow sometimes, up against the rocks. In bad or foggy weather when they are passing Cape Race it is difficult to tell their position, and the swift current there often takes them right onto the coast. The captains to whom I spoke suggested to me that it would be in the interest of shipping to have a large gas buoy at that point. Of course the providing of such an important aid to navigation at that point may be an international affair, and therefore the Newfoundland government might be asked to co-operate. Certainly the minister would be well justified in providing a sufficient amount of money to establish a gas buoy there as has been suggested. In view of the conditions which prevail there it is surprising that the suggestion was not made much earlier. Had it been carried into effect it would have been the means of saving many lives, and millions of dollars of property would not have been lost.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Canadian Government have never undertaken the responsibility of placing gas buoys along the Newfoundland coast. It is a matter that has engaged the attention of the Newfoundland government and which the Canadian Goverment have taken up with them from time to time. The subject is one to which I will with pleasure direct to the attention of the Newfoundland government. Every hon. gentleman will appreciate the fact that the Canadian Government could not properly maintain or look after a gas buoy so far distant from Canadian territory, and we have never, as I say, undertaken such a responsibility. However, there is a good deal in what the hon. member states, and I will again call the attention of the Newfoundland government to the matter.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I would like to get information in respect of the Lighthouse Board—its personnel, its location, its duties, dates of meeting, and so forth. If I can get this information on another item I shall not press for it now.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The personnel of the board consists of the Deputy Minister of Marine, the chief engineer, a representative from the Shipping Federation, the Commissioner of Lights, and a representative from the Dominion Marine Association. They have no set dates for meeting, but they meet quite frequently whenever business demands it. Their duties relate to lighthouse needs.

Mr. CHISHOLM: When the minister again brings down these Estimates would he get me a report from the board as to what they have done in respect to the application for a range light at Grand Matane? My people want this information, and I want it, and surely it is little enough for us to know what has been done, this matter having been before the board for three years or longer. What has the board done?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will be very glad to give that information.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not quite satisfied with the information given me in regard to the Bar light in Sydney harbour. I would like to know what the board intends to do about repairing that lighthouse, which was erected at a cost of $100,000 and is about to fall down. The matter is of great concern to the people of Sydney and North Sydney.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I cannot make a definite promise, but I think in the very near future a new lighthouse will be built on the site of the one that was swept away.

Mr. McCOIG: When can the captains navigating lake Erie waters expect any better light service than they are receiving at the present time at Erieau? A heavy revenue is derived at this port from the valuable cargoes that are brought in there, and the very best lighthouse system should be provided, especially in view of the local dangers.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have a representative of the Lake Carriers Association on the Lighthouse Board, but at the moment I could not say whether he has made any representations in regard to the lighting system at this port. However, I will look into the matter and let the hon. member know.

Construction of lights and aids to navigations, including regulations of traffic in the Detroit river, and such other places as may be found necessary—$400,000.

Mr. POWER: What is meant by the regulation of traffic in the Detroit river?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is what might be called a dual control of traffic on the Detroit river: The Americans look after their part, and the Department of Marine look after our part.

Mr. POWER: I am informed, it may be incorrectly, that the Department of Marine and Fisheries have certain gasoline boats on the Detroit river acting as revenue cutters to prevent intoxicating liquor entering the United States. I would like to know whether that is true or not.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member could not have been in the House when a similar question was asked by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff). I informed the latter gentleman that there was no foundation for the press report, and I make the same reply to my hon. friend.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What portion of this vote is used in regulating traffic on the Detroit river?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: About $5,000.

Signal service—$65,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister dismissed my question rather summarily in regard to St. Paul's island. I do not expect any information to-night, but when will the minister be able to give me that information?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will be very glad to give the hon. member the fullest detailed information not later than two days from now, and possibly to-morrow.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is the increase of $5,000 for?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Salaries.

Administration of pilotage—$400,000.

Mr. WIGMORE: I do not wish to take up the time of the committee, because I think it has been very well taken up to-night on individual matters, and I find from my experience that it is a great deal easier to get satisfaction by taking up these individual matters with the minister or the deputy minister rather than raising them on the floor of the House. I have always had very great consideration shown to me in connection with every matter that I have taken up with the department, and I have taken up many different matters. I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that a very serious condition exists in the Bay of Fundy and the harbour of St. John, due to the unfortunate sinking of a pilot boat by a steamer coming up the bay. When I first applied to the department they with their usual promptness took the matter up at once and sent for the agent at St. John to discuss it with them. I would like to know if any definite arrangements have been arrived at. I know the department have for the last two or three years been considering the pilotage system in St. John and the Bay of Fundy with a

view to putting it on a permanent basis similar to what they have established at Halifax and other ports. Pilot matters in St. John have been handled during the past number of years by a Board of Pilot Commissioners, some of whom were appointed by the Government, some by the city of St. John, and others by the Board of Trade of St. John. But they feel that the time has now arrived when the Government should take some definite action and take this matter of pilotage over entirely, and either supply the pilots with proper boats and equipment or else make some other suitable arrangements the Government may have in mind. I am bringing this matter to the attention of the minister, because I know the people, the Board of Trade and the shipping interests of St. John, are very anxious to know what decision the Government have reached. If possible, I should like the minister to give me some information along those lines, and if he cannot give me it now, I should like to know when I may expect this information.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am happy to inform the hon. member that all arrangements have been made, and the Marine Department will take over the pilotage service of St. John by the 15th May.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: There is a very large increase, namely, $200,000 in this item. It seems to me that the usual experience when the Government takes over anything is that it becomes more expensive. There is no reason why the ships should not pay for pilotage. During the last few years shipowners have been making money, and it is a mistake that the Government should assume any expenditure in connection with pilotage, because all this pilotage service should be paid by the ships. I do not know what the plans of the minister are or whether there is a contra account for this item or not. There may be one: but if so, it would be well to have an explanation of it, because the item is a very large one, and I should like to lay down the principle that whatever is expended in pilotage on the coasts of this Dominion should be a tax on the shipping of the Dominion and not on the ordinary taxpayer.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member is quite correct. The pilotage dues will cover all the expenditure. This is merely a book-keeping entry, but the pilotage dues in each pilotage district throughout Canada fully cover the expenditure.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does the minister estimate that the additional dues will amount to $200,000?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, and, I think, more.

Mr. COPP: The minister has given a very short statement in reference to taking over the pilotage service at the port of St. John. Is this a special arrangement for St. John harbour, or is it general throughout the Dominion?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member will no doubt recall that at the last session of Parliament legislation was passed vesting the pilotage authority for the port of St. John as well as the other principal pilotage districts in the Governor in Council, and that really makes the Minister of Marine the pilotage authority. The system that the port of St. John will come under now is similar to what has been in force in the pilotage districts of Montreal and Quebec for a long number of years. This does away entirely with the local pilotage board, and a local superintendent of pilots will be appointed at St. John, and he will report to the General Superintendent of Pilots at Ottawa. The pilotage districts that now come under the Minister of Marine are Halifax, Sydney, St. John, Montreal, Quebec, Vancouver and Victoria.

Mr. COPP: If I understand the matter correctly, pilots have in the past been licensed to do business, so to speak, on their own hook. Are these pilots who have been operating in the port of St. John to be kept on by the Government as Government appointees to do the work, or what will become of them?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The department will, of course, retain in the service the pilots who are there now, and what ever pilot boats they have the department will have to take over and pay for. The only difference is that we are transferring the authority of the pilotage district of St. John from a local board to the Minister of Marine at Ottawa.

Mr. CHISHOLM: How does the income from pilotage dues compare with the expenditure of last year, throughout the Dominion?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is the first season that all these pilotage districts apart from the districts of Montreal and Quebec come under the Minister of Marine; but judging by our experience with those two districts, our revenue has been somewhat greater than the expenditure.

Mr. WIGMORE: Is the minister considering the matter of giving compensation to the owner of the pilot boat that was lost in the Bay of Fundy by being run down by a Canadian Government Merchant Marine boat?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Certainly. Unfortunately there was a collision in the Bay of Fundy between a Canadian Government Merchant Marine ship called the "Canadian Voyageur" and a pilot boat, but we shall have to negotiate with the pilots of St. John and see that they do not lose anything on account of the collision.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it accepted that the fault was that of the Government boat?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: An investigation will have to be held; I cannot know who will be held responsible for the collision until such time as the court of inquiry comes to a decision.

Mr. McKENZIE: I thought the minister was committing his department a little too soon. It does not follow that because a smaller vessel collides with a larger one, the larger vessel was at fault. I am sure, if the pilot lost his vessel by reason of any faulty seamanship on the part of the captain of the larger vessel, the man should be recompensed, but the facts will have to be ascertained first and the minister will decide on those facts. I notice the minister states that the pilotage district of the harbour of St. John is to be taken over on the 15th May. Does the same remark apply to the harbour of Sydney?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, the pilotage district of Sydney has not yet been formally taken over, and I cannot say just when it will be.

Mr. McKENZIE: The season which is now under way will be carried on under the old system?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Do I understand the minister to say generally that the receipts from pilotage dues throughout the Dominion balance the expenditures? I find in the Auditor General's Report that $91,076.75 was expended in the administration of pilotage. I was endeavouring to lay down the principle that the expenditure in administering the pilotage should be in some way a tax on the shipping of the country, and I understood the minister to say that he was receiving more than he was spending as regards pilotage. Does that statement cover expenditures throughout the Dominion, or was the minister referring only to the river St. Lawrence and the harbour of St. John?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have not yet had one full season's experience with all the districts that I have mentioned, but as far as I can judge, we should come out on the right side. To take, for instance, the pilotage districts of Vancouver and Victoria from the 1st January to 31st March, the gross earnings amounted to $23,292.86 and the expenses were $20,505.49. I would not care to make too positive a statement, but my judgment is that in 1920 we ought to come out even, or very nearly so, if not a little on the right side.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister is not prepared to give a general statement for the whole Dominion showing the receipts and expenditures of each of the districts?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not the figures here, but I know that the revenue does take care of the expenditure.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the financial year in this connection be the same as the Government financial year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: Whenever we hear of a business merger, we are told that overhead charges and administrative costs are to be cut down. The Minister of Marine is going to merge all the pilotage districts under one head in the Department of Marine. I presume that will result in a saving in the cost of administration. I would suggest to the minister that instead of having commissioners at each port he turn the work of the district over to the marine agents at the different ports—the marine agents at Halifax, Sydney, Vancouver and other places. In that way I think the Government would save a great deal of money.

I am sorry my hon. friend (Mr. Wigmore) has been delaying the Estimates of the minister, especially in view of the lecture which he read hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. He comes before the committee and asks if the owners of the "Canadian Voyageur" are going to pay for the pilot boat that was sunk in the Bay of Fundy, when he could get that information without any trouble by going to the Hunter Block and seeing the minister or his deputy. My hon. friend is not treating the committee or the minister right in bringing up a small matter like that

before the committee. I am surprised if the hon. member (Mr. Wigmore) has so much influence with the Department of Marine, that for a number of days or weeks there has been no pilot boat on the Bay of Fundy. If he has so much influence with the department he should have seen that the pilot boat was replaced within a day or two after the sinking. Apparently, he has not as much influence with the department as he thinks he has. Evidently some official of the department has been pulling his leg.

Mr. WIGMORE: Pilot boats are not picked up every day.

Mr. COPP: Nor sunk every day.

Mr. WIGMORE: As soon as the matter was called to the attention of the department they got busy at once and they have made arrangements along these lines. As to taking up different matters with the department, I think the time of this committee has been taken up with very simple matters that do not concern the ordinary member at all. These matters of detail concerning the different constituencies have take up the greater part of the time of this committee. They could have been dealt with more expeditiously by going to see the minister or his deputy at his office.

Mr. DUFF: If the hon. member is correct, then the statement I made a moment ago is also correct. If it is not necessary for us to get up on the floor of this House and refer to matters affecting our constituents, why did my hon. friend get up on his feet and bring to the attention of the minister the fact that a pilot boat had been sunk in the Bay of Fundy and ask who was going to pay for the damages? I can tell my hon. friend that I am going to ask as many questions as I like, and I shall not allow him to tell me when to sit down.

Mr. COPP: I think my hon. friend (Mr. Wigmore) may be excused for bringing to the attention of the minister the matter he did, because it gave the minister an opportunity of making a statement which, I have no doubt, my hon. friend will be very glad to have go down to the people of St. John who are deeply interested in this matter. However, I am not concerned with whether my hon. friend (Mr. Wigmore) thinks we are wasting time or not. I want to ask a few questions in regard to this pilotage business, as it is somewhat new to me. Are the pilotage arrangements which the minister has made for the port of St. John to be extended to the smaller ports along the Bay of Fundy, or are they confined to that one port?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: St. John only.

Mr. CHISHOLM: My hon. friend (Mr. Duff) made a suggestion to the minister a few moments ago, and I should like to hear the minister's opinion about it. He suggested that the marine agents at the different ports act as pilotage commissioners. While I am on my feet, I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Wigmore) that if he has been successful with the Department of Marine and Fisheries I congratulate him. If he had been to the department as often as I have, and had lost as much time looking after small matters and being disappointed and defeated every time, he would appreciate the great privilege of having some place where you could put your case before the Government. I take it that this committee is just for such a purpose. If I go to the Department of Marine and they turn me down, I am not going to stop there, because I am not built just that way. I am going somewhere else, and I do not know any other place to come to than this committee. If the hon. member (Mr. Wigmore) is going to deny me my right to come here and put these matters before the minister and the Government, I might as well go home. This is the sort of autocratic policy which my friend would like adopted. My hon. friend must realize that while we are in Opposition we are not getting as much courtesy and consideration from the department as apparently my hon. friend is getting. I tell my hon. friend, right here and now, that I have tried that other method for all it is worth. I have used all the power I have to try and persuade the minister in matters that I thought should be conceded, and I have failed, and failed often. My only recourse, then, is to come here. I can tell my hon. friend, however, that I do not expect very much here either. I am not of the right political complexion to suit this Government, but I shall discharge my duty to my constituents by coming here and submitting these matters even though they may appear to my hon. friend (Mr. Wigmore) to be small. I shall submit them to the ministry, and through Hansard I will make my constituents acquainted with the fact that I have brought these matters to the attention of the department and the Government. Would the minister be good enough to give us his opinion as to the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Duff)?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Before doing that I desire to say, as Minister of Marine, and

speaking also for the Government, that it certainly is the privilege of hon. members in this committee to ask as many questions as they like. I have made no objection at all, and I should be very sorry to see the discussion cut too short, because hon. members and the public generally have the right to know how the money voted by this committee is going to be spent, and if increases are being made, the reasons therefore.

With regard to hon. members calling on the department over which I have the honour to preside, I think hon. gentlemen opposite will agree that I show them just as much attention and courtesy, and just as great a desire to meet their wishes and requests, as I do hon. gentlemen on this side. I congratulate the constituency of Inverness in having such an able and persistent representative in this House. I find no fault whatever with his coming to the department as often as he does. I know the particular case he has in mind, but the only reason I could not meet his views in that matter was again, the lack of money. It is, of course, the duty of myself and every one connected with the department to be courteous and to endeavour to meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen so far as we can.

In regard to the question, who shall be in charge of the pilots in the various districts, we are doing away altogether with the local pilotage boards and we shall have a local superintendent in the different pilotage divisions. My only reason for bringing the pilotage authority under the Department of Marine was that there might be an increase in efficiency. I shall not go into details now, but I am thoroughly satisfied that the pilotage work will be much more efficient under the new system than it has been in the past. The expenditure may be somewhat greater under the new system, but if it is there will be a corresponding increase in the efficiency. There is no necessity for local commissioners because we shall have an experienced man who holds a master mariner's certificate as superintendent of pilotage for each district, and he will be under the general superintendent of pilots, Captain Robertson, who is located at headquarters.

Mr. DUFF: These will be new appointees of the Government?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Some of them, yes.

Mr. DENIS: How long has this new system of pilotage under government control been in effect?

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That depends on the pilotage district you have in mind. The districts of Montreal and Quebec have been under the Minister of Marine for the past fifteen years. In fact, the deputy minister informs me that it is longer; they have been under the minister for at least twenty years.

Mr. CANNON: I understand that it is the intention of the department to decrease the number of pilots between the city of Montreal and the city of Quebec.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not aware of such an intention.

Mr. CANNON: I received a communication to-day from a pilot informing me that the number of pilots between Montreal and Quebec was to be decreased from fifty to thirty-five.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is no such intention on the part of the department.

Maintenance and repairs to wharves—$10,000.

Mr. COPP: What wharves does this item refer to?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is a small vote for repairs that may be needed in connection with various wharves. We cannot tell what particular wharf or wharves will need repairs during the coming year, but I see that last year repairs were made in Nova Scotia amounting to $98.37; Prince Edward Island, $107.45; New Brunswick, $3,675.48; Quebec, $1,618.92; Montreal district, $198.82; Ontario, $1,714.04; British Columbia, $50; general account, $224.42; making an actual expenditure for last year of $7,687.50. We are asking for $2,000 less this year than the previous fiscal year, but we think it better to have a vote of $10,000, even though the expenditure last year was only $7,000 odd, in case the expenditures may amount to two or three thousand dollars more.

Mr. COPP: I want to draw the attention of the minister to a certain matter, and I think I may be pardoned for so doing if it may not be altogether within my purview. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Wigmore) has been largely devoting his attention to having the port of St. John properly attended to, and possibly he has not been able to find time to consider matters that are of some importance even though they may not be as important as the port of St. John. We have along the river of St. John—it is not in my constituency, but I come from the province—a large number

of wharves which were constructed many years ago by the Government of New Brunswick. A few years ago, I understand, an arrangement was made between the local and the Dominion Governments by which these local wharves were to be taken over by the Dominion Government, who were to be responsible for their repairs. I have not been up the river for the last year or two, but I have been informed by a number of persons, and have received communications to the same effect, that these wharves are in a bad state of disrepair and that it is impossible for steamers plying up and down the river to tie up at the wharves. If the responsibility is upon the Dominion Government I would ask the minister whether a part of this money is to be used in repairing those wharves.

Mr. WIGMORE: I want to inform my hon. friend that this matter does not come under the Minister of Marine at all. I may further inform the hon. gentleman that I have already taken up the matter with the Department of Public Works, which has charge of these wharves, and while things are not moving as quickly as some of us may desire, I can assure my hon. friend that the Acting Minister of Public Works and his officials are looking after the matter.

Mr. COPP: I am much obliged to my hon. friend for this information, but I should like to have a statement from the minister himself. If my hon. friend has been so successful, and with such quick dispatch has been able to have matters attended to promptly by the Department of Marine, as he said just now, he might transfer the matter of these wharves to that department and perhaps he would receive more expeditious service. Evidently the information he has received from the Department of Public Works is not very reassuring.

Mr. WIGMORE: Oh, yes.

Mr. COPP: The matter is not one of concern to my particular constituency, but it appertains to the province from which I come, and I have had communications concerning it. I therefore thought that I would take this opportunity to call the attention of the minister to the condition of the wharves in question.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think the hon. member is aware that the construction of wharves comes under the Department of Public Works.

Mr. COPP: This is a matter of repairs.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: A certain number of these wharves were transferred to the Marine Department, and the amount I am asking is for maintenance in a small way to keep in a proper state of repair those wharves that are under the jurisdiction of the Marine Department.

Mr. CANNON: Where are these wharves?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I can give the expenditure by provinces, but I cannot tell where each wharf is located.

Mr. CANNON: I ask this question because there a number of wharves which I know are in bad condition. I do not blame the minister at all, and perhaps it might be well to leave the matter until his colleague has his Estimates before the committee. I want to be sure, however, who is responsible for the matter.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: A few wharves may have been transferred to the Department of Marine but generally speaking they are under the Department of Public Works.

Mr. CANNON: When the Estimates of the Department of Public Works comes before the House, will there be a responsible head for that department or will the condition be the same as it is to-day?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There will be a responsible acting head in the person of the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid).

Mr. CHISHOLM: What becomes of the revenues accruing from these wharves?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: A certain percentage goes to the wharfinger, and the balance to the department.

Mr. McKENZIE: For many years I have been bringing to the notice of the minister and his predecessor certain conditions with regard to two wharves in my county which I regard as part of the national railway system. One of them is right beside the railway at Grand Narrows. At that point passengers and freight coming by the railway are transferred to a boat that crosses the lakes over to a main body of Victoria county. It would be impossible for the railway to do business in that section of the county without this wharf; the tracks run out upon it and the goods are transferred from the car to the ferry. I do not think any wharfage fees are collected alongside the railway. But for the landing of freight and passengers at Baddeck on the other side of the lake it was also necessary to build a public wharf. For many

years, while it was under the Public Works Department no fees were charged on the Baddeck wharf. These charges are small, but they are very bothersome, and I do think that as these two wharves are really part of the national railway system and absolutely essential to the operation of the road in that part of the country, no fees should be charged in connection with the handling of passengers and freight upon them. One of the reasons given last year for continuing these charges was that there was a wharfinger at Baddeck and that in order to pay him something would have to be charged. Well, the poor wharfinger is dead, and I do not think it is necessary to appoint any one in his place. The agents there look after the wharf, they are good, capable, honest men and they see that it is properly cared for.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: At present there is no wharfinger at either of these wharves and no dues are being collected. But under the statute we are obliged, I am afraid, to appoint wharfingers as soon as possible and prescribe the required tariff.

To provide for breaking ice in Thunder Bay, Lake Superior and other points deemed advisable for the good of navigation—$40,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: During last winter the weather was very severe and the harbour of Guysborough was frozen over for five or six weeks. Application was made to the department to have the ice broken and the department did all they could, but there was no suitable boat on the coast to do the work. I think it will be quite possible to have a boat so equipped that it could break ice in these harbours in case of emergency and also perform the ordinary service carried on by the department every year. I would like the minister to look into that matter and see if anything can be done. We are badly in need of an icebreaker at certain seasons on the coasts of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Stanley will be available as soon as the necessary repairs have been made, and when the new icebreaker is built it is the intention of my department to place the Montcalm down there. A considerable amount of icebreaking is required to be done on the coast of Nova Scotia every year, and I think the Stanley and the Montcalm will be able to cope with the situation.

Mr. FIELDING: May I, then, repeat a request I made to the minister on a previous occasion as respects the ports on the southern coast of Nova Scotia? The minister helped us last year to the extent of his equipment, but he has not the proper equipment, and until he gets some additional boats he really cannot give us all the assistance we require.

To provide for telephones at different points throughout the Dominion in connection with aids to navigation—$500.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I want to make application to the minister—I made a similar application to the department last year—for a cable to Margaree Island. This is a very important island, where the fishing industry is carried on on a large scale. It is about two miles and a half from the shore. There is a tri-weekly mail service from the mainland to the island, and it is very important that this cable be supplied if that can be done at reasonable cost. I would like the minister to consider the matter, because I think it is very important.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will be very glad to consider it.

Amount required to pay Messrs. Job Bros. for the use of their wharf at Greenly Island—$375.

Mr. DENIS: Is that a private wharf?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, the wharf is owned by Job Bros., and we have to pay them this amount for the use of that wharf.

Mr. COPP: This appears to be a new item. Nothing was paid last year.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It appears that the Government have been using this wharf for the past twenty-five years, and have never paid anything for it. Job Bros. made a claim on the department, and the sum of $375 has been agreed upon as the amount which should be paid. It covers a period of a quarter of a century.

Mr. CHISHOLM: For what purpose is the wharf used?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: For the purpose of unloading coal, lumber and provisions.

Mr. McKENZIE: It appears that this man has the patience of his ancestor. Is he the only Job now living? Where does he reside? The minister steered clear of telling us where he is.

Mr. FIELDING: Job Bros. are a well-known commercial firm in Newfoundland. Are they the parties mentioned here?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They are the only Jobs that we know.

Mr. DUFF: How much money was paid last year in gratuities, or gifts, to the crews of vessels for saving life on the high seas? Sometimes instead of gratuities the gifts consist of gold watches or binoculars.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the hon. member will be good enough to bring the matter up again when we take up the Naval Estimates, under which the vote for life-saving equipment and stations comes, I will be glad to give him the information.

Meteorological Service, including Magnetic Observatory grants of $500 each to Kingston and Montreal Observatories, also allowance of $400 to L. F. Gorman, observer at Ottawa—$245,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: There is a large increase in this item.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I wish to explain the reason of the increase of $34,120. Part of it is for the augmentation of salaries, but the principal amount is for the opening up of a station at Winnipeg in connection with the Winnipeg Grain Exchange so that the weather conditions may be set forth throughout the Prairie Provinces. This will be most valuable information to the grain growers.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Is it contemplated to increase the salaries of the officers along the coast in connection with the meteorological station who have to do with the weather reports?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, it is not intended to increase the salaries generally.

Steamboat inspection—$105,470.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is the object of the increase in this item?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: To increase salaries and appoint a few additional inspectors.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Where are these additional inspectors to be appointed?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is to be an additional man in the province of Ontario, one in British Columbia perhaps, and one at Quebec.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Who is the inspector in Nova Scotia?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Norman Curry.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Where is he located?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Halifax.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is he the only inspector in the province of Nova Scotia?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, there is another inspector named D. J. Murray.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Is he also at Halifax?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does the duty devolve upon these men of inspecting vessels in all parts of Nova Scotia?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Who has been inspecting in the yard of the Nova Scotia Steel Company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have the following inspectors in the province of Nova Scotia: N. A. Curry, D. K. O'Brien, A. McDougall, D. J. Stevens, and D. J. Murray.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Where are they located?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: At Halifax.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Which inspector inspects the ships built by the Nova Scotia Steel Company in Trenton, N. S. ?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It would be one of the five, but which particular one inspects the Nova Scotia Steel Company's plant I am unable to say.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Is one of these officers present all the time while a ship is being built?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, the officer would go there periodically during the construction of the ship. The Nova Scotia Steel Company have a contract for two small ships of twenty-eight hundred deadweight tonnage. On of them has been built and the other is under construction.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does the minister receive reports from these inspectors regularly?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Macdonald, Chairman of the Inspecting Board, receives reports regularly.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Are those reports in the department?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Progress reported.

On motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at eleven p.m.

Friday, May 7, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

SENATE BILL.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 114 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Edward Vinall.—Mr. MacNutt.

COMMITTEE ON SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT—REPORT IN FRENCH.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. SPEAKER: On Wednesday last the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) put a question with reference to the French edition of the report of the Committee on Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. I find upon inquiry that the report is practically complete, and will be bound and ready for distribution on Tuesday next.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S RETURN.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): I would ask my rt. hon. friend if the report is correct which appears in the press to-day that the Prime Minister is actually on his way back to Ottawa.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): The report is correct in so far as that the Prime Minister has started on his way. I do not know that it is correct to say that he will be here on Sunday. I am inclined to think not.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Perhaps the Minister of Railways might tell us.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He knows nothing more about it.

DATE OF THE BUDGET.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Would my right hon. friend inform us when the Budget will be brought down?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It will be brought down, if nothing happens in the meantime, on Wednesday next.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): I regret that at this end of the Chamber we have not heard a word of the pleasant little dialogue that has taken place between the leader of the Opposition and the Acting Prime Minister.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice): They were having a tea party.

Mr. CRERAR: I should be obliged if they would repeat the performance in a little louder tone of voice.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is all the fault of the leader of the Opposition. He spoke in too mild a tone and I answered in kind.

Mr. CRERAR: That does not give us the information we desire, however.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The questions that were asked and the replies that were given were, first, whether the report which appeared in the press that the Prime Minister was on his way back to Ottawa was true, to which the reply was that the Prime Minister was on his way here, but that I doubted whether he would be here on Sunday next—

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): It's a long way to Tipperary.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:—The leader of the Opposition also asked when the Budget would be brought down, and I replied that it would be brought down, if nothing happened to prevent it, on Wednesday next.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Deo volente.

INQUIRY RE QUESTION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice): Some time ago I put a question on the Order Paper as to the terminals, lands and buildings belonging to the Canadian Northern at Port Arthur. On the 5th of May the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) brought down what purports to be an answer to that question, but which is not an answer. I would ask the Minister of Railways if he intends to answer my question.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): I have not seen the question.

Mr. BUREAU: It appears on page 2078 of Hansard.

Hon. J. D. REID: I will look it up and give the hon. member a further answer on Monday, if the question requires any other answer.

Mr. BUREAU: Not "any other answer," but an answer.

MENNONITES LEAVING FOR THE UNITED STATES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. I. E. PEDLOW (South Renfrew): In this morning's Montreal Gazette there is a despatch to the effect that the Mennonites of Manitoba have decided to leave Canada and seek new homes in the United States. There was a despatch in the press a few days ago that about 9,000 Mennonites had decided to leave Saskatchewan for the United States. I should like to ask whether the Government have any information in connection with this matter, and if so, whether they are taking any steps to induce these people to remain in Canada.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): The Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) is not at present in the House, and I would rather my hon. friend deferred his question until he is here. I might add that it would be well for my hon. friend not to put too much trust in despatches.

SUPPLY.

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

Soldiers' Land Settlement—salaries of Board of Commissioners, $17,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Have these Estimates already been taken up on some other day?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were taken up on one day which was not a Thursday or a Friday, so I am informed. I could not have been here myself.

Mr. BUREAU: What day.

Mr. DOHERTY: It was the day we had an amendment to the motion for going into Supply, which amendment was ultimately defeated and we went into Supply late in the evening and took up one of these items so that we could go on with them on another day, and then the House adjourned.

The CHAIRMAN: If members of the committee will look at Hansard of April 26, page 1741, it will be found that the first item in these Estimates was then considered.

Soldiers' Land Settlement, $50,000,000.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): The committee will be entitled before being asked to vote the very large sum called for by these items, to a short statement of the work of the Soldiers' Settlement Board during the past year. The board was constituted in 1917, constituted, however, first of all, only for the purpose of assisting in the settlement of returned soldiers on Dominion lands. Certain work was done, certain entries were made, and assistance was given by the board to settlers on soldier grants or homestead lands. A year ago last December, power was taken and exercised under Order in Council, extending the work of the board to settlement on purchased lands, and enabling the board to give assistance by way of loans for improvements, stock, and equipment; a power it previously did not have. These powers so exercised as early as 1918 were confirmed by legislation of a year ago; and acting upon the Orders in Council and subsequent legislation the board has performed a very large achievement entailing a considerable financial commitment, a short record of which I think I should give.

The Soldiers' Settlement Act contemplated assistance to returned soldiers of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, of the United Kingdom, and of the United Kingdom's Allies in the great war, within certain restrictions set out in the definition. Under that legislation some fifty thousand men have applied to the Soldiers' Settlement Board, men almost wholly of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, and the work of the board has since consisted in the reception and disposition of those applications and of assistance to the men who were deemed to be qualified to receive that assistance under the Act.

At this stage I may say that the soldiers' settlement work divides itself into three distinct branches. There is, first, the agricultural branch; secondly, the lands and loans branch; and thirdly, what is known as the home branch. I might explain that the soldiers' settlement work is conducted, under the Act, as a part of the Department of the Interior, although in practice it has been carried on as a separate institution. That is to say, it is not in practice a distinct part of the department, having been conducted rather as in the nature of a separate department, the chairman of the board reporting direct to me as minister. The Interior Department is of sufficient magnitude to engage the full attention of the deputy minister. The Agricultural Branch has to do with the acceptance of applications from soldiers; with the deliberation as to whether or not the applicants are such as should be granted assistance; with the training of men who are found to require training; with the determination of the extent and character of stock and equipment which the men should

receive; and finally with the supervision of the farming operations of the men after they are placed on the land.

Mr. BUREAU: When the minister uses the word "training," is its application confined to training for farming purposes exclusively, or does it mean training in general?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The training of which I am speaking is given only for the purpose of enabling men to become farmers. Under the Act the qualification boards were first established throughout the various agricultural districts of Canada. There was a qualification board at each district office of the Soldiers' Settlement Board, of which district offices there are altogether eighteen in Canada. These qualification boards received the 50,423 applications that came in up to March 21st last and since that time have accepted a total of 36,830 men. There have also been accepted for training 1,556 men, and the rest have been either not finally disposed of or have been rejected. The work of the boards on the whole, I think, has been carried out with tolerable satisfaction; but as time progressed it was deemed best gradually to do away with the separate institution of qualification boards and to perform the same service through the permanent offices of the department. After the men are passed as fitted to come in under the Act, their selection of land, if they desire land to be purchased, is passed upon by what are known as loan boards, who receive the appraisal of the land at the hands of specially qualified appraisal officers, and upon that appraisal, or after such further inspection as is demanded, they state whether or not, at the price the soldier is prepared to pay for the land, the board should be advised to advance assistance against that land and to what amount. Those loan boards are situate in every district office of the Settlement Board in Canada; that is to say, in eighteen offices altogether. When the loans are passed they have, in the early work of the board, been put through the hands of local solicitors in order that the board's title and security as provided by the Act should be of the character which the aid given requires. We found the operations of the board, from the legal standpoint, to be, as we thought, unnecessarily expensive following that system. No other system was possible in the early stages of the board's work because of the rapid expansion of the organization which the rush of applications demanded. But in later months we have adopted the policy of having a legal branch in each district office of the board, and in the more important offices this policy now obtains. The consequence has been that we have been able to reduce very materially, indeed rather startlingly, the legal costs of the operations under the Act. I can give the committee in detail what has been the result of the adoption of that policy but it may come by question and answer later on.

The board has purchased lands and has also loaned for the purpose of discharging incumbrances on lands already owned; it has purchased stock and equipment and loaned against stock and equipment to the soldier settler and has as well loaned to the soldier settler who locates upon Dominion lands or soldier grants. The operations of the board up to the date I just gave, the 27th March, 1920, entail a financial commitment on the Dominion of $58,741,605. That sum refers to the aggregate amount of the loans approved and passed by the board, and of that total approximately $42,000,000 has been disbursed.

Mr. POWER: Since when?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Since the commencement of the board's operations.

Mr. BELAND: That covers the 36,000 who have been passed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That covers all of the 36,000 who have been passed and whose loans have been approved. The 36,000 men may be said to be either on the land to-day as a result of the operations of the board or on the way to the land. Some applications for loans are still under consideration, some applicants have not yet selected land that suits them, but 15,234 are actually as of that date on the land and settled there under the operations of the board.

Mr. C. MARCIL: Has the minister the figures by provinces?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can give the committee the result of the operation of the Act by provinces. The number of settlers in Alberta is the largest. I am giving now by provinces the number of men making up the aggregate of 15,234, who are at the present day upon the land under the Act:

Alberta	4,603
Saskatchewan	3,117
British Columbia	2,555
Manitoba	2,525
Ontario	1,109
Quebec	362
New Brunswick	410
Nova Scotia	319
Prince Edward Island	234

The amount of the commitments by provinces is as follows:

Alberta	$17,059,331
Saskatchewan	12,257,766
British Columbia	10,728,388
Manitoba	9,789,686
Ontario	4,778,736
Quebec	1,573,081
New Brunswick	1,105,325
Nova Scotia	981,581
Prince Edward Island	585,175

In proportion to population, Prince Edward Island stands very high in the list. The number in training at the present time is 674. Of the total number of 36,000 odd who have been accepted as qualified, I stated before that 15,234 had actually had their loans approved and they are disposed of except for subsequent supervision in so far as the board is concerned. But the further fact exists that 6,511 more have, under the Soldier Settlement Act, settled upon soldier grants. Of these only a portion have received loans. There are many who have not received loans, and placing the number who have received loans—2,564—against the total entrants on Dominion lands or soldier grants, there would remain a balance of some 3,000. The total of settlers under the Act aggregates 19,181 at the present time. Of the 15,234 who received loans, 9,981 settled on purchased land; 2,779 received advances on lands they already owned to remove encumbrances and for improvements or for stock; 2,564 received advances on Dominion lands, soldier grants.

Of the total of $58,859,069, the commitments for loans are divided as follows:

Loans against purchased lands	$32,173,776
To remove encumbrances	1,834,157
For permanent improvements	6,502,435
Advances for stock and equipment	18,348,701

The board, as every one understands, advances for the purpose of the purchase of land up to 90 per cent of the purchase price after of course the valuation is approved of by the board's officers, but providing that no single advance exceeds $4,500 for that purpose. Having regard to stock and equipment, the board advances $7,500. The total advance though per capita to all who have received the benefit of the Act averages $3,700.

Mr. PROULX: What are the terms of repayment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The terms of repayment as respects land and improvement advances are repayment in twenty-five years, with interest at 5 per cent amortised. The terms of repayment of advances for stock and equipment are, I think, six years, with free interest for two years. There is no interest charged on stock and equipment for the first two years. Under the new Act, as amended this year, we will have power to charge interest on stock and equipment for the first two years with respect to those who have settled on improved lands.

Mr. C. MARCIL: Is all this exclusive of the work of the provinces?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. There has been a little settlement under special Act in Ontario and there have been two purchases made by British Columbia, but I do not know whether any permanent settlement has taken place in British Columbia or not. What I speak of is of course solely a Federal work.

Mr. PROULX: Are those who have received aid from the province of Ontario receiving aid from this Government too?

Mr. MEIGHEN: At Kapuskasing?

Mr. PROULX: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, we have nothing to do with that. I stated that the board advance, in respect of land security, up to $4,500, and up to ninety per cent of the appraised value of the land. We have power in certain special cases defined by the Act to advance up to one hundred per cent. We have done that in a limited number of cases. I have before me the exact figures and I think I shall give those figures to the House. The number of cases in which the whole amount has been advanced aggregate 801. I desire here to express the opinion that Parliament was well advised in very strictly limiting the number of cases where the board was empowered to advance up to one hundred per cent.

Mr. NESBITT: May I ask what the exceptions were?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They can only be judged by the proportion of salvage cases that apply to those who got one hundred per cent, who invested nothing themselves, as against the number of salvage cases where they advanced ten per cent.

Mr. NESBITT: I have reference to the exceptions to the one hundred per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The salvage cases so far aggregate 1.71 which is, as all will readily agree, a very small proportion. Of course in those cases it is only as respects some that there is any loss. The board is usually able to turn over the land to another soldier at what may be against the prop-

erty in the hands of the defaulting man. Now, of that 1.71 per cent—that is to say 261 cases in all—forty of those were of the men who did not put up any advance themselves. In other words five per cent who put up no advance have failed, but of those who did put up an advance, the proportion is only 1.71 per cent. I should say in this connection that of the salvage cases, the larger proportion are of those who settled before the Act of a year ago was passed, and before the system of qualification that now prevails was established. That is to say, when any man was ready to go and get a soldier entry, even when he had no other qualification than the fact that he was a returned man, he was entitled to soldier entry. The proportion of salvage cases among that class has been large, and has enhanced the percentage that is now disclosed as applying to the whole body of the returned men.

Mr. NESBITT: What I asked the minister was, where the exception was made to the one hundred per cent?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In practice we have applied it only to those married men who had long and successful previous farming experience in Canada—that was the definition given in the Act. To that we have restricted ourselves; and I think I might even go further than I went before and say that if we were entering upon the policy again it would be in the interest of the returned man, as well as in the interest of the country, to insist in virtually every case upon a stake being had in the property by the returned man himself.

There are some further details in connection with loans that would be of interest. Notwithstanding the fact that twenty-five years at five per cent is allowed the men for repayment, we have already received repayment in full in no less than sixty-four cases.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): May I ask in what provinces these repayments have been made?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In British Columbia six. In Alberta, twenty-five—most of them are in Alberta.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In Saskatchewan, six; and in Manitoba, three. Alberta is distinctly in the lead.

In the determination of the qualification of applicants, eigthy-three per cent of all those who applied were found to be qualified in the year 1919. In the present year up-to-date, that percentage has been reduced to sixty-five per cent, showing that the standard of the applicant is gradually diminishing, which of course was only to be expected. The better men—the men who had set their heart upon agricultural pursuits—were early on the ground and anxious to take advantage of the Act. Consequently it is only reasonable that we might now look forward to a gradual contraction of the rapidity of the financial commitment involved in the Soldier Settlement policy. We grade the men when they apply. The man who has had ten years' experience, and is otherwise qualified, is graded in Class A; the man with five years' experience, and otherwise qualified, in Class B; the man with two years' experience, and otherwise qualified, in Class C; and the man with one year's experience, and otherwise qualified, in Class D. In every case of a married man, the board insists on a signed consent by his wife that she is herself desirous of taking the responsibility that appertains to the farm—of going upon a farm to live. Everything connected with the prospect of that man's success is canvassed, and upon all the facts taken together the board decides upon his qualification.

Mr. BELAND: The fact that a young man has been on a farm since his youth is a sufficient qualification to place him in the first class, I understand?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, provided he is not physically disabled, or has not since acquired such habits as are foreign to the industry, and that a man must not have if he is ever going to succeed upon a farm. For example, if he has become a loafer or a drunkard, then it will not do for him merely to say, "Well, I was brought up on a farm"; he must otherwise be qualified in the elements that make for success.

Mr. BELAND: Is the applicant subjected to an examination?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: In every case?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is not a medical examination in every case.

Mr. BELAND: I mean any examination as to his ability.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, he has to apply personally and answer a series of questions, or a written questionnaire. Then subsequently he must come in person before the qualification board. The plan that he has

in mind for farming purposes is reviewed. He is questioned as to what he intends to do, what stock he intends to get, what character of land he intends to procure, and what he expects that land to produce; in general, that man's practical knowledge of farming is thoroughly reviewed by the qualification board.

Now, in connection with the purchase of stock and equipment, and loans against stock and equipment, some interesting facts may be adduced. Before doing so, let me say that the total before mentioned gives an indication of the prices paid for land in the various provinces.

Up to the date of the calculations in this report 108 purchases had been made in Prince Edward Island involving an expenditure of $267,464. The average size of the farms purchased varied, being in Prince Edward Island 110.04 acres, in Nova Scotia 117 acres; in New Brunswick 145.04 acres; in Quebec 129 acres; in Ontario 136.03 acres; in Manitoba 169.06 acres; in Saskatchewan 185 acres; in Alberta 187 acres; in British Columbia 60 acres. The average price per acre was: Prince Edward Island $22.42; Nova Scotia $21.40; New Brunswick $16.69; Quebec $24.42; Ontario $33.02; Manitoba $22.31; Saskatchewan $18; Alberta $18.13; British Columbia $53.80

Now I will give some details of the stock and equipment purchased and the prices paid. The money invested in implements out of loans advanced by the Government aggregates $4,777,418.77,—that, representing the value. The saving to the settler by reason of the arrangements made by the Board with manufacturers has totalled $403,768.52; in other words, the settler would have had to pay that much more had he bought for cash other than through the board. The total investment in clearing and breaking land, drainage, labour, fertilizing, and crops amounts to $273,487.06. The total investment in equipment bought secondhand and not through the board is $1,319,406. The total investment in live stock is $5,747,108.98.

Up to the 31st of March last the board had supervised the purchase, or had purchased direct and turned over to the settler, 20,718 horses, which were bought at an average price per head of $151.65; it bought 20,390 cows at an average price of $80.53; 15,671 other cattle at an average price of $43.62; 5,381 sheep at an average price of $12.58; 7,634 swine at an average price of $14.97; 92,723 poultry at an average price of $1.05.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How was the saving of $400,000 odd affected on the purchase of implements?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the case of implements, harness, hardware, lumber, building material, fencing, household equipment, feed, fruit trees and plants, and dairy and poultry supplies, the board effected arrangements with the manufacturers whereby on the order of the board, they would deliver to any settler under the Act any of these articles at a certain specific advance on the cost of manufacture, certain defined rates being arrived at, which of course placed the articles in the hands of the settler at a very much reduced price. The percentage allowed varies in respect to the different articles. The settler places his order, he is charged with the amount, and he knows what he is getting, for he himself chooses the article. The board settles with the company at the end of each period, and so knows exactly what the saving is in respect to each class of article.

Mr. PEDLOW: Does the report indicate the advance allowed to the manufacturers in each case?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not the figures before me now. I gave particulars of the arrangement and the percentage charged a year ago. The percentage is very small indeed. I have not those particulars at hand, but I can readily get them.

Mr. PROULX: Were the horses, cattle and poultry purchased through agents or through officers of the department?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Two methods are followed. The board sometimes buys itself and at other times it buys through the best experts it can secure. If an advance in price is anticipated the policy of the board is to secure a supply so that the settlers whom the board has to take care of will not be caught at the advanced price. The board has bought large numbers of horses and cows in that way. But of course no settler has to buy from the board; he comes and makes his choice. The board sells to the settler at the price it has paid, and all it seeks is that it may come out of the transaction without loss. If, however, the settler chooses to buy for himself, he is at liberty to do so, but the board undertakes, through its field supervisors operating in every district, to see that the settler is not taken advantage of by speculators who know values better than he does. In a word, they not only pass upon the extent of equipment that the settler is to get, but

they pass as well on the value; they must be satisfied that he is getting value for his money. Let me emphasize this point, that in every single case the settler's will has to cover the transaction. He is driven into nothing; he decides himself both as to the land and stock. The board never exercises its activity except to reduce the extent of the purchase, but very often it does so, and almost always successfully.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Then the minister claims a saving to the settler by his purchasing through the board?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly in respect to implements.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I was speaking of live stock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We rather think so or the settler would not buy through us; but we cannot say, because we simply sell at the price we pay.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's): When you buy through experts do you add a commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think any commission has ever been paid. There is certainly none paid in respect to land purchases.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's): But in regard to live stock?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think so. If I am wrong I will advise the hon. gentleman later.

Mr. PROULX: Does the minister know the average age of those horses?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not; but I will guarantee they are a lot younger than the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PROULX: I hope they are younger than those purchased in Nova Scotia in 1914.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Doubtless they are, because I need scarcely intimate to hon. members that the purchase of land, and horses, and cattle in every district in Canada is, politically, a rather perilous enterprise, as well as perilous from the business standpoint. No doubt mistakes would be made, but as respects horses and cattle at all events, the purchases have been of such a minor character that no such case as my hon. friend has referred to has come to my knowledge. The operations have now been proceeding for about fifteen months, so I do not think that any very venerable horses have come into the possession of the board.

Mr. PROULX: I am glad that the board has acted prudently and has not made any such purchases of horses as were made by the Department of Militia in Nova Scotia in 1914.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know about the Militia purchases, but I do know that nobody ever acted more prudently than the board has acted in this regard; and that ought to satisfy the hon. member.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria): A great deal of stock is sometimes lost in the West during a severe winter such as we had last year. Because of a shortage of feed, or for other reasons, a man might find himself in the spring without enough horses to go on with. I am speaking of the man who has received the maximum allowance for equipment. Is any special provision made for such cases?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No special provision is made; the Act does not permit any. Under the Act we cannot advance any man more than $7,500, and we never do. In the early days of the operation of the Act certain of the men in the first instance secured the whole amount, and where they encountered in the first year a total failure—and particularly in Alberta and Southern Saskatchewan, by reason of the drought, there necessarily have been total failures—the board has been powerless to come to their aid in the way of a further loan. The board has, however, kept as closely as possible in touch with all these men, and by means of the promotion of sales of stock and equipment which under the strained circumstances the men could do without, and the application of the proceeds to the purchase of seed or feed, it has managed to carry these men along. Even then there may be some cases of very great hardship, but we have reports from our Edmonton office, which is in the district most liable at present to cases of distress, to the effect that only a very small number indeed will not be able in some way to pull through. It would be a help to these men, of course, to extend the maximum, but no matter what the extent of the loan may be, you are bound to have still other cases for extension. On the whole, the scale of the systems that this Parliament determined upon in respect of the returned soldier farmer was a generous scale and I have not felt like recommending that in any case the maximum should be exceeded.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria): When I inquired whether any provision was made for the relief of these people I had in mind action taken by the department, particularly in the way of permitting a reduction of stock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh yes, we do that and have done it. I have stated that there are now 674 men in actual training. Many, of course, have taken their training and are now upon the land. The course pursued is this: training centres have been established at several points in Canada: at Kentville, N.S., Fredericton, N.B., Lennoxville, P.Q., Elkhorn, Man., Red Deer, and Crossfield, Alta., Agassiz and Matsqui, B.C. At these farms men who are otherwise qualified but who lack experience are first given a month's training in actual farm work. These are not experimental or fancy farms; they are simply operated in the way that the soldier is expected to operate his land after he gets it. He gets the rudiments of farm work in order that he may be of some use when hired to work on land. He is then told to go out and find a place on a farm. He is assisted to get a suitable location and he is expected to put in approximately a year's work. After that, if he so desires and if it is felt he needs it, he may get two months' special training in an agricultural college. For this purpose we utilize five of the provincial colleges: one at Winnipeg, the Agricultural College at Guelph, and the agricultural colleges at Saskatoon, Fort William, and Matsqui, B.C. That constitutes the entire range of training that the men secure. While they are taking this training they are entitled to assistance to enable them to conserve the money they have saved against the purchase of their land later. Single men are allowed $10 a month, with free tuition and board, and married men are allowed $35 a month, free tuition and board, and, if they have children, $6 for one child and $5 for each subsequent child, with an aggregate maximum of $80. When the men go upon the farm, they get, of course, farm wages. At this stage single men get no further assistance, but married men are allowed $20 per month while they are working on a farm, and, if they have children, $6 for the first child, and $5 for each other child. The committee will observe that the scale of assistance is considerably lower than the scale which obtains in the case of civil re-establishment, for the very obvious reason that men who come in under the soldiers' settlement plan are able-bodied men, and men who later get a very considerable measure of assistance from the State. The man who comes under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment gets more because he is disabled and because he does not get special assistance after he is located in employment.

4 p.m.

Mr. GLASS: The allowance made to men who, after their training, are employed on farms, is not reduced by reason of any amount earned while so employed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, they get their wages besides, the best they can secure. The country has spent $82,457.01 in respect of allowances to men in training. The estimate for next year looks forward to an expenditure of about the same amount.

Now, there is what is known as the Home Branch of the department. This branch is presided over by Mrs. Muldrew and has to do particularly with the giving of assistance to the wives of settlers. Our women officers do not undertake to visit all the wives of settlers. It is the duty of the field supervisors of the department who are attached to each district office and who are skilled agriculturists, to visit all the men, particularly those who graded low, in D, C, and B grades, and help them by advice and suggestion, report upon their progress and upon the condition of their stock and equipment, and make any other suggestions that will enable the board to be helpful to them. These field supervisors visit the men regularly at least once in six months. As time goes on and the success of each settler becomes assured the supervision need not be so frequent; we are already reducing these visits where we find that the men do not need such close contact on the part of the board's officers. We hope to be able to reduce this service more rapidly as time goes on. But for the present these field supervisors visit and render assistance to every man settled under the board; for the purpose not only of helping them but of protecting the board's security.

Otherwise we would not be able to follow our security and protect ourselves against men who are not making a success. These men, reporting to the various offices, give an account also of the home conditions that prevail in the case of each settler. They frequently come across cases of distress, lack of knowledge of home economics and the management of a house, and in those cases they make it their business by circular and by visits from home counsellors—women under the charge of Mrs. Muldrew—to give help where it is absolutely needed by the wives of these men. They get into touch

with women's organizations in the district, Red Cross societies and patriotic organizations, and through those instrumentalities they have been able to render very material help to many a distressed wife of a settler. They also conduct training classes for these women who in the first instance are not making a success of the management of their home. In the province of Saskatchewan 250 women have taken the course in Home Economics that is provided by the Home Branch. There are 20 at present attending the school for that purpose in Prince Edward Island. We purpose doing this work in all the provinces.

I have followed the operations of the board pretty completely so far as they have proceeded. Last year in many parts of the West, and that is where the great body of our settlers are, there were areas where, owing to the accumulated blights of different kinds that all seemed to come at once, it was impossible to raise any crop at all. As a consequence, the proportion of collections was not as good as it would have been in a normal year. Last year, of course, was the first that any payments became due, and of the money that became due, $34,307 in all, $11,911.71 was paid, and extensions were granted and rearrangements made covering $12,623. At the present time there remains only $7,693 not taken care of. It was not anticipated that we would secure in the very first year any larger proportion of our payments than we did. Indeed, if the Act were to be drawn again, I would be disposed to postpone for a little longer period all payments other than interest. However, this sum has been returned and some have met with such conspicuous success that they were able to pay up in full at once. Others have paid more than they were called upon to pay. Of the number who paid up in full something over half, by reason of one accident or another, had sold their land, but at prices which fully discharged their obligation to the board. The estimate for the year to come is fixed at $50,000,000. That is less than the commitments of last year. It is, however, more than the actual money disbursed last year. We hope with this provision to settle next year between 15,000 and 16,000 persons. Furthermore, we hope to get along with $2,000,000, outside of the money we lend, it being intended to invest $48,000,000 in loans. We hope that $2,000,000 will take care of all the training undertaken by the board, take care of the staff of the board situate in every part of Canada, take care also of the cost of supervision and the cost of the loans, because the board in every case pay the appraisal costs and all legal costs that ordinarily are charged against a borrower. Everything but the $2,000,000 will be actually invested in returnable money, and the $2,000,000 itself is invested in advantages which the soldier receives.

The cost to the Government for soldier land settlement for the last fiscal year will amount to approximately $5,000,000. The country loses two years' interest on the stock and equipment, loses also the margin of interest between the rate at which the board loans the money and the rate the Government pays to secure it, loses also the cost of training and of administration. On the amount of money expended last year, this would mean a net unreturnable outlay of about $5,000,000. For next year it will be about the same. There is no possibility of this money being returned to the treasury of Canada. There is, indeed, no possibility, in view of what we know of human nature and of business generally, of the return of all the money that is loaned. There will undoubtedly be losses; there has been a small amount of loss already, and there will be more; but a survey of the operations of the year and an estimate of the lessons learned by the year's operations and the improvements we can make as a result, lead me to the opinion that the proportion of losses will not in the aggregate be a serious one, that it will be, at all events, very much smaller than the great advantages which the country undoubtedly will secure, not only by the increase in the production of these first essentials, but by the addition to the stable unwavering section of our population of so large a proportion of the returned men of Canada.

The Act in its first drafting, and as it stands to-day, admitted to its benefits returned soldiers in England of the army of Great Britain, as well as the army of France, of the United States, and our other Allies. We have sought first, however, to take care so far as we could of the unexpected avalanche of applications that came from our own men. The difficulty of extending the organization rapidly enough and yet at the same time maintain such a degree of efficiency that there might not be disappointment and undue delay to our own men, was such that the doors were opened very gradually and very slowly to the admission of any others. Last year, however, we established in England a board of two, whose duties were to select from applicants of the British army those who had sufficient money and sufficient stamina, so far as that could be gauged, and the right kind of experience

that would make them the best prospects at least, of success in Canada. The instructions given to that board were to exercise the greatest care and caution, to err on that side, if any, so that the doors of the system in Canada would not be flooded with those who ultimately had to be denied, because of lack of experience in this country—a primary and indispensable necessity— and perhaps turned back again to their native land. We have sought to let these men know right at their homes before they start what is required in money and experience, the type and class of man that is required, and the training that is required, for we fix a period of two years in the case of all outside inexperienced men. We sought to bring home to them all these requirements at home, so that they would not launch upon journeys and expenses that would land them nowhere in the end. There are innumerable details to which I might allude, but already I have detained the committee and I reserve the rest for such questions as hon. members may see fit to ask.

Mr. GLASS: I understood the minister to say that the loan was on a 5 per cent basis, amortising in twenty-five years, and that 64 of the loans had already been repaid in full. I assume the department has no objection to the loan being repaid in full at any time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. GLASS: Suppose a soldier has occupied his farm for one, two, or three years and made all the payments required by the regulations—If he wishes to sell his farm, is there any provision by which he can do so and have the purchaser assume the obligation he is under.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He can with the approval of the board. I may say that the total number of employees of the board is 1,321. Of these, 962 are males, of whom 876 are returned soldiers, or a total of 91 per cent of the male officials of the board. We have sought to confine ourselves to the utmost of our powers to returned soldiers, except in the case of appraisers. In connection with appraisers we find it impossible to follow the rules to the same extent, for reasons which are no discredit to the returned soldiers, but which are obvious. We had to get men of long experience in actual farming work, and as a general rule it was impossible to secure that class among the returned men, although we did in many instances. But apart from appraisers, 91 per cent are returned men. We have been assisted in every possible way by the Civil Service Commission, and as time went on we were able to co-operate more efficiently and expeditiously with them. Long delays took place at first and we had to dispense rather ruthlessly with the services of many. The operations of the board have suffered at various points by reason of the inefficiency of some men secured, but by adopting a policy that perhaps appeared harsh at the time we believe we have been able to evolve an organization which is now as nearly efficient as possible. It is not 100 per cent efficient, for nothing can be that; but at least it possesses more than average efficiency as a government organization, and at the same time it is predominantly composed of the returned men themselves.

Mr. PROULX: Are the valuators paid by salary or commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are paid by salary; we pay no commissions. I can scarcely conceive of anything that would more strikingly manifest folly than to pay valuators on a commission basis.

Mr. PROULX: I have been informed that they were being paid on commission. I was told that in certain places the prices that were paid were exorbitant, and my information is that in one place the Settlement Board paid $7,000 for a farm valued at $3,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Can the hon. gentleman favour me with the names of the place and of the parties??

Mr. PROULX: It does not happen to be in my county. I got the information from a colleague and I shall ask him to give me the particulars. He is not in the House at present.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A great many cases have been presented to me of just such definiteness as the one mentioned by my hon. friend.

Mr. ANDREWS: I desire to congratulate the minister on his very clear presentment of a most remarkable achievement. One hears very often at the present time that the Union Government is reactionary and that it is working in behalf of the big interests, and so forth; but in this case at least I think that the Liberal members of this House as well as the country at large may congratulate the Government on having enacted the most advanced legislation that has ever been put on the statute book in this country since Confederation. For the first time in the history of Canada the funds of the State have been loaned

to individuals for the development of the resources of the country. The machinery and everything in connection with this work are absolutely new. Everything had to be created to meet the new conditions, and of course under the circumstances there was no past experience that could serve as a guide. That necessarily had to be learned. While the Soldiers' Settlement Board has been operating in every province in Canada, indeed almost in every constituency, I imagine that its shortcomings and its mistakes must be very well known to the members of this House, and those who know of any mistakes should avail themselves of the present opportunity to bring them to the attention of the minister. So far as I am concerned, I am not disposed to be critical but rather the reverse. At our convention recently we drew up a long list of suggestions, very few of which are concerned with the general principle of the work, being almost entirely devoted to matters of detail. I think that these suggestions might well go before the committee on Re-establishment which is now in session, rather than before this committee. There is one suggestion in particular, however, which I would direct to the attention of the minister, and that is in regard to the advantage of insuring the men so that there might be no possibility of failure on their part to repay the money loaned them. The suggestion reads:

> That the board insure every married settler, who borrows from the Soldiers' Settlement Board, in an amount equal to his loan and thus secure itself against loss, and, at the same time, provide the dependents of the deceased soldier with an equity for their maintenance.

This suggestion, I think, is one that should be given careful consideration, and I therefore bring it to the attention of the minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The suggestion, I presume, relates to life insurance.

Mr. ANDREWS: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Representations have been made to me from other sources that it would be advantageous to have a system of life insurance established for the protection of the board, and while I have not yet discussed the subject with the board, I intend to do so.

Mr. CALDWELL: I desire to make a few remarks on this subject, especially in view of the fact that I was very closely connected with the operation of the Soldiers' Settlement Act in the province from which I come. I was Chairman of the Qualification Board before whom the soldiers in my part of the country came for examination in regard to their fitness as settlers, and shortly after the work began I was made a member of the Loan Committee. I want to speak particularly in regard to the price per acre of land in the different provinces. I observed that some hon. members smiled when they heard what the price per acre was in New Brunswick, and I am inclined to think they got a wrong impression in that respect. Perhaps no one realizes better than I that the statement is correct, because I was one of the board who decided what should be paid. I realize this probably more than anybody else because I was one of the board who decided what farms should be bought and what we should pay for them. The soldier selected a farm and the inspector inspected it and put a valuation upon it. We did not in every case pay what the valuator said it was worth. We even turned down a number of farms that the farm inspector said were good value at the price asked for them. That is the reason why the prices were less per acre in New Brunswick than in some other provinces. But we estimated the value of these farms on the production basis. If a farm would not produce enough to enable the settler to sustain his family and to give him a pretty fair chance of making his payments the board asked the soldier to select another farm. In a great many cases the farms were good but were top heavy with buildings. We realized that the soldier could not make any money out of the buildings and while they would be a good investment for the man who had the money to pay for them we did not encourage soldiers to burden themselves with such farms. We refused different farms that were top heavy with buildings. That is another reason why our price per acre is smaller than in other provinces where they purchased farms with better buildings. I know that farms were sold to private individuals, cash down for a price that we said the soldier could not pay and still I believe we were right. When the purchase was made by a man who had the money to pay for the farm and the buildings, there is no doubt that he made a good trade but there is a great difference between a man going on a farm and going into debt for it and a man who has money to pay for it.

I had hoped that a Bill would have been brought down by the minister to extend the time for repayment of the advance on stock and equipment for a longer period. I think the period should be longer. How-

ever, I suppose we should be grateful for small favours. I understand you extend the time for two years?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not think that is sufficient but still there is nothing to prevent this House from extending the time further if it is found necessary, and I think it will be found necessary. I think the payment per year that the soldier will have to make on $2,000 worth of stock and equipment will be $380?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I think so.

Mr. CALDWELL: The payment on the farm would be $850 or $875 a year. It will be upwards of ten per cent on the whole investment of $8,000. I believe the minister said they would only advance $7,500 although the maximum is $8,500 if the settler wants $1,000 more for permanent improvements.

In regard to the payment for both farm and the stock and equipment, I believe they have a pretty good plan worked out and that it is being well carried out. I do not think they could have devised a better method. I heard an hon. gentleman while the minister was speaking, say that it would be a peculiar thing if there were no graft in connection with buying so much loose stuff. I do not think there is any possibility of graft in this respect. The inspector goes out to inspect the stock and to say whether it is worth what the soldier pays for it. The cheque in payment of the purchase price is made payable directly from the board to the person that the stock is purchased from. The man who does the buying does not handle any of the money. I believe that is a wise method.

I, like the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews), feel like giving the Government every credit for this Act. I believe that it is a good thing and that it serves a good purpose. I believe that it will put returned soldiers into civil life who otherwise would not be able to establish themselves under such favourable conditions. I hope the time for repayment will be extended if necessary and I feel sure it will be. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews) made a suggestion with regard to insuring the settlers and I think that would be a wise provision. However, I do not believe that the board or the Government or the country takes any risk of losing anything by this transaction. The settler pays ten per cent of the purchase price down. He must do that. If he dies next year the Government has the property absolutely together with the ten per cent of the price which the settler has paid down. If he makes his payment for five years he will have paid approximately one-third of the purchase price and the Government still absolutely own the property because the soldier has no claim against it until it is fully paid for. I think there is very little chance of the Government losing through this scheme but I think that as an extra safeguard and as a protection to the settler's family he should be insured. If the settler dies the board will have to take the farm over and it may not be able to realize as much at forced sale as it otherwise would. You cannot sell a property at forced sale for all it is worth. In that case the family might be destitute and if the Government should insure the settler it would be a protection to themselves as well as to the soldier's family.

The method of paying for the farm is the same as the method for paying for the stock and machinery. Ordinarily you cannot buy a farm or anything else without paying a commission to somebody but the Government brought in an Act which was passed by Parliament making it a criminal offence to accept a commission on any property sold to a returned soldier. That was a wise provision. We had a case in New Brunswick where a real estate man tried to sell a farm to a returned soldier. He had asked the soldier to make a deposit of $300. Our committee turned down the sale, we did not buy the farm and we had some trouble to get the money back from the real estate man. If we had not read the Act to him and shown him that it was a criminal offence it is doubtful if the man would have got his money back. I believe that the real estate men undertook to corner the farms that we offered for sale in order that they might get their commission when these farms were sold. This Act headed them off and it was very necessary to have such a protection. The tendency of the time is to make all you can out of every opportunity that presents itself, these real estate men were legitimately in the business to sell farms and while it is legitimate under ordinary circumstances to sell real estate for a commission I think it was a wise thing to make it an offence to collect a commission on farms sold to returned soldiers.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks on this very important matter. I am sure that every member of the House was pleased when the minister told us that in many cases the

soldier made a ten per cent deposit when his farm was purchased. I gather from that that it is partly on account of the excellent work done by the qualification board. I believe they have been hand picked.

The explanation of that is this: the soldier farmer who managed to get through without putting down his ten per cent perhaps worked a little on the sympathies of the qualification board, because after all we are all human.

I want to make this further remark: If I caught the minister's words aright he spoke about doing away with the qualification board. If I am wrong in that understanding I want to be corrected.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are, where we have found it possible to use the services of our own officers. We are not doing that everywhere; it all depends on circumstances. I would be compelled to mention instances to make clear what I say. We have had difficulties in connection with the working together of the board and the committe in certain points; and we have found we can work more economically through our own officers who have proven at that particular point to be thoroughly qualified as qualification men, and not have any qualification committe at all. We save a lot of expense that way, a very great deal of expense. But we never do it unless our men at that point have been tried by the test of experience and have proven true. We could not move very rapidly in that direction, but wherever we know that our men who are on our regular staff are qualified then we rely on that staff alone. It is a proper principle if we can get to it, but we will have to get to it slowly.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): It is not my intention to debate this point with the minister, but the success that has been achieved in the past up to the present time, is, I think, greatly to the credit of the qualification board; and it may be a "penny wise and pound foolish" policy to do away with a part of the machine which has been so very instrumental in attaining that success.

I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Caldwell) that the Act is a good one, and has worked out well; but there is an old saying that very often the man behind the gun is the best part of it, and I am of opinion that a great deal of credit is due to the worthy chairman of the Soldiers' Settlement Board. I believe that he has slept with the Act and thereby has made its administration a success. It is not a very easy matter to hand pick men and loan money belonging to the State, and to say to them—as an individual would in the case of an ordinary business transaction—"You must make a success of this." The common tendency in the case of a transaction such as this, where money is being borrowed from the State, is to say: "It does not matter much whether it is a failure or not—the Government has to pay the expense."

I am very glad to know that such a large percentage of our men have made good. I would ask the minister now to give the committee this information: What is the number of soldier farmers who were on the land, say on the 1st November, who have wintered on that land?

Mr. NESBITT: The number who have gone through the winter on the land?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member mean the number of men who have gone on the land up to November last?

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): The number of soldier farmers who went on to the land and who have wintered on the land.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is practically the same as the figures I gave, 15,234 up to the 21st March. Very few have gone on since November. They start in the spring, in the month of April, and from that time until the fall they go out on the land and stay there over the winter. They do not, however, go on the land between November and March.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: As the one who gave his benediction to this scheme last year, perhaps the committee will permit me a word or two in hearty appreciation of the most satisfactory and lucid statement which we have just had from the minister. As years advance on one, one naturally becomes of a more pacific and less militant type, and I find more interest in constructive politics of this kind than in the fierce clashes of party warfare. So that it is a personal pleasure to me to hear a statement from a minister who I cannot—not now—always support, in which I find everything to commend and nothing to criticise.

I am naturally, Mr. Chairman, and the committee will pardon me, if I say it, proud of the province from which I come. The figures about that province, good as I know it to be, astonish me though I do not know why they should. Alberta led in recruiting in war; she leads in soldier settlement on the land in peace; and she leads in hustlers who pay the money back first. That province must, at some time or another, have had a good education in patriotism, in agriculture, and in

hustling. The members from other provinces will pardon me for drawing attention to these facts: It is not by way of pride, but by way of trying to induce emulation in others and bringing other provinces up to the splendid position in which we find the good little province of Alberta.

The statement of the minister is a splendid advertisement of the magnificent resources of this great country. I was astounded myself to find that so many as sixty-four men had actually now paid back all they borrowed. It was rather a swift and staggering reply to some one who tauntingly said—when the minister was asked a few minutes ago how many years were to be given to the paying back—"Never." "Never," as I told a member the other day, is a long time; and it so happens that some people have already paid back all that they got. I repeat that is a splendid advertisement of this magnificent country. It is an advertisement which should be used in other countries of the earth to let them know what sort of a country Canada really is.

I want to say also that the statement of the minister is a high tribute to the way in which the work of the Interior Department in its administrative capacity is carried on, and it is a tribute to the splendid qualities of the members of the Soldiers' Land Settlement Board. I have had considerable dealings—as I suppose all members of the House have had—with these gentlemen, and it is a pleasure to me to testify that they have the utmost capacity for hard work, they are extremely courteous in the reception of any suggestion, anxious to help and anxious to be helped; and they have, above all things, that enthusiasm which is always followed by hard work. And, the minister would be the first to agree with me that they have been of very great assistance to him in carrying out this Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: There are just one or two points that the minister mentioned which I should like to confirm his opinion upon. The board have got the right idea when they send men to work first on a farm. The way to learn to play cricket is to play it under a man who has played cricket before and who knows the game well; and the way to learn farming is to do actual farming and actual settlement work in Western Canada. It is the way I began myself eighteen and a half years ago; and I remember the pride with which at the end of my first day I received the congratulations of the somewhat waggish old lady at the head of the family with whom I was staying, when she congratulated me that I at least knew the end of a cow by which it took its hay, and the end from which the milk was got. It was with very great pride that I achieved that distinction. I have done a little better since that time.

Another point upon which I think the minister is to be congratulated is the fact that he and the board are giving a predominant chance to the citizens of our own country. I think there is a double reason, which will occur to the members of the committee, why that should be done. In the first place, our primary duty, as every one of us will agree—it is commonplace almost to say it—is to our own citizens; but in the second place, and perhaps more important it is along that line that we shall achieve the greatest success, because men who know something of Canada will naturally make better Canadian farmers; although I do hope that in time with the extension of its operations an increasing number of British and French citizens from the Old Lands will be found working under this board.

Before I sit down I should like to give two warnings which may prove useful. There will be a great temptation to take a lenient view of applications for extra loans. We all feel very favourably towards the returned soldier, and when one receives a letter from a returned soldier asking for an increase in his loan, one's heart naturally goes out to him. But I should like to advise the board to look very carefully into such applications. After all, it is no misfortune to the man himself,—and the public interest has to be guarded,—to have "to face it stiffly" in the first years of his operations. Any one who has settled on the land in the West—and I am sure those hon. gentlemen opposite to me know that it is equally true of their forefathers who first settled in Ontario—had a stiff row to hoe in the early years, and it is because they had that the sons of Canada are the men they are to-day. I would therefore advise the minister to look carefully into these applications for extra loans, and not to let his heart run away with his head—always a very dangerous proceeding in matters relating to money.

Another warning I should like to make in this regard,—and it emphasizes the warning I have just uttered,—is that the success of this board in its speed will perhaps be greater in the early years than at any other period. I think the men whom one

would most trust anticipate that agricultural prices will keep at the present height for at least a couple of years yet. No one can tell exactly what the truth is on that subject; but what we want to keep in mind is that agricultural prices will not remain forever at their present level. Therefore while that would emphasize the warning I have just uttered about not giving more loans than are necessary in response to the promptings of the heart, it would also tend, in my mind, to the thought that we ought not to let our enthusiasm for this work—and it is a splendid work—run with us any further than is absolutely necessary to deal with men who really need occupation. In other words, we must spread our returned soldiers over as many operations of our country as possible—industrial, agricultural, lumbering and fishing. Therefore I would advise the board to moderate their zeal, so to speak, and not let the work run away with them. I do not think the warning is really needed, for I am sure they will be cautious, but it is well to bear in mind that the prices of agricultural produce cannot remain where they are and that hard times will come, and consequently my warning may well be heeded.

Of course, we shall be able to meet the worst years if the Government, and the board, and the rest of Canada will emulate the people of Alberta not only in their hustling, fighting and agricultural qualities, but also in their fiscal qualities. I will not tell the committee what those fiscal qualities are.

Mr. NESBITT: Mr. Chairman, I think the country is to be congratulated on the choice of the chairman of this board; and I also think that the chairman is to be congratulated on the choice of his assistants. He has, I think, used every precaution that it was possible for him to use and still endeavour to carry out the intention of the Act.

My experience is that there have been greater and more numerous failures among men going on farms without any knowledge of farming than among men entering any other line of business—and we all know there have been more failures in this country than in any other by reason of men taking up work that they had no knowledge of and in which they had to buy their experience. This particularly is the case in regard to farming.

I would like to give to the chairman one or two thoughts that have occurred to me in connection with this report. I am going to confine my remarks to Ontario. The average price of land I see was $33. Unless most of these settlers were put in the far north or in the uncultivated regions, the average price of land would denote that they had bought run-down farms. It is absolutely impossible for a man without means to settle on such a farm and build it up inside of two or three years, and therefore he must have means enough to carry him over that period. I have no doubt that the farms were purchased for real value, but it would be a great mistake to purchase a farm because it is a cheap farm. It is far easier for a man to go on a farm in first-class condition, so far as buildings, fences, and fertility are concerned and make money from the start than to build up a run-down farm.

With reference to the purchase of cows, I notice that the average price paid in Ontario was $80. I am afraid that those cows could never be made to pay. In my judgment you cannot make a cow pay in Ontario at the present time unless she yields 6,000 pounds of milk a year; and certainly such a cow cannot be bought for $80. It costs nearly as much to keep a poor cow as it does to keep the cow that is putting her feed into the pail, and this is the type of cow that is needed on the average dairy farm in this province. Of course, if a man is buying a cow for beef purposes it is not material whether she is a good milker or not; but if he is buying her for dairy purposes, which is the principal business for which cows are kept in Ontario, then he needs a cow that will give 6,000 pounds of milk a year rather than a yield of only 3,000 or 4,000 pounds. In my section of the country for the last three years, speaking roughly, good registered cows have sold at an average price of from $120 to $180. If I were going to buy a cow to-morrow I would rather pay $200 for it than $80—that is, of course, provided I was satisfied as to the quality of the cow and her record. It is the poor cows that we are constantly turning out of our herds. Every year those who keep tab on what they are doing turn their poor cows over to the butcher, if they are straight, or sell them to their neighbours at the best price they can get for them, if they are not straight. I repeat that the country is to be congratulated upon having at the head of this board a man who has done such admirable work and who, considering the probable applicants who might apply to go on the land for the purpose of getting the loan, has so wonderfully well protected the interests of

the country. I hope that he will continue in the same prudent, careful, cautious manner which has characterized his work in the past. If he does, I have no doubt that the scheme will be an entire success. I offer these remarks not by way of criticism, but simply because I think that the suggestions which I have made ought to be taken into consideration.

Mr. STACEY: Perhaps it would not be out of place for a representative of another province which has received a large number of returned soldiers as settlers to say a word or two. I join most heartily with those hon. members who have extended hearty congratulations to the chairman of this board for the able and efficient manner in which this work has been conducted during the past two or three years. I would like to mention two points which, I think, have not been dealt with by hon. members who have spoken. First, with regard to the attitude of the returned soldier settler himself, I would not presume to speak for any other province than my own, but so far as my knowledge goes there is general satisfaction—I do not say universal satisfaction, because that would be impossible—but there is satisfaction on the part of the returned soldier, who now feels that he has a chance, and that, just as he made good overseas, it is now up to him to make good here. Generally speaking, I say, they are satisfied with their position and with the treatment accorded to them by the Government. A large number—it would be futile to make an estimate, nor is it within my province to do so—have good hope of success, and from all appearances a very large percentage of those who have settled upon the land will make good.

I wish to direct attention also to the work which has been carried on by Mrs. Muldrew, who is in charge of the home branch, and to the tact and wisdom manifested by her in soliciting and securing the co-operation of other women's organizations. The task which has been committed to Mrs. Muldrew is a difficult and sometimes a very delicate one, but certainly it has been carried out with marked success, and as a result of wise and diplomatic management, the co-operation of individuals and organizations has been secured. On the whole, I think there is good ground for believing that this scheme will be highly successful from the standpoint not only of the country but also of the returned soldier; and that it will bring about increased production and general prosperity. If the scheme is as successful in the future as it has been in the past, it will prove to have been the finest of its kind that has been initiated and carried out in any country affected by the war.

Mr. POWER: Together with some of the hon. gentlemen of the Farmers' party with whom I sit this afternoon—temporarily only, I assure the minister—I congratulate the minister on his clear, lucid and interesting statement with regard to his policy and what I might call his very interesting experiment. I have a few criticisms to offer on behalf of myself and others, and I make them in spite of the fact that the only criticism so far offered has been met by the minister with a reply which shows that he does not believe in the adage, "A soft answer turneth away wrath." I may also be excused, as my hon. friend (Mr. Proulx) has been, if I am somewhat indefinite in my statement. However, I conceive it to be my duty to make these few remarks and to offer a few criticisms.

5 p.m.

To begin with, I suppose I should congratulate the chairman of the board, whose efforts have apparently met with satisfaction throughout the country. But I have this criticism to offer—and I am sure that the committee must be weary of hearing me offer this criticism in all departments—that unfortunately, so far as my knowledge goes, the chairman of this board, a board entrusted with the task of looking after returned soldiers and placing them on the land, is not himself a returned soldier. I do not need to elaborate this point; the principle that returned soldiers should be looked after by returned soldiers has been generally admitted by ministers and by members on both sides. I simply give it as my opinion that within the ranks of the Canadian Expeditionary Force it would have been quite possible to find a man as competent—though I do not doubt the high competence and managerial ability of the chairman—as the chairman himself.

Mr. NESBITT: Possible; but do you think it would have been probable?

Mr. POWER: Quite possible; even probable. I have heard the minister complimented on his report in that a certain number of these returned soldiers have been able to repay the money lent to them. I also congratulate the minister in that the money has been returned to him. But it would appear from the remarks made by two hon. gentlemen that these moneys were returned because the soldiers in question were enabled, through obtaining a

loan from the Government, to make a fortunate and lucky speculation. Now, if we are allowed to do that off the land, why should the Government not lend any of us city dwellers sufficient money to gamble on the stock exchange? We might make a fortune out of speculation and so be enabled to return the money to the Government.

Mr. NESBITT: You might not, though.

Mr. POWER: To my mind, the facts stated by some of my hon. friends are the best arguments I have yet heard in favour of the famous Harry J. Flynn gratuity scheme. That is to say, lend a certain amount of money to a returned soldier and shortly afterwards he will be able to pay you back. The Government, having done that, congratulates itself on being the means of enabling certain soldiers to speculate on land and return the money which they had borrowed.

From what I have heard here this afternoon apparently a large number of soldiers have settled on land that had previously been occupied, I understand from my hon. friend (Mr. Caldwell) that in New Brunswick at any rate the farms purchased were as a rule farms that had already been occupied. Now if this scheme of land settlement is to be of any permanent use to the country, in my opinion we should make it a colonization scheme, not a scheme for placing soldiers on the land in order that other people occupying that land may come to the cities. That is how it would appear to have worked out in New Brunswick at any rate, and from the little knowledge I have of the scheme in Quebec I would think the same condition exists there. If this is not a colonization scheme, but simply a scheme for the advantage of certain returned soldiers, I say that all returned soldiers should be entitled to equal benefits under it—another argument in favour of the gratuity. In passing I might say that I have never been in favour of the gratuity, and I am not now, but the very reasons which the Government gives for congratulating itself might be used by those who do not favour its policy in urging their own claim.

I should also like to call the attention of the Government to some criticisms by a certain body favourably and generally known as the Great War Veterans' Association. This body is a very large and representative one, and its members are the people who are supposed to be benefited under this scheme. It is all very well for members of the House representing the agricultural classes to state that the scheme as a whole has worked well, and I am glad that the minister has been fortunate enough to receive their congratulations, as I am sure he is glad, but if this scheme does not meet with the approval of those presumed to be benefited under it, I think it must lack something, and it is the duty of the minister and of the Government to see whether any remedy suggested cannot be applied. I had here a few moments ago, until my desk mate disappeared, a number of resolutions passed by the Great War Veterans' Association. However, I have in my hand a newspaper report quoting certain of these resolutions, as to which I think the minister should make some statement. The text of the resolution adopted by the Great War Veterans' Association in convention assembled reads in part as follows:

> And whereas the present Soldiers' Settlement Act gives wide latitude in the promulgation of regulations to the Soldiers' Settlement Board;
>
> And whereas said regulations have been, in many instances, unnecessarily rigorous and designed for idealistic conditions which do not exist;
>
> And whereas, in many instances, hardship has ensued to our comrades by reason of the administration and general inefficiency of the Soldiers' Settlement Board;
>
> And whereas said regulations, in many instances, break the pledges made to the soldier, while in the trenches, in regard to land settlement;
>
> Therefore be it resolved that the Great War Veterans' Association of Canada memorialize Parliament to entirely reorganize, after investigation, the present administration of the Soldiers' Settlement Board.

Before proceeding to the other resolutions I would ask the minister to tell the committee whether he has taken any steps to meet the wishes of the organized veterans with respect to reorganizing the Soldiers' Settlement Board, and if not, why.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have listened to the hon. member (Mr. Power) and particularly to his quotation from the resolution passed at a Great War Veterans' Association meeting demanding reorganization of the land settlement work. If my memory serves me correctly the resolution was moved by Mr. Dace, was it not?

Mr. POWER: Mr. Dace moved one of the clauses of it at any rate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was moved by Mr. Dace, was it not?

Mr. POWER: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Shortly before it was moved, reorganization was already under way, and one of the first steps in that reorganization was the removal of Mr. Dace. Mr. Dace had been associated with, and I think he had been the head of, a real estate firm that had done a somewhat flourishing business selling land to the returned men. That was in the days before the Act was passed preventing commissions. His activities were somewhat contracted when commissions were denied, but he still was in the insurance business, and being in that business and also in the soldiers' settlement organization, being a returned man, and being taken on chiefly for that reason, he managed to turn a lot of the insurance to the firm of Dace & Company, or at least to the firm of which he was the head. Indeed, so anxious was he to do business that in some cases he placed insurance for soldiers on buildings where there were no buildings at all. So we considered that about the first step in reorganization was to dispense with the services of Mr. Dace, and the resolution which the hon. member gives so much attention to followed very closely upon that dispensation.

An investigation, if I remember correctly, was also contemplated by the resolution. I might say that an investigation was proceeding at the time the resolution was moved, and we expect a report after no great length of time more fully disclosing just what activities were being carried on —activities that certainly were not in the interests of the returned soldiers, though possibly they were in the interest of Mr. Dace. I am afraid that some of the men present at that meeting whose motives were of the best, and who had no disposition to be unfair, were very much misled by speeches on the part of those who were most anxious to complain of a board that had not appreciated their services. Only for those speeches I do not think any such action would have been taken. I am very much of opinion that many of those present now believe that the resolution did not do very much credit to the association, and that it would have been better not to have passed it.

Referring to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) it is true that the average price per animal for cows purchased does seem low, but that was not the average price in Ontario, but the average for Canada, and particularly as regards the West, where largely because of the failure of crops and the lack of feed cows went down to a pretty low figure.

Mr. NESBITT: I understood you to say "Ontario."

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I said "Ontario" it was a mistake. There is the further factor that included in the term "cows" are heifers, which are not properly in that category. The chairman of the board tells me, however, that they are embraced in that designation. As to prices in Ontario the average for the week ending 31st March was $106.26.

Mr. NESBITT: I may say that two-year-olds often sell at higher prices than cows somewhat older, especially when they are in calf. It depends on the breeding; and three-year-olds, I think, are certainly counted valuable cows.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly, the breeding will make up for years very often. But of the same breeding, a three-year-old is not so valuable as a four or five or six-year-old.

Mr. NESBITT: They do not bring the same money, whether they are counted more valuable or not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Conditions may have changed, but that was the case some years ago. I wish to acknowledge on behalf of the chairman of the board, the well deserved marks of appreciation on the part of hon. members. The success of the soldiers' settlement work —and I think it has been a real success, though certainly not unqualified—is due to the chairman more than to any other man. The chairman and members of the board have all worked together well and efficiently, showing conspicuous ability and devotion to duty, which only a minister, I think, knows how fully to recognize. I ought to say here that the board has been very much assisted in various parts of Canada by hon. members of the House, and particularly by the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Stacey), who spoke just a few moments ago. At a time when the mind of the soldier in this country was so agitated that anything like satisfaction to him was utterly out of the question, that hon. gentleman in his own province, where an abnormal number of soldiers had collected, rendered very great assistance in the way of explaining to the soldiers the plans and operations of the board, and generally helping the organization of the board in serving the returned men in that province.

Mr. POWER: With reference to Mr. Dace, who as a matter of fact did move an amendment to the resolution referred to, I hardly

think it is fair for the minister to dismiss, as he has a resolution passed by a body such as the Great War Veterans' Association at a meeting at which there were delegates from all over Canada. To say that because a man named Dace, of whose action the Government did not perhaps approve, had something to do with the consideration of a resolution passed by this association, the resolution should not be deemed worthy of attention, is something I cannot understand. Let the minister remember that at that meeting there were representatives of some two or three thousand returned soldiers, and these men were not of such a character that they could be swayed by the speeches of one or two or three persons. As a returned soldier myself, I protest that the minister has no right to make the statement, or at least to insinuate, that because two or three men had personal grievances they were able, so to speak, to dragoon a convention such as this into accepting a resolution for which, according to the minister, they are sorry. I have been perhaps in as close touch as the minister with the returned soldiers' organization and I have not yet heard any member of that association express any sorrow in connection with the matter. The minister may probably have friends who are more closely connected with this great body than I am and he may have heard from them, but I can assure him that I have a large number of friends in the rank and file of the association and not one of them has as yet attributed to those who had anything to do with the passing of the resolutions the motives which the minister seeks to attribute to them. I will go further. I do not know whether Comrade Drennan of British Columbia has had any trouble with the Soldiers' Settlement Board—he may have had—but he says that the Land Settlement scheme was merely a scheme whereby the returned soldier must pay a stated amount to take up land. Comrade Mills of Winnipeg advocated a thorough investigation into the administration of the board, asserting that the local representative of the board in Winnipeg, paid by the Government, was charging irregular fees. I have not the pleasure of knowing the other comrades whom I have mentioned, but as regards Dr. A. Mackenzie Forbes, of Montreal, who is well known to the majority of hon. members from Quebec, and who has a very high standing in his profession, I hardly think that even the minister himself will attribute to him any ulterior motives. Dr. Forbes made an impassioned address on the subject and concluded that the Government, in spite of the excellent provisions of the Land Settlement Act, had done nothing and that the soldiers had seen that they were not able to avail themselves of the provisions of the Act. The Act itself, he said, was good, but its administration had been an absolute failure. R. L. Calder also supported the plea for an investigation. This gentleman, I may say, is fairly well known in the city of Montreal. He said he had opened a special file in his office which contained nothing but tales of misery caused by the administration of the Land Settlement Act. He cited specific instances, one being that of an applicant for land who had been disqualified on the judgment of a broken-down journalist. I do not think that the minister was quite fair in dismissing the complaints of these men on the ground that the mover of the resolution, or the amendment thereto, was a man who was himself dissatisfied with the administration of the board. It seems to me that these resolutions, coming from a body representative in itself, should have met with better treatment at the hands of the minister, and at the risk of having my hon. friend give me the same answer, I will proceed to read another resolution. I really think the minister should be asked to take these resolutions one by one and explain why they have not been carried, out, but since I do not intend to weary the committee by repeating these one after the other, and since I may possibly expect from the minister some answer when I have got through the first one, perhaps I would do well to confine myself to two or three:

That all soldier settlers should be in possession of a copy of all agreements existing between the Soldiers' Settlement Board and themselves, immediately on the completion of said agreements, and that all such agreements should be completed immediately upon the transfer of title to the Soldiers' Settlement Board.

Again:

That all applicants for loans be supplied at time of qualification with literature giving full particulars of liabilities that may be assumed and outlining the regulations of the Soldiers' Settlement Board.

Has the minister anything to say with reference to these resolutions?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not really intend to cut the hon. gentleman off with a sharp or warm answer. Nor did I have any similar intention in regard to the hon. member for Quebec when he put a question a few minutes before. As to the resolutions, every hon. member of this House must have respect for the returned man though he may

have had faults and may have failed in other respects. Nevertheless, he is a returned man. We must have respect particularly for resolutions passed by returned men, but, resolutions are, after all, only resolutions. What counts is facts. I do not see where one can spend any time usefully in meditating upon the terms of a resolution calling for reorganization and for dispensing with the services of the board. It is only a weariness to the flesh to meditate over those things. A resolution of consequence which would appeal to a minister would be one designating cases or phases in respect to which the board have failed.

Mr. POWER: I expected the minister to say that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, you would expect any minister to say that. That is all really that counts. It is not opinions that count; it is work that counts; it is deeds. I am open to receive evidence of misdeeds, but until I receive evidence of misdeeds I would not be worthy of my position or of any position at all if I made people suffer because of opinions unsupported by evidence? Where is the hon. gentleman's evidence? It must still be at the back of his head. He has not even suggested any. He said that somebody made an impassioned speech. I have no doubt that that is true and that it would have been a great pleasure to have heard these gentlemen. But what did they say; what did they find out was wrong? Where is the weakness? Show that it is a weakness. That is all I am waiting for from the hon. member.

Mr. POWER: As I said in the beginning of my remarks, I rather expected the minister to tell me that the criticisms I was about to make would not be definite enough for him to answer. But I thought that perhaps he had given some attention to these resolutions that had been adopted by a body of men such as the Great War Veterans asking for a reorganization. He should have made it his business as the minister in charge of the administration of this department to have given some consideration to the resolutions which he so slightingly refers to here. He should have said to himself: Here is a body of men directly affected by the operation of this Act and they ask for a reorganization by Parliament. It is true the minister did not, in the resolutions themselves, have a recital of the facts, but the minister must have known that in order to pass such resolutions these men must have had some facts in their minds. Surely the minister does not imagine that these men pass resolutions merely for the pleasure of doing it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It looks suspicious.

Mr. POWER: The minister is a little suspicious—I am glad to have that admission from him. The admission will no doubt be received with considerable pleasure by the Great War Veterans in his constituency that he is a little suspicious of the resolutions which they have passed. But the Great War Veterans' Association, suspicious though the minister is of them, must be regarded on the whole as being composed of fairly reasonable men and when they debate, as apparently they debated on this day, resolutions of this kind, they must have some facts with which to back them up. My view of the minister's duty is that he should immediately have taken cognizance of such a complaint and asked his department to investigate in so far as possible to ascertain whether there were or were not any reasonable grounds for complaint. This resolution is only a portion of a long list of resolutions and in the long list of resolutions there are no doubt facts stated which would give the minister some light on the subject. Surely even though the minister does think that his department is absolutely perfect, he might have read these resolutions over. If he had done so he would have come to the conclusion that those who had passed these resolutions were not so full of admiration for his own virtue or that of his department as he may have imagined and that possibly there may be room for improvement. That is the spirit in which I am criticizing the minister. If there is room for improvement in his department it is demonstrated by his failure to listen and pay attention to the criticism that is made of his department. A moment ago I asked the minister what he had to say with reference to the two resolutions one of which distinctly asked for a copy of the agreement and the other that the soldier settler should be able to obtain literature giving full particulars of the liability which he assumes. That is an important point but the minister has not answered it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have answered it. They get it in every case but of course they cannot get it immediately. They get the money because the agreement cannot be fully completed and the amount of the money inserted in it until they get all their advances. The advances are often made progressively. When the loan is closed and the transaction completed every soldier is

given a copy of his agreement and that agreement discloses to him all his liabilities to the board, the dates of maturities and all the information that we have or he requires.

Mr. POWER: How long may this progressive borrowing extend?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Until the soldier gets the full amount of his loan.

Mr. POWER: How many years?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be his own fault if it were at all long. It might run to six weeks. It may not be his fault but it is his choice. He is waiting until he gets goods that suit him but once he gets the loan and the agreement is completed he gets a copy of the agreement.

Mr. POWER: At what date did this system of giving the soldiers a copy of the agreement go into force?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, that has always been in force.

Mr. POWER: Therefore there would be no truth in the allegation contained in this particular resolution?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there is any allegation. The resolution simply asks that the man be given a copy of the agreement. That has probably arisen from the fact that for quite a period he is without a copy of his agreement, but that is unavoidable until the agreement is completed. That is perhaps not fully understood and therefore there is a misapprehension which has given rise to the resolution.

Mr. POWER: I remember reading in a newspaper, some time in the course of last week, of a case where a settler in the vicinity of Quebec was called before the police magistrate for having sold some of his stock. I am not familiar with the details of the case, but the plan of the defence was that he did not know what his rights were and that he had no agreement. The case occurred within the last ten days, but unfortunately I have not the newspaper clipping before me at the present time. The matter was before the court in the city of Quebec, and I remember that Major John Roy was prosecuting for the board. The defence was that there was no agreement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would presume the deence failed.

Mr. POWER: No, I think the case was adjourned to permit of the production of further evidence on behalf of the Crown.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. POWER: No. I thought some other member might have something to say, and I did not want to take up the time of the committee for the whole afternoon. But really, sitting as I am at the present time, with members of the Progressive party, I am becoming very talkative.

An hon. MEMBER: You never did better.

An hon. MEMBER: I should think they would ask you to move on.

Mr. POWER: There is another resolution to this effect:

That a sufficient staff of veterinary surgeons be employed by the Soldiers' Settlement Board, and that each settler, under the Soldiers' Settlement Board, be visited at least semi-annually by the representative of this veterinary staff, and all stock inspected and treatment administered, where necessary. All expenses in this connection to be borne by the Soldiers' Settlement Board.

May I ask the minister if this is the "home" treatment which we heard about a few minutes ago?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member read a resolution—I never heard of it before—asking us to send out a veterinary surgeon every six months.

Mr. POWER: To inspect the stock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member think that would be wise?

Mr. POWER: I do not know whether it would be wise or not. I am simply calling the minister's attention to the complaint of a large number of men that this is not done. I will not take it upon myself to go into each and every one of these complaints. Some of them may be purely local; some may have reference only to settlers in the Prairie Provinces and to conditions which do not exist in Quebec. I am not in a position here to judge as to these matters; I have not at my disposal the mass of evidence, or the staff at my disposal to collect all these facts, which the minister has. I am bringing this subject to the attention of the minister, and asking him if he has done anything with reference to it, or if he is willing to do anything. If he is not, let him say so, because personally it does not affect me in any way. I am not going on the land; I could not farm if I wanted to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The cost of sending a veterinary surgeon around to each settler every six months would approximate $400,000 a year—that is, if the veterinary sur-

geons could be secured. As a matter of fact, they could not be secured; we could not get enough veterinary surgeons to do this work. In the next place, these men are visited by Field Supervisors who, being specialists in agriculture—I think practically all, if not all, are graduates of agricultural colleges—know more about farming than merely the care of stock or the condition of stock if the animal should be suffering from any disease. These supervisors have such a general knowledge as renders them able to assist the settler in every particular. Now what would be the common sense of sending a veterinary surgeon around every six months, even assuming there is no information to show he is not needed at all? I do not think the hon. member would need to be classed as a farmer, or need to have any special information of any kind, to bring him, upon reflection, at once to the conclusion that such a suggestion would not appeal to any one; it would be a very great expense and utterly unjustified. I never heard of this resolution before; I did hear of the first one, and it is the only one I know of. I may inform the hon. member that a delegation from the organization in question waited upon the Government and presented certain resolutions, but they never said a word about this particular resolution, and I give them very great credit for the omission.

Mr. POWER: I thank the minister for the answer which he has given; it is a far more reasonable one than the reply he first gave to me. I hope he will continue to answer in the same fashion other questions I put to him along similar lines, and perhaps the Great War Veterans will be more than pleased with him. I am sorry the minister did not make it his business to read these resolutions. For that reason I am all the more convinced that I should make it my business to let him know about them. If the minister has not seen them, I am very glad to be able now to bring them to his attention. He has already spoken with reference to the resolution that returned soldiers should be appointed as valuators, so I do not need to ask him about it again. The next resolution is worded as follows:

That advisory committees be instructed from Ottawa that the Act, as it concerns them, is for guidance in their decisions, and that the head of the Soldiers' Settlement Board should arrange that these advisory committees have sufficient latitude to deal with cases which vary from the ordinary to a degree not provided for in the Act, and further, that they have full power to determine the acreage required by each individual settler for the successful carrying out of his operations.

I think the minister ought to take up a resolution of that kind. I quite understand he may have regulations in his department but perhaps it would be well—though I have not much faith in giving any discretion to any departmental authority—to give instructions to these advisory boards, or to his department, that the absolute regulation may be infringed when by so doing a greater service may be rendered to one of the returned men.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I may say that what is called for in that resolution is already the practice. The boards have discretion within the circumference of the statute; we have no power to give them a discretion beyond the limit of the statute itself.

Mr. HALBERT: If the hon. member (Mr. Power) who has just spoken has run out—

Mr. POWER: Oh, no, I need a rest.

Mr. HALBERT:—I rise at this time to compliment the board on the chairman that they have selected. I want to make this addition to what has been said because the chairman and myself happened to be boys together in Dufferin county; and as I have known him for some years you will realize that we are not boys any longer. The remark has been made that the chairman has not had military experience, but I can testify that he has had farming experience. He has been brought up on and has worked on a farm, and I think that experience well qualifies him for this position. In my opinion the board is extremely fortunate in having as chairman a man with the experience and ability which Mr. Black possesses. Coming as we both do from Dufferin county—which gives three members to this House at the present time, although of course they do not all represent that riding here—I am very glad to bear that testimony to him. I also want to compliment the board on the very efficient way in which they are buying the equipment for the soldiers—the harness and so on. I also wish to compliment them on being successful enough to get manufacturers to sell their goods at a better price than that at which I could buy them. Therefore I think we should not leave all the flowers until after these men are dead and then strew them on their graves.

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) drew the attention of the minister to the necessity of acting carefully in granting increased loans. I am not

familiar with other farm lands, but those in Ontario are high at the present time. Some fault was found with the board at the commencement of the operations on account of their having bought poor farms, but that may have been when the man was in charge whom the hon. minister says is no longer connected with the board, and practically that trouble has been done away with. I think soldiers should be started on good quality farms. The judges to pick out these lands should be experts, because it would be unfortunate to get our returned men started on poor farms.

The hon. member from Quebec South (Mr. Power) referred to farms being bought from their owners who were retiring from farming. As far as my knowledge goes, it was not farmers who were retiring who were selling their farms, but rather farmers who were on small farms and were desirous of buying larger farms, and therefore they were glad to sell their farms to the board. The reason I draw attention to the price of land being high in Ontario, and to the subject of advancing more money for the purchase of such land, is that I believe we shall find the price of farm lands depreciate, as well as the price of stock, and the depreciation might eventually reach the point that, if the land was bought at too high a price the depreciation would eventually eat up the money the returned man had put into his farm. I agree with the member for Red Deer that although those men may have to work as hard as our fathers did, it will give them a stiff upper lip and no doubt make better men of them.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I think we can well leave soldier settlement in the hands of the board when we have as its chairman the capable man who is now occupying that position.

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that neither the minister nor the chairman of the board need any assurance from me of my interest in the work they are doing, nor of my appreciation of it. But perhaps because of that very interest and appreciation there are a few matters that I would like to ask their special consideration of. First, I am well aware from my personal contact with many of them that a number of settlers at the present time are not in a position to go on. In some cases it is true that is due to their own fault; they did not have means when they went on the land, they exhausted their loans, and the consequence is that unless they can get seed and feed, and, in some cases, even provisions for their household, they are going to have to leave their farms for this season and make a living elsewhere. That is one matter that will require attention in the West this spring. These men in some cases are anxious to secure loans for seed from the municipalities, and generally our western municipalities are ready to make the necessary provision, but it will be understood that if one or two men who are not suitable are among the number of men requiring assistance the municipality is not anxious to risk its money for them, and feels that the burden is on the Federal Government rather than on the local authorities.

Another matter that has in the past caused very considerable criticism throughout the West has been the tardiness with which settlement was made for stock and equipment purchased. I think probably that has largely been corrected, or at any rate it can be corrected by small changes in administration; but it has been quite a grievance both to the settler and to his vendor.

One other matter. I have disagreed with the chairman of the board in his choice of supervisors from amongst college men,—mainly young men. I hold the opinion very strongly that supervisors should be men of considerable age and experience, rather than very young men who have just come out of college, even though they might be able to write a better essay or pass higher in an examination on botany or some other such subject than the older practical men.

Connected with that, too, both in regard to supervisors and to inspectors of land, is what to my mind constitutes a serious weakness—that the pay is not sufficient to hold good men. I understand that the average pay of supervisors is $125 a month, and of land inspectors $150 a month. Furthermore, the latter are not engaged for the whole year, but only for the active season from probably the first of March to the first of December. For $1,300 a year you cannot get the type of man that should be employed by the board. While I mention this criticism, I would also mention this in excuse of the board, that I know they are doing their very best to keep down expenses. But since the success of this work will depend not less upon administration than upon the calibre of the men in the field, it is a poor point at which to attempt economies; and I think that you need rather to employ inspectors the year round at good salaries, and to employ supervisors who have had some experience and

who can command better pay because they can give better service.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I rise to make one observation in regard to this matter. Before doing so I wish to endorse what the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Davis) has said in respect to supervisors. I think the board would be well advised to employ older men, for although these young fellows coming out of college may have the technical education, they have not the practical experience.

When the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) rose to speak this afternoon he drew attention to the fact that he was speaking from this particular end of the Chamber, and he hastened to inform the committee that he was only here for the time being. Now, Sir, I believe if the member for Quebec South were to decide to sit with this group permanently it might be necessary for him to revise his views in some particulars. It is only a few weeks ago that the hon. member in a very able address charged the Agrarians or the farmers of this country with profiteering--at least, he tried to put them in the profiteer class. That is one thing he would have to disabuse his mind of.

When I returned to the West last fall I took occasion to meet the returned men in my constituency at a number of places, and their big criticism was the slowness with which inspections were made in Saskatchewan last year. I was informed by returned men that in some cases options that had been taken upon land expired before inspection and valuation was made. Again, in many cases inspection had not been made before the snow was on the ground, and during the winter the men were in a state of uncertainty as to whether or not they were going to get the lands. I hope the minister will see to it that this year the inspections are cleaned up early in the fall so that the men will not be kept in suspense.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to refer to some remarks made by the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Davis), supplemented and supported by my hon. friend (Mr. Johnston). The criticism was that there should not be such an adherence to young men, particularly agricultural college graduates, in the selection of supervisors. The duty of the field supervisor is to visit and assist the settler periodically after he goes on the land. There would be advantage in securing older men—experienced, successful farmers—but the difficulties are twofold. First, experienced, successful farmers are not available in these times at the prices which the board are able to pay. The conditions under which farming has been carried on during the last eight years have been too favourable to make it pay for a farmer to take a position of this kind for only part of the year at $150 a month. But secondly, and more important, we have been anxious to the utmost of our ability to secure returned men. Now, we cannot as a rule take returned men as appraisers, for the reasons that I have given; consequently we are more than anxious to take them as field supervisors, and we do so take them. It is very hard to get a returned man who is anything but a fairly young man and who at the same time knows agriculture. If you are going to have a returned man, and also an agriculturist, then about the best you can select is the agricultural college graduate who is a returned man. Consequently, our field supervisors are predominatingly of that class.

The hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) states that he has heard of cases of delay in Saskatchewan in the securing of valuations. There undoubtedly has been delay in winter. We have consistently refused to inspect land when it is under snow; I do not feel that we can do it when the land is under snow, and do it right. Consequently there is delay then, but the settler will simply have to put up with it because we cannot have winter inspections and at the same time protect the interests of the board. I do not think that there has been any general delay in summer. There may have been a few individual cases, but none of them have come to my ears until now, and the settlers are not slow to write me if there is anything wrong. The average time between application and the completion of inspection is between two and three weeks, and that is certainly not long. There were inspected in Saskatchewan last year approximately 5,600 farms, so that with the limited staff at our disposal the hon. member will see that there has been anything but lethargy in the carrying on of the work.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I have passed this information on to the minister as it came to me, but I wish to impress upon the minister that it is imperative that the inspection be cleaned up in the fall so that the men will not have to be in uncertainty during the winter months. As to the employment of returned men, my view is that returned

men should be employed wherever possible, other things being equal. But I would not employ a returned man if I thought I could get a better man. I would say that in respect to the chairman of this board; I believe that he is the right man for the position, and from the fact that he is the right man there results a benefit to all returned men.

6 p.m.

Mr. CALDWELL: In New Brunswick we were able to keep up with the inspection branch of the work all right, but our trouble was to get the legal documents made out after the purchase had been made. As a member of the local branch in our province I know that recommendations were made time and again to the chairman of the board that a solicitor should be provided for each county to look up the records and get out the papers without delay after a purchase was made. In a number of cases last summer we had so much delay that we had to get authority to make agreements of sale between the board and the man from whom we were buying, pending the making out of the formal legal documents, and in that way we got the settlers on the land in time to harvest the crops; otherwise, that would have been impossible. In fact, those from whom the lands are purchased do not want to wait three months before the transfer is effected and the money is paid, and they do not feel like giving up the farm to the settler until they have something more reliable than a man's word for it that the price stated will be paid for the property. Our solicitor in New Brunswick had quite a large practice of his own, and he said that he simply did not have time to keep up with all the word. This soldier settlement work had to wait until he got his own work done,—that is, if he did not farm it out to some one else. In that respect I think some improvement might be made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If we had a solicitor in each county the cost would be utterly indefensible, if not startling. By our system of having a solicitor in the service of the board—I think that is the case in New Brunswick—we get more expeditious results, and we have reduced the legal costs allowed to lawyers in respect of searching titles for the board from an average of $20 to $22 per title to about $4 per title. In Alberta alone we saved by that method $180,000 in eight months. We are extending the system throughout the whole Dominion.

Mr. CALDWELL: My proposal would not be to employ a solicitor in each county to devote his whole time to the work. In our province we had offers from solicitors in the different counties to take up this work at so much per deed, and I believe that the work could have been done just as cheaply in New Brunswick if we had so employed a man in each county. Several lawyers from different counties talked to me about this matter. I am not sure that you could get it done for $4 each. That looks to me very cheap, because my experience with lawyers has been that they will hardly bid you the time of day for less than that.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 73 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ignace Perugini.—Mr. Copp.

Bill No. 74 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Murray Gray.—Mr. MacNutt.

Bill No. 76 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gladys Stewart Addison.—Mr. Stewart (Lanark).

Bill No. 77 (from the Senate), for the relief of Fedorin Cope.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 75 (from the Senate), for the relief of Albert Harvey McBride.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 79 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alexander Scougall.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 81 (from the Senate) for the relief of Ada Mabel Sanderson.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 82 (from the Senate), for the relief of John Albert Green.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 83 (from the Senate), for the relief of Emily Cruickshank.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 84 (from the Senate), for the relief of Cyril Graham Sinclair.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 86 (from the Senate), for the relief of Richard Ernest Anderson.—Mr. Cronyn.

Bill No. 80 (from the Senate), for the relief of Edith Gertrude Willis.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 87 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Edward Dowthwaite.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 88 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Ferby Gatenby.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 89 (from the Senate), for the relief of Michael Joseph Courtney.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 90 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Patrick O'Neill.—Mr. Stewart (Lanark).

Bill No. 91 (from the Senate), for the relief of Robert Ernest Beadie.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 23, to incorporate Canadian American Fire Insurance Company. (As amended and recommending that the title be changed to "An Act to incorporate Aberdeen Fire Insurance Company.").—Mr. Griesbach.

Bill No. 71, respecting The Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—Mr. Mewburn.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 95 (from the Senate) for the relief of William George Mackness.—Mr. Fraser.

Bill No. 96 (from the Senate) for the relief of Charles Elias Vardon.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 97 (from the Senate) for the relief of John Hamilton Harvey.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 98 (from the Senate) for the relief of James Goddard.—Mr. MacNutt.

Bill No. 99 (from the Senate) for the relief of Frederick Stephen Hartmann.—Mr. MacNutt.

Bill No. 100 (from the Senate) for the relief of William George McBride.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 101 (from the Senate) for the relief of George Stinson.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 102 (from the Senate) for the relief of John James Davis.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 105 (from the Senate) to incorporate United Canada Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Blake.

Bill No. 106 (from the Senate) for the relief of Arthur Jones.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 107 (from the Senate) for the relief of Eva Mary Moss.—Mr. Sheard.

Second Reading of Bill No. 110 (from the Senate) for the relief of Nellie Adeline Wallace.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 111 (from the Senate) for the relief of Marion Olive Booth.—Mr. Blake.

SUPPLY.

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

Soldiers' Land Settlement, $50,017,000.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock we had, I believe, just terminated the discussion on this item. Shall the item carry?

Mr. POWER: Before the item carries, Mr. Chairman; I have a large number of resolutions, passed by the Great War Veterans in convention assembled, to bring to the attention of the minister. Some of these resolutions have already been discussed, but I am under the impression that owing to the fact that very important business is to come on later time will perhaps be saved were I to ask the minister to obtain through his very efficient department, copies of these resolutions and see to it that they are placed before the committee now sitting on Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. This committee, I am sure, will be in a position to deal with matters affecting the re-establishment of the soldier, as it has already dealt with the question of pensions. But before asking the minister to do this, I would like to draw his attention particularly to some of the resolutions in the hope that he will be able to settle the grievances complained of, and thus relieve the committee referred to of the necessity of bringing in any recommendations.

One of the resolutions asks that the Settlement Board make arrangements for the breaking of wild lands in any locality where there are large soldier settlements; and another recommends that all leased lands be re-inspected and re-classified immediately, and that such inspection be conducted by experts other than branch inspectors. There are a number of others with reference to waste land; and one in particular with reference to Dominion lands which recommends that service in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces be held equivalent to residence and duty done irrespective of whether the entry was made prior or subsequent to enlistment. As I said before, it may not, perhaps, serve any useful purpose to take up the time of the House with this matter, but there is no doubt that the soldiers appear to have a real grievance, and this grievance should receive a hearing from some authority. The best possible body at present constituted for that purpose is the Committee of Re-establishment.

Before closing, however, I would like to make this statement,—that though it is rather early to unduly criticize the whole policy of re-establishment, it does seem to me that if this is intended to be a policy of colonization, in the old provinces at any rate, it has failed of its purpose, inasmuch as old farms are being taken up by new settlers who may or may not make agricultural experts, and so for the time during which greater production is needed that

greater production will not be obtained. If this scheme is intended for re-establishment of our soldiers, it sins in this respect, that we are re-establishing one class of soldiers at the expense of all the other classes. On the principle of giving equal justice to all the Government should make some provision whereby other soldiers will also be enabled to re-establish themselves.

Mr. McISAAC: Mr. Chairman, when we take into account the magnitude of this undertaking, the very large amount of money involved, and the great number of soldiers to be dealt with, and, further, when we consider that the whole matter is new and that the minister and his associates have had nothing to guide them in working out this intricate problem, it appears to me that he and the board of management are entitled to the greatest possible commendation.

From every point of view the report presented to this committee is admirable. I can scarcely permit the occasion to pass without making a brief reference to the province from which I come—Prince Edward Island, and to express my gratification at the excellent showing that this small province—the smallest in Confederation — has made. According to the report 234 settlements were made, which is a very large number in proportion to the total population of the province. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but the high average value per acre of the lands appropriated for settlement in that province, over $22 is most gratifying, it being the third highest, British Columbia coming first and Alberta second. Another very agreeable fact is that among these 234 soldiers who were settled on the Island only one failed to make good, which is a very pleasant feature indeed.

On the whole, then, when we consider this question in all its phases,—the enormous amount of money involved and the magnitude of the work—and when we contrast the intricacy of the problems to be solved with the marked success that has attended the solution of those problems by the minister and his board of management, and especially by the chairman of that board, I say again, Mr. Chairman, that all concerned are deserving of the highest praise.

Mr. MacNUTT: I want to take this opportunity of putting in a good word for the chairman of the Soldiers' Settlement Board, Doctor Black. I have had a good deal of correspondence with him and numerous conversations, and I know him to be perfectly efficient, and that his heart is in the work. Why he was appointed rather than a returned soldier I cannot say, but possibly at the time there was no sufficiently qualified returned soldier available. I can say, however, from my experience of Dr. Black that he was a good choice; he is doing his work well and, I think, in the interests of the soldiers. I understand that about 90 per cent of the officials of the board are returned soldiers, which is a very fair showing.

There have been, however, some defects in local administration. I take a good deal of interest in the work of the board, and last fall I spent several weeks in order to ascertain how the Soldiers' Settlement Act was working out in practice. I found very few complaints of wrong valuations (there were some, of course); but there were numerous complaints of delays in land valuation and stock inspection. Delays in land valuation have already been dealt with this afternoon, and I need only add that I know of cases where the applications were approved in the middle of the summer or even earlier, but inspections were not made, and, of course, when the snow came those inspections were hung up until the following spring. Now, it seems to me that in many cases this delay was entirely inexcusable. A few weeks should be all that is necessary between the time of the application being approved and the inspection being made. Those soldiers whose inspections were delayed have had to wait until spring, not only for the valuation of the land, but if that is approved, for the valuation of the stock, and that means that they are losing a year. I am speaking, of course, of men who want to buy improved farms.

There are two classes of inspection: Land valuating, and stock and implement inspection. A good land man may not be a good stock man; and the converse may be the case. I think, though, that wherever possible the duties should be combined, and that when a man makes a valuation of the land, if he is a capable man, he should also make an inspection of the stock and implements. But in any event, there is no reason why stock and implement inspection should be delayed on account of the snow. I found a large number of men whose land had been inspected did not know what to do—they were losing options in stock and good markets, and were very much discontented. I took the matter up at Regina, and a very good land valuator was authorized, who, however, at that time had no authority to inspect stock and implements, although he was a first-class man at this work. He was called into Regina and given instructions to go over the district I

am speaking about—my own constituency—and as I kept in touch with him and also with the returned men by phone and otherwise, I found that he was doing good work. He had had sixty or seventy cases to start with. The men were waiting for an inspection which could have been made considerably earlier. However, most of these cases have been dealt with, and there has been a great improvement along this line which I hope will continue. This plan for the settlement of soldiers upon the land is a good one if you get the right men on the right kind of land and deal with them in a proper way. But you must give them a good start; if they get a bad start it will be hard for them to make up. They have a good deal on their shoulders, but after all they are called upon to pay an interest rate of only a little more than seven per cent on the cost of the land which covers principal as well. If a man went to a loan company he would probably have to pay eight per cent or thereabouts simply for the use of the money. I do think, however, that in the matter of repayment, the amounts allowed for stock and implements should, if possible, be put on the same basis as amounts allowed for land. Of course, the amount is amortized for four years, the first two years without interest. But even so, the first few years are going to be most difficult for the settler. I know that the whole thing has to be done on business lines, but in any case the land is responsible for the whole debt incurred by the settler when he takes advantage of this loan together with the stock and implements. Moreover, the land would increase in value as time went on, and the Government would still have good security. The suggestion that the amounts which are expended upon the purchase of stock and implements should be included with the land payments is one which I think is well worthy of consideration, in the general interests of soldier settlement. As to the defects of local administration to which I have referred, I believe that the machinery is now runing more smoothly under the chairmanship of Dr. Black, who has kept in touch with matters of this kind, and I am satisfied that the plan will work well in the future.

Mr. MORPHY: So many uniformly delightful things have been said to-day about the administration of this department that a changed condition has been brought about in this Chamber. It is rather pleasing to me, as one who has had a good deal to do with individual cases before the Soldiers' Settlement Board, to find that my experience has been the general experience of all those who have spoken and who have had dealings with the board. It is true that the encomiums have come largely from friends of the third or Agrarian party, and from this side of the House. Whether it is because these hon. gentlemen have taken a keener interest in the welfare of the soldier than hon. gentlemen opposite, I do not know; but it struck me as rather peculiar that all the commendatory remarks had come from these two sides of the House. They have come, I believe, from the sincerity of the hearts of those who have had to do with the board. My mind reverts to the time when this board was being formed. All kinds of predictions of disaster were made; the Government were entering it was said, upon a ruinous undertaking the end of which no man knew. The country would be impoverished; the soldier would fall down in the undertaking and leave his debts unpaid; there would be a great financial loss all round. It is rather pleasing to know now from the minister that the scheme has been well thought out and that to-day we have fifteen or sixteen thousand returned soldiers on the land, practically all making good—so good that already some of them have been able to pay back to the Government, long before the repayment was required, the money that was advanced to them. This is a hopeful sign, because it will operate as an incentive to those who have yet to take up land under the soldier settlement scheme. So that we have launched upon the sea of Canadian life a scheme which goes to re-establish the soldier, to put him upon his feet, to enable him to make a first-class living for himself, and which also ensures to the consumers of the country a vastly greater production than would have been the case had this plan not been adopted. In this early period of reconstruction it is pleasing to find this branch of soldier settlement and re-establishment meeting with a great measure of success. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) who would have had to take the responsibility for failure, is entitled to the credit for the success of the scheme, and so far as it has been a success I join with other hon. gentlemen who have congratulated him. But the thing that struck me more than anything else in my dealing with the board was the manner in which the service outside of Ottawa—in Toronto, for instance—was carried on. A great deal of credit is due to Dr. Black

for having followed the example of the minister in getting round him a good staff and in prosecuting the work outside of what we might call headquarters. The executive in Toronto are up-to-date, business-like, prompt, courteous, and altogether alive to the work that they have to do. I congratulate Dr. Black on his services and on the services of those whom he has seen fit to bring into the country's service under him. I have great pleasure in giving this testimony, based, as it is, upon my own personal experience.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I desire to make some remarks later anent the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Power) and also as to some suggestions made by the member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt), but as the House expects another matter of importance to go on to-night which cannot be deferred much longer, I beg to move, in accordance with the suggestion of the Acting Prime Minister, that the committee rise, report progress and beg leave to sit again this day.

Motion agreed to; progress reported.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

On the motion of Sir George Foster the House returned to the order of motions.

Mr. HUME CRONYN (London): I beg to move:

That the first report of the Special Committee appointed to enquire into the matter of the development in Canada of scientific research be now considered and that the recommendations thereof be commended to the consideration of the Government.

It is not uncommon when a member of the House rises to introduce a resolution of this type to hear him state that the matter is one of prime importance, nor is it hard to understand such a declaration, because if the matter at issue did not in the mind of the mover seem to be important he doubtless would have hesitated to bring it to the attention of the House. When, therefore, by way of introduction, I assert my belief that the resolution and the report it seeks to confirm are of importance to the country, I am but affirming my pronounced conviction on that point. Doubtless matters already debated in the House, and to be debated, are rightly classed as important, but I doubt if there be one whose influence, if carried to conclusion, would be as widespread and enduring, at least to the material prosperity of Canada, as that dealing with scientific industrial research. I therefore crave a hearing and consideration from the members to the remarks that may follow in this debate, as I am above all anxious that Parliament and the country shall understand the recommendations of the committee. My part of the task will be to co-ordinate the report made at the spring session of last year with the present report, as the latter is the logical outcome of what previously occurred.

Let me go back for a moment to review what has happened. Some three years ago under the terms of an Act passed by this Parliament an Honourary Advisory Council was appointed to survey the present situation in this respect and to report thereon. After very carefully considering the matter and making numerous and widespread inquiries, consulting those both here and abroad best fitted to express an opinion, the council reached the conclusion that scientific industrial research was worthy of support by this Dominion, and that such support could most effectively be applied by the foundation of a central research institute in or near the capital of the country. For more extended reference to these reports I would direct the House to the reports of the administrative chairman of the council which have from time to time been laid on the Table. During the spring session of last year a Select Parliamentary Committee was appointed to inquire into the whole matter and I would ask leave to read one or two extracts from their report:

Upon consideration of the whole question, your committee beg to report that scientific research in Canada requires and deserves generous encouragement and financial support from the Dominion Government. In no better way can the natural resources of our country be made available with the same degree of celerity and certainty, nor can our native industries achieve their proper position in the markets of the world unless given the advantages accruing from scientific research and discovery.

Your committee feel that the time has arrived when further steps must be taken and additional financial support be available if this country desires to make a proper use of its potential assets and to attain or maintain its standing in the commonwealth of nations.

The attention of your committee has been directed to the fact that there does not exist in this country any institution corresponding to the Bureau of Standards at Washington. As a result, Canada is dependent on the neighbouring republic or on other countries for information and guidance in matters which vitally concern her industries. A study of the evidence submitted will convince any impartial student of the weakness of our position in this regard and of the need for a speedy remedy. Your committee, therefore, recommend to the consid-

eration of the Government the establishment of a Dominion Bureau of Standards.

While your committee, as above stated, are unanimous as to the need of co-operation and national support of scientific research, yet a majority of its members, owing to the lack of time and pressure of other parliamentary duties, feel they have been unable to so consider and digest the evidence adduced and the other material brought to their attention as to advise the House at this time what may be the best method of aiding and encouraging scientific research throughout Canada.

These extracts are from the report of the committee of a year ago. The committee appointed this session has given consideration to the question raised by the former committee, and the report which has just been tabled shows the findings of the committee in that respect. As, possibly, that report has not been read by most of the members present I might make a short review of its contents.

After reciting the situation in somewhat the same language that I have just used the report goes on record as follows:

The urgency of action to be taken to establish a National Research Institute to promote scientific and industrial research in Canada is patent to all who know what is being done abroad in this line.

There is in Canada no organization which even distantly approaches the character of any of the research institutes established abroad or now being established.

The report then states what is being done, what has been done, and what is about to be done, in this matter, by countries like Great Britain, the United States, Japan, and other overseas Dominions. It goes on:

It is evident, therefore, that Canada, to meet the international competition which the work of these laboratories will serve to accentuate very greatly, must have a National Research Institute, which will place at the command of the country all the resources of science and further the development of the natural wealth of the country to meet the huge burden of debt imposed by the war. The developed wealth of Canada as compared with that of the United States is small. If the natural resources of the Dominions were appropriately utilized, its developed wealth might readily be as much as ten times what it is now. The conversion of our natural resources into developed wealth, however, can only be accomplished through the application to them of science of the most highly advanced type.

One example is given, among many, of what it is hoped may be accomplished by scientific research, and it would be easy to instance others of equal importance. The report then states:

Your Committee believe the first step towards providing for the research required is the establishment of a National Research Institute whose functions will be to carry on researches, not only parallel to those of the Bureau of Standards at Washington, but such also as will assist in the development of the natural resources of the country and will promote the application of the most advanced scientific knowledge to all lines of industrial production in Canada.

The report then sets forth just what work such an institution would undertake. I do not propose to read that portion of the report verbatim, but in general terms I might explain that the functions of such an institute will be in the main of two kinds. In the first place it will be charged with the standardization of measures throughout the country, including in that term (a) standards of length, volume, weight, etc., of heat, light, electricity and other forms of energy; (b) of scientific and technical apparatus whether used in the public service or in the industries of the country; and (c) of the quality of the materials required in the construction of public works and of the supplies needed in the various branches of the Government service.

The second function of the institute will be to direct and supervise researches into technical processes and methods so as to assist, first, in the development of the natural resources of Canada; second, in the expansion of existing industries or the furthering of new industries; third, in utilization of those materials which have hitherto been discarded as waste products. To put it shortly, the institute is not only to be a bureau of standards in the narrower significance of the term, but it will as well undertake the supervision of scientific industrial research for the benefit of the country at large.

The methods to be followed in the fulfilment of the latter part of the programme will be in the main those already adopted by Great Britain and the United States. An endeavour will be made—nor do I see any reason why it should fail—to form in this country trade associations or, as it is proposed to call them, trade guilds, for research. That is to say, the industries scattered throughout the land that are interested in some form of activity will be brought together, and through their joint efforts and subscription a competent scientific investigator or research expert will be selected and his salary paid by the guild. This man and his assistants will be allotted a properly equipped laboratory in the governmental central research institute where he will find at his disposal not merely the various mechanical and physical appliances with which the institute will be furnished, but as well the skilled experience

and advice of the Government experts in charge of the institute. As I have stated, the plan outlined is that already followed in Great Britain and the United States. In the former country indeed the government is inclined to deal more liberally with the industries than our plan suggests because under the plan adopted by Great Britain, there is supplied out of the public funds to trade associations for research an equal amount to any sum which these associations can themselves raise. The report concludes with the following recommendation:

Your Committee accordingly recommend:

(1) that a National Research Institute for Canada, endowed with the function and of the character indicated in the foregoing, be established in the vicinity of Ottawa on a site fifty acres in area of easy access and conveniently located for water, gas and electric power supply.

(2) that the first building to be erected for the Institute should be of the best modern construction suitable for laboratory work and of such dimensions as to provide accommodation for some years to come.

(3) that there be appropriated by Parliament $500,000 for the purchase of the site and the construction of the building, $100,000 for the scientific equipment of the Institute, and $50,000 for salaries and maintenance during the first year of operation.

(4) that legislation be enacted at this session to provide for the establishment of this National Research Institute and the government of the same.

I do not propose to discuss clause by clause these recommendations, but lest the sums mentioned might at first blush appear large, let us say to our Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), particularly in view of the need for stringent economy recognised and adopted by the Government, permit me to say that these figures were not reached without mature consideration. They are based in the first place on the information given to the committee last year by the director of the Bureau of Standards in the United States, and, taking into account the increased cost of building material, they practically agree with the initial expenditure made in Washington some twenty years ago for the same purpose. The figures are further confirmed by the plans and estimates prepared by a competent architect and by the judgment of those whose knowledge of such matters can be relied upon. It may be pointed out that the expenditure of the amounts mentioned must of necessity be spread over a term of years. It will be quite impossible to erect the building required and instal the equipment within the present financial year. So far as the item for salaries and maintenance is concerned, the greater part of it must remain in abeyance until the institute is completed and is actually in operation. It is believed by the committee that the expenditure proposed will provide for the requirements of scientific research in Canada for some years to come, and it is our opinion that it would be shortsighted to make the common mistake of failing to recognize the inevitable expansion which must take place in a movement of this kind.

May I note in passing that one of the distinguished witnesses who appeared before the committee last year namely, Professor McLennan of Toronto, expressed disappointment at the meagreness of the budget which this committee has suggested and contrasted it disadvantageously with the infinitely more liberal provisions which the British Government has made for the same purpose since the war.

I do not propose to discuss at this stage any of the alternative suggestions which have come before the committee. They were earnestly considered and much of the testimony introduced last year bore directly on the point. The conclusion of the committee was definite, that the plan now recommended is undoubtedly the best; but I do not wish to be understood as saying that in future some qualifications of this plan may not be wise. So far as one can see, a central research institute will always be a necessity, although as in other departments there must, and I should think would be, a natural growth. If in the course of the debate questions arise in regard to alternative proposals, doubtless they can be dealt with by other speakers, or I shall be happy to take them up when I have an opportunity of closing the debate.

As before stated, the committee during last session heard evidence of a number of expert witnesses both from this country and from the neighbouring republic. These men were experts, some of whom had spent their entire lives in scientific research. While that testimony and reference to such works as are available on the subject convinced me personally of the wisdom of the proposal, it seemed wise to make a personal investigation so that I could look more closely into the actual working of institutions similar to the one proposed. With that end in view I took advantage of the late Easter vacation to pay a visit to Washington to see the Bureau of Standards, and to Pittsburgh to examine the Mellon Institute; and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like briefly to repeat the impressions gained by that visit, impressions which have already been conveyed to the committee.

The Bureau of Standards is situated a few miles out of Washington close to the electric line, in the centre of what has become a well-settled residential district. The purchase made twenty years ago was of eight acres. Since that time other portions surrounding the original area have been bought and the total holding is now 36 acres. This area is considered too small for the needs of the bureau, but unfortunately the territory surrounding it has been largely built up and the price of land has reached an extraordinarily high level. The original building is encircled by others of larger dimensions which are devoted to the ever-growing needs of the Bureau, and during the war the United States Government erected a building larger than any of those that had previously gone up. This was intended to be used for some specific war purpose but it had not been occupied at the time the Armistice was signed and the President of the United States thereupon handed it over to the Bureau. The building is of the finest factory construction, of steel and reinforced concrete and with maximum window space. It cost in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000. It has been dedicated by the Bureau of Standards to Scientific Industrial Research and the greater part of it is already occupied by various industries or associations with a view to solving their problems—problems which constantly confront all those in the modern industrial world.

The annual estimates of the Bureau, which were considered a few weeks ago, are over $2,000,000 a year. It is true that there is some disposition this year on the part of the Houses of Congress, owing to the nearness of the presidential election, to exercise a sporadic economy by lopping off a certain amount of these estimates, but it is not thought that the activities of the Bureau will be seriously prejudiced by what, after all, is a temporary political movement. The original function of the Bureau was to determine standards throughout the United States. If we change but one word in the report now before the House—that is delete the word "Canada"—we have a complete description of the activities of the Bureau on its standards side. I do not propose to read a list of these activities to you. I think I have discussed them in speaking of our own institute, but among them I might mention that the Bureau tests everything purchased by the Government; indeed, it goes farther and at the request of the various departments, it prepares specifications of all important materials which are to be purchased for the use of the public service. One or two instances of this kind might be illuminating. The American Government desired to purchase incandescent lamps. Upon investigation by the Bureau it was found that the lamp supplied by the lowest tenderer was deficient in certain qualities. As a result of this inquiry the Bureau definitely established a type of lamp which would give the maximum of light and the greatest length of service. What happened? The wide-awake manufacturers in the United States were only too glad to supply that type of lamp and to secure from the Bureau a certificate as to their quality.

Again, the Government there required, as we do in this country, vast quantities of paper for use in the public service. The usual specification set out the materials that the paper should consist of. But when the first shipment came in the Bureau found that the paper supplied lacked entirely one of the necessary ingredients. In this case the manufacturer candidly admitted that he had not tried to live up to the specification because he never dreamed that such a test would be made. He prepared himself at once to give exactly what the Government needed and called for.

The Bureau of Standards investigated on behalf of the Government, the question of storage batteries. They found, as a result of their scientific research into the question, that without expense the ordinary type of battery could be improved by at least ten per cent. The manufacturers, of course, were glad to adopt that improvement and it is now general throughout the whole country. When we consider that $100,000,000 worth of these batteries are each year sold throughout the country, it is perhaps not unfair to credit the Bureau of Standards with a saving to the country of something akin to $10,000,000. As a matter of record that research is still going on in the Bureau and the expert in charge is reasonably hopeful that he may improve the ordinary storage battery by at least 25 per cent over the one found on the commercial market.

With reference to the matter of testing materials supplied to the Government, one can understand the vast quantity of articles like cement, steel, brick and so forth that are used in that country and the statement is made by the officers of the Bureau that the saving of the Government on that one item alone is sufficient to pay the entire cost of the maintenance of the Bureau. Any manufacturer in the United

States is at liberty to submit his wares to be tested at the Bureau of Standards and to receive an official certificate as to their quality. I think we can understand how rapidly improvements along many lines must follow because of this rule. Indeed, some Canadian firms are alive to the advantage and so far have been permitted to submit their goods to the tests of the Bureau of Standards at Washington.

Let me revert for a moment again to the question of paper. The Bureau has installed in one of the buildings a small paper mill and there it manufactures paper for all ordinary uses from the most unpromising material. The Bureau tests the ropes used in the navy, and it also tests the twine used in the various departments. It accumulates thus a great quantity of samples, and instead of throwing these away or selling them to the ragman it converts them into paper. I have a sample of the wrapping paper used by the Government and made from manila rope. Certainly, to any one handling it, it seems to be a first-class article of its kind. They have also made paper out of stranger material than that, because I have a sample of paper made from the banana stalks of plants grown in Siam, made at the request of the representative of Siam. That paper might be very well used for various purposes, such as wrapping fruit, as it has a silky quality. There is also a paper made from a wild grass that grows in that same country—grass which to my mind is precisely like that which grows very freely in the marshes of our western provinces.

There is even a further extension of the standard side of this Bureau because the acceptance of the word "standard" has been enlarged to include standards of practice, and, following that line, standards of safety have been developed, and in co-operation with various states of the Union and municipalities these have been largely accepted throughout the whole Republic. I have under my hand one of the safety codes of standards adopted by the Bureau. It is dated 1916, and is called "The National Electric Safety Code." Now it is said, but I cannot vouch for it, that each year in the United States approximately 1,000 people meet their death by accident with electric appliances. If the use of this code, which sets out in great detail all the necessary precautions which should be taken, is adopted by the States in framing their legislation, or by the municipalities in framing their regulations, so wanton a loss of life may largely be avoided. I note that in the introduction of this code the following paragraph appears:

> The bureau has had the cordial co-operation and assistance of many state industrial and public-service commissions, municipal electrical inspectors, engineers of operating and manufacturing companies, committees of engineering societies, and representatives of the fire and casualty insurance interests, and of the electrical workers. Without such co-operation the work would have been impossible.

Similar codes dealing with the various uses of gas, with fire prevention and fire-resisting construction have been published and many others are under way. So much for the standard side of the Bureau.

Last year when Dr. Stratton, director of the Bureau, appeared before our committee, he told us something of the industrial research which was carried on in that institution. I must confess, I was greatly impressed by the very active development which has occurred along that line. This, in part, is due to the acquisition of the new building to which reference has already been made, but also in part it is due to the general recognition throughout the United States of the immense value to the country of concerted effort in scientific research. There is established at Washington a National Research Council, which, although not a governmental institution, acts in close co-operation with the various scientific departments of the government. One of its main activities is to educate industries throughout the country as to what may be accomplished by scientific research, and to counsel, by personal addresses and printed matter, through its energetic secretary and other officers, all those who might be interested. As a result there is brought prominently before the public the full meaning and significance of the movement. It should not be surprising, therefore, that full advantage has been taken of the facilities offered by the Bureau of Standards, as the industries are free to bring their problems to the Bureau and to have them investigated with the aid of the best material, both physical and mental, which the country can supply. Experience has shown that even bitter rivals in their particular line find the value of co-operation; and we were given ocular demonstration of tests being made of various methods to demonstrate which was the most effective and economical.

The Mellon Institute of Pittsburg is a pioneer institution in purely industrial scientific research. While its building was erected and its overhead expense of $60,000 a year is sup-

plied through the munificence of the Mellon Bros., the institution itself is conducted on a commercial basis, i.e., the parties desirous of taking advantage of its facilities must pay a fixed sum for a year or term of years. The discoveries made by means of the research accrue to the subscriber—or donor as he is termed—although as a rule liberal rewards by way of bonus are granted to the investigator who produces the result. The most striking testimony to the success of the institution is found in the fact that not only is every square foot of their large building occupied, but there is a waiting list of considerable length of those who are desirous of taking advantage of the institution. The institution has published a list of the researches undertaken by it during the past year. These are forty-eight in number, and I would like to mention a few of them to show how varied are the matters inquired into. The first one mentioned is window-glass, the next soap, then dental products, copper, oil, yeast—for which $15,000 is paid for investigation and there is a separate one for bread involving a payment of $10,000 per annum—household utilities, fuel, by-products recovery, insecticides—which has been in existence for some years—fertilizer, laundry—in connection with this we met two young lady scientists who had been in charge of the work for some time—and the last on the list is fruit beverages—hon. gentlemen will see they were anticipating the arid spell which has fallen on the United States. I have quoted at some length from the results of this visit, not because the institutions are American, but because they are nearby and are in line with those we desire to adopt.

It seemed well to give to the House the above sketch of the result of a trip taken with the sole view of ascertaining what could be learned of the actual operation and results of institutions similar to the one suggested for Canada. Many of us, Mr. Speaker, possess in imagination, far up the broad river of Time, an Island of Long Ago. To us it appears a delectable land where life had more of content and leisure than we can expect to gain this side of the grave. I suspect, however, that the mists of the past hide from us most of what was objectionable in that far-off region. H G. Wells may well be right when he exclaims:

> "That large, naked, virtuous, pink natural man, drinking pure spring water, eating the fruits of the earth, and living to 90 in the open air, is a fantasy; he never was nor will be. . . . The real savage is a nest of parasites within and without; he smells, he rots, he starves."

Whatever may be the truth in this respect is but a matter of academic interest, for the world has definitely turned its steps into the highway of national progress. As this morning's paper puts it:

> Do you really want the "good old days" when there were no Pullmans, fast trains, anaesthetics, telephones, bicycles, automobiles, moving pictures, self-binders, hay-loaders, cream-separators, phonographs, cold storage, plate glass, gas cooking ranges, incandescent lights, aeroplanes, elevators, fast ocean liners, X-ray photography, typewriters, adding machines, cash registers, asphalt, microscopes, telescopes, linotypes, high-speed presses, and automatic machines in almost every branch of endeavour? Think it over. Have these things not added something to the measure of human happiness?

If we were to examine the above heterogeneous list or any other which might be compiled we would discover that without science not a single one of the many articles mentioned would be in existence. The world, as I say, has determined on "Progress," as its motto. Other nations are moving forward. Can we in Canada afford to neglect the systematic study of the greatest aid to advancement? Assuredly unless we make the effort we shall be left behind.

I am glad to believe that neither business life nor, what is perhaps more trying, political experience, has wholly atrophied my faculty of imagination—one need not, in a country such as ours, give even free rein to this faculty to visualize the possibilities which may be disclosed by concerted effort in scientific research. While, however, I may have exercised my imagination I have, nevertheless, endeavoured throughout the inquiry to look at this matter from a cold-blooded business point of view. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that from that point alone the establishment of a Central Research Institute will be a paying venture. Had I the resources at my disposal I would conceive it to be a thoroughly sound and profitable investment, provided the value of the discoveries and improvements made by means of such an institute could accrue to my personal advantage.

I have attempted, Mr. Speaker, to refrain from repetition of what I said on this subject nearly a year ago. On that occasion I made the endeavour to cover a wider field; but while the temptation was pressing, I hoped that those hon. members who are interested in the subject might remember something of what was then said and would quite properly resent the threshing of old

straw. I do venture, however, once more, to repeat that the need of such an institute is pressing, that the rewards to the country will be great, and that the expenditure proposed is, in my opinion, amply justified.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of seconding the motion which has been so well proposed by the chairman of this Research Committee, my hon. friend from London (Mr. Cronyn). I think you will agree with me after hearing what he has said that the committee appointed by the House has not followed this inquiry in any haphazard way. Both last session and this session, but particularly last session, the committee had the privilege of hearing distinguished scientists on various questions which it desired to consider in connection with the Institute of Research.

Pioneering is, of course, expensive in all industries, and the committee has had the benefit of the experience gained in European countries and in the United States with regard to the Bureau of Standards and the Institute of Research. I am satisfied that if our country is to take its proper place in the industrial world both of these institutions are necessities for Canada in an industrial sense.

Probably at no period in the history of man has it been easier to demonstrate the value of applied science than it is to-day. The late war has amply shown us what science can do in the field; and the industrial progress of the great nations to-day shows us what the application of science is doing in connection with the industries of the world. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that that nation which is best equipped with scientific knowledge, scientific apparatus, and scientific institutions will, in the future, have the best chance in the race for industrial supremacy or, indeed, in that of war.

Canada is rich in natural resources—immensely rich; but in order to transmute these resources into commodities which the world needs one thing particularly is required, and that is applied science. Industry you must have—you must have the intelligent artisan; you must have people in the country who have faith enough in its future to put their capital into manufacturing enterprises; but without science that labour and those manufacturing enterprises would not go very far.

My hon. friend (Mr. Cronyn) has given you very clearly the objects which the committee had in mind in recommending that a Bureau of Standards be established, and in conjunction with it an Institute for Scientific Research. I shall not traverse again the ground that he so well covered, but I would like to refer to just one or two items, particularly in connection with the Bureau of Standards. Take for instance, Mr. Speaker, our unit of measurement, the yard. It had its origin in the mists of antiquity, came across the Channel with the Anglo-Saxons, and now the representative of that system is lying somewhere in the archives of the city of London in the shape of a metal bar of a certain length. In 1870 the French people decided to create a new unit of measurement, and they took a section of a quadrant of the circumference of the earth and called it a metre. It was not very many years before the scientific men of their country discovered that the metre was not scientifically accurate. Since then scientists have discovered a means whereby a measurement can be adopted which is universal and never-changing—the wave of light; and I have no doubt that within the next few years that will be the standard of measurement for length. So I might refer to the unit for the measure of volume and other units of measurement, but I will not detain the House in regard to them.

My hon. friend has referred to the testing of building material—a very excellent thing for us to have to-day—in connection with our public works—in order to ascertain the strength and quality of such materials. I do not think our Government have any means at the present time of making such tests.

With regard to research, it is well known that we have huge areas of tar sands in the northern and western portions of our Prairie Provinces. They have been there for millions of years; they will be there for millions of years longer unless we can discover some means of taking from them their asphaltic products and transferring them to the markets of the world. There is therefore a great field for research in relation to those tar sands. So too with iron ore. We were told here the other day that the higher grades of iron ores are being depleted and that soon we shall have to depend on the low grade ores of Canada—another field for scientific research.

We are about to enter the world as an exporting trade nation, and it is absolutely necessary that our goods when exported should bear the hallmark of quality; otherwise these three transcontinental roads we have built and these great merchant ships we are putting on the oceans of the world

will not carry the cargoes from our shores that they should carry. Therefore I hope that when this Bureau of Standards is established in Ottawa every ton of goods leaving Canada will bear the stamp of that Bureau which will mean Canadian quality of the first class.

I was interested a few days ago to meet a man who told me that our greatest competitors in the sale of wheat in the Liverpool market were the Russians. He informed me that the Russian wheat was sold in Liverpool by sample; the Canadian wheat was sold by standard. And it was easier to sell the Canadian wheat, and it brought a little better price.

In this great province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, there is not one ton of coal—hard coal, soft coal or lignites; and to-day when coal prices are pressing so heavily upon us it is very important, and it will become increasingly important, to find relief from this burden. We have billions of tons of coal east of us, and we have billions of tons of coal west of us, but in this the greatest province, the richest province, the most populous province, there is not one ton of coal. Now, underlying the western provinces there are billions of tons of lignite, which, our scientists tell us, can be transformed into coal almost equal to the Pennsylvania anthracite coal,—and that coal is within our own country. What an excellent thing it would be if the money that we are now sending, and will send, to the United States for hard coal could be kept within Canada; could be used in the purchase of the anthracite which now lies beneath our western prairies. I have no doubt that within a few years this will take place, because its practicability has already been demonstrated.

Potash is one of the things which we must have if we are to continue as an agricultural nation. Potash is one of the great things which made it possible for Germany to raise the field products which she raised. Immense salt deposits have recently been discovered in Nova Scotia, and there are other salt deposits throughout Canada. There is some potash in these salt deposits. It is possible, therefore, that we shall be able to develop the potash industry within our own country.

Electric smelting is only in its infancy. If it were possible to harness the great water-powers of our country and smelt the iron ores to which I referred a few minutes ago, we would keep more than one hundred million dollars of good Canadian money within Canada. Go down to the lumber sections of our country and you will see thousands upon thousands of tons of sawdust banked in the river valleys and wherever saw mills have been or are situated—absolutely going to waste. Now, any scientific man will tell you that that sawdust is a great potential asset; all that is required is the scientific knowledge to tackle the problem and to take from that material some of the commodities which it contains and which we could use. If we had a research institute in this country, with men, with money, and with the necessary apparatus, we could accomplish great work along this line.

The explosive engine has revolutionized traffic. Without the explosive engine you could not have automobiles; without it you could have no aerial navigation; without it no aeroplane could rise into space. But the explosive engine is almost altogether, if not entirely, dependent upon gasoline. Any person who has studied this question will tell you that, according to the opinion of scientific men of the United States, the end of the deposits of petroleum in that country is already in sight. I have not a doubt in my mind that within the lifetime of men who are now within the sound of my voice, the petroleum deposits of the United States will have become exhausted. What then? Some other fuel will have to take the place of petroleum, or gasoline, one of its products. What fuel is most likely to do that? Industrial alcohol. Here is a great field for our research institute.

The oil shales of Canada offer another field for research and experiment. Billions of tons of oil shale from which petroleum can be extracted may be found in the Maritime Provinces. Or, we have still another resource—straw, which is now being burned every year on our prairies, can be transmuted into gas which can be used for power.

We are trying to establish in this country the flax industry. Science, applied to that industry, by cultivating germs which will be placed in tanks with the flax fibre may hasten the retting process and make it possible to produce flax more cheaply, as we must do if we are to compete with the Irish and Belgian products. So with fish refuse —and I might go on indefinitely, but I shall not do so.

I wish to refer, before closing, to a few things that science has done. I shall not elaborate upon what Watt did in the development of steam; Farraday in the development of electricity; Pasteur in the

application of science to the development of the silkworm industry in France, and to the destroying of a disease which killed the sheep of France many years ago. Then we have Graham Bell with the telephone and Kelvin with the compass; and we have wireless telegraphy. Not long ago an American magazine asked its readers to give them a synopsis of what they considered to be the seven wonders of the modern world. From the replies to these inquiries the following were selected as the seven wonders of the modern world: Wireless telegraphy, the telephone, the aeroplane, radium, antiseptics, antitoxins, and the seventh was divided between spectrum analysis and X-rays. All of these, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of antiseptics—even that was introduced not many decades ago—have come into being within our own lifetime.

We have heard a great deal about the paper industry; about what a wonderful thing the pulp industry is in our own country. Do you know how that industry originated? A French naturalist named Réamur was one day walking through the fields of France when he observed a wasp's nest constructed of paper and like material produced by the insects by the mastication of wood fibre and other substances. The naturalist had the imagination to see that this material could be used as paper, and from that simple observation has arisen the whole pulp industry of the world. This gives you a slight idea, Mr. Speaker, of the possibilities of science.

Then, take calcium carbide, the discoverer of which, Mr. Wilson, lived for years in our city. Calcium carbide produces acetylene gas. Many parts of our coasts are lighted with acetylene gas; the miners use acetylene gas in the lamps which they carry in their hats.

A few years ago a girl in Colorado was washing some ore sacks in which ore belonging to her brother had been carried. She noticed in the soap suds some small particles of metal floating on the bubbles. She told that to a scientist; the scientist developed the idea, and to-day you have the flotation process throughout the length and breadth of this land and in the United States as well.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, permit me to quote from Buckle as to the value of science, scientific men and scientific ideas:

> The discoveries of great men never leave us; they are immortal. They contain those eternal truths which survive the shock of empires, outlive rival creeds and witness the decay of successive religions. To the discoveries of genius we owe all that we now have; they are for all ages and all times; never young, never old, they bear the seeds of their own life; they flow on in a perennial stream; they are essentially cumulative and thus influence posterity and after the lapse of centuries produce more effect than they were able to do even at the moment of their promulgation.

[Mr. A. Thompson.]

Mr. J. J. DENIS (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I am fully sensible of the difficulties which the subject now under discussion presents, and were it not for my desire, as a member of the committee which is now reporting to the House, to contribute in my humble way to the discussion, I should certainly have abstained from adressing the House on this occasion.

I offer my compliments to the chairman of the committee for the splendid work which he has accomplished in connection with the subject of the resolution now before the House, which, if adopted, will result in the carrying on of a work of great benefit to the country. This is a question into which politics do not enter at all. It is a question upon which every member can feel perfectly free to express his opinion. What is asked is that a national research institute be established in Canada in order to promote scientific and industrial research generally, which includes a great many subjects, as has been pointed out by the mover of the resolution (Mr. Cronyn). To the casual observer it might appear that this project is a luxury, a sport, something of purely academic interest; but such is not the case. Now the war is over we have to cope with the after-war conditions, and we must not lose sight of the fact that since the war, and even during the war, the different nations of the world have entered upon a wild race to capture the trade of the world and the predominant position in commerce. Even while the war was on and the battlefields of Europe were soaked with blood, the nations had the foresight to appreciate that immediately the war was over this race for the world's trade would be begun. The United States were in a peculiarly advantageous position in this respect, because they only entered the war in its last year practically, and thus were enabled to make preparations which the other nations that had been engaged in the war from the beginning were unable to make. From the report of the Special Committee on Scientific Research we see that Great Britain, France, Italy, the Commonwealth of Australia, New Zealand, the United States, Germany, and Japan, in fact practically all the civilized nations of the world, have re-

cognized since the war is over, or had recognized before the war, the necessity of scientific research in promoting the trade and commerce of their respective countries. Before the war Germany perhaps more than any other nation had travelled in the fields of scientific research, and that is one of the reasons why, rightly or wrongly, she was looked upon as the land of culture. Germany had astonished the world with her marvellous inventions, and it is not too much to say that through her many inventions she had achieved the prosperity through which she was passing when she declared war on the world. Her success in invention continued through the early stages of the war, and in fact all through it. We all remember how, in the month of April, 1915, suddenly and without warning, Germany developed that great gas attack which heralded a new phase in the war. Of course, the use of gas was strictly forbidden by all the rules of war, and no civilized nation had ever attempted to use it up to that time, but the fact remains that Germany had in her possession secrets which the other nations did not possess, or at all events, not to the same extent. We all remember how when these poisonous gases were let loose on our armies, the Allies could not find out their exact composition, but immediately scientists began investigating and determined their composition, and in order to offset the unlawful advantage which Germany had thereby gained the Allies in turn were compelled to invent and manufacture new gases to be used against the German armies. They had also to invent appliances to resist the gases by which they were attacked. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, where would the Allies have been at that time of perplexity if they had not had in their midst scientists and scientific institutions that could devote themselves at once to a study of these gases and devise a protection against them? Germany did other things. We know that before the war she had practically a monopoly of the incomparable dyes which she was selling to the whole civilized world. That is surprising, because one would naturally have expected England to be the place where these dyes were manufactured. In the field of war Germany also had her Zeppelins, her submarines, and that wonderful cannon with a range of 75 miles with which she bombarded Paris in the forever-famous offensive of March, 1918. All through the war Germany brought out new inventions from time to time, and these inventions were so numerous and called into being so many devices on our side in order to counteract them that General Joffre is reported to have said after leaving his army for three or six months he would not be able to lead them any more because he had not kept abreast of the many new developments in warfare.

Germany not only had marvellous inventions of destruction, but her scientific institutions were so advanced that she would have been able to capture the trade of the world had she not committed the blunder of declaring war and trying to subdue mankind by force of arms. The civilized world to-day is determined that no nation shall be allowed to repeat the attempt which Germany launched in 1914, and it is generally recognized now that if trade is to be gained it must be not through war but through peaceful methods, by the development of industries, the intensive prosecution of agriculture, and the exploitation of every resource which a progressive nation can make use of.

And this is just where the question of scientific research becomes important. We are not asking for the establishment of an institution to destroy humanity as the Germans did; we are trying to produce wealth for the benefit of the nation. I hope there will be no serious objection to the proposal now before us, but if there is it can only be in relation to the financial considerations involved. It might be argued that while the proposal is one that is well worthy of consideration there is not sufficient means to take any practical steps in the matter. Well, so far as this objection is concerned, I think every hon. member will realize that scientific research is neither a luxury nor a sport; nor is it a subject of purely academic interest. As was said a moment ago by the mover of the resolution, scientific research is a cold-blooded business proposition, and the motion which is under consideration is nothing if not extremely practical. Our public debt is enormous and we say that we do not know how we shall make ends meet; and some hon. members might conclude that as our expenditures are so high at the present time it is not advisable to give effect to the recommendations which have been made in this matter. Well, Sir, I say that the public debt is certainly enormous, and we are confronted with a great problem to provide the necessary revenue. But from the premises I draw an altogether different conclusion. If we are ever going to discharge the public debt of this country our only hope lies in the development of our natural resources This is the only way in which we shall be able

to pay the huge debt we incurred during the war, and this proposed institute for scientific research, far from adding to the burdens which we already have to bear, will, I am sure, prove a valuable asset, and the benefits that will accrue from its operation will more than offset the expenditures that may be made in connection with it. The Government has recently undertaken a shipbuilding programme which is costing us something like $60,000,000. Whatever objections there may be to this undertaking, a majority of the members of this House have expressed their belief that the expenditure of this $60,000,000 on ships will be a benefit to the country. We have also acquired the property of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The debate on that subject was long, and although we on this side of the House pronounced against the transaction, nevertheless a majority of the members regarded this matter also as beneficial to the Canadian nation, and evidently they believe that the expenditure of $500,000,000 will prove a very wise one. A year or two ago Canada lent considerable sums of money to Roumania, Greece and other foreign states, and this is a matter that is open to very much debate; very diverse views may be held in regard to it; but the fact remains that the Government considered it a sound policy and one that would be advantageous to the people of Canada to lend money to those countries. I cite these stupendous undertakings in order to show that the question of money is not the most serious obstacle. The question is not: What expenses will be involved in the new institution?—but: What revenue will the country derive from its operation? A convincing answer to this question was given in the eloquent speech made by the mover of the resolution, and no one who heard that speech could fail to realize what an enormous advantage the establishment of a Scientific Research Institute must be. I shall not attempt to go into details; one could only touch a few of the multitude of questions that would arise in the consideration of this subject. This proposed institution could deal with an infinitude of matters. As an example we might take the exploitation of our coal fields, as mentioned a moment ago. At this time, when we are paying $1.10 for every dollar's worth of goods we buy in the United States, we are actually buying from that country coal to the amount of $70,000,000 a year. If through the process of scientific research we could find a way by which our soft coal in canada, of which we have an immeasureable quantity, could be utilized, if but partly, in place of the coal which we now import from the United States, through this item alone the expenditure which this new bureau might involve would be repaid tenfold.

I wish once more to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for London for the magnificent work he has done. I would not take the responsibility of saying that he has been the only man in this country who ever thought of having a Bureau of Scientific Research. Others probably have had the same idea, but he has the merit—the great merit—of being the first member of this House to take this question into his own hands, to follow it up, and to give his whole time to it. I am aware that he even went to the United States to make a personal study of the matter. The hon. member, with the knowledge and accomplishments that we all know him to possess, was convinced from the outset that such a scheme could only be beneficial to the country, and, being anxious to serve his country, he has spared neither time nor effort to accomplish what is now before the House.

I say therefore, Sir, that I hope this House will find itself unanimous on this point. I am only speaking for myself, but from what I can see my friends on this side of the House are warm on this subject and are ready to endorse it. From what I can see members on the other side of the House are ready to support the motion, and it would be a great satisfaction, I am sure, for my hon. friend from London, this House, and the country generally, if we could say to-night that the House had accepted unanimously the motion which is now under consideration.

Mr. P. McGIBBON (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I can assure you it is not my intention to occupy the time of the House at any great length. I do think, however, that this subject is of such great importance, having occupied the time of a committee of the House for two sessions, that it might have been given a little more prominence than to be put on at an hour when the House and the galleries are practically empty. I say this in justice to a subject which has such great possibilities, when applied to the industries of the country and the country itself.

I think it is quite evident to every person that at this stage of the world's history we cannot go on as we have done in the past. We must utilize to a greater extent than ever before new methods in the application of science to the industries of this

country if this country is going to prosper and carry on, with the great debt it has at the present time. If there is one thing more than another that the last few years has demonstrated it is the fact that we are living in a new age, that old methods are sent to the scrap heap, that new, better and more efficient ones have to be devised, and that in this great undertaking it is the duty of Canada to look after itself. The object of all science is the preservation and betterment of human life and fundamental science as applied to industry bears indirectly towards that end. Applying that to conditions in Canada today, if we are to provide for the enormous debt and to develop the great resources which we have in this country, it is absolutely essential that we should devise better means of manufacturing and marketing different products.

It is my intention to take up only for a few minutes some of the methods and some of the ways by which science, as applied to industry, can be beneficial. I think probably that at the outset I might not go farther afield than simply to call your attention to the invention, as a result of scientific discovery, by which this House is lighted at the present time. Today houses are lighted and heated more or less by electricity and electricity also supplies the motive power to the great industries of this country. This is but one illustration of the many ways in which our industries have been helped by the great discoveries of science.

But, as I have said, the object of all science is the preservation of human life. There is probably not a man here whose days have not been extended as a result of scientific discovery. The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Thompson) has referred to the discoveries of Pasteur. He mentioned particularly the great discovery which now forms the basis of all surgery. But more than that, at the request of the French Government, Pasteur was invited to apply his knowledge to the great industries of France. The world is familiar with the services which he rendered in connection with the silk-worm industries; the perfecting of yeast by which he prevented the wines of France from becoming sour; and the eradication of splenic fever, which was depleting the sheep flocks of France. As a result of work in his laboratory he discovered remedies for every one of these troubles. The monetary result to the French nation has been estimated by a man of no less prominence than Professor Huxley as being equal to the whole indemnity that France had to pay Germany after the war of 1870. Here we have three instances of the application of scientific discoveries adding to the riches of the country.

Coming down to more recent times let us see what steps were taken to apply the inventions of science to the activities and necessities of war. It is within the knowledge of every man here that one of the great obstacles which Germany had to contend against during the early part of the war was the restricted imports of cotton and nitrates. We were told by scientists that if the British Government would stop the importation of cotton the war would end within six months. After some little time pressure was brought to bear upon the British Government and that was done, then importation of cotton was stopped. But what was the result? Germany set her scientists to work and from the pulp mills of that country they developed out of cellulose a substitute which was almost equally good and which enabled them to carry on. The same thing applies to the nitrates, which as you know, are not only useful for producing fertilizers but very useful for making explosives. After the importation of these nitrates—which came mostly from Chili—was stopped, the scientists were set to work again and they utilized the discovery made some years ago by a great scientist named Cavendish, who found that by the passing of an electrical spark through the air ammonia was formed, and by means of the application of nitric acid nitrates were obtained. No less than 600,000 horse power being developed in Norway alone was utilized for that purpose. We see at once the great results that would come from the application of this discovery to this great country of Canada, in which the demand for fertilizers is very great. We have as has been pointed out, enormous water powers in the northern parts of Ontario and Quebec and by the application of this discovery large quantities of fertilizers, could be turned out.

We also see a possible application of science to the great fishing industry in this country. Great quantities of fish offal are produced every year, and this material is practically thrown away. In that offal, it has been estimated, there are no less than $10,000,000 worth of proteid matter and oils. These waste products could be extracted and form the basis of a great industry which might be cultivated and developed

in Canada. When you consider that the whole fishing industry of the Dominion only represents a value of about $40,000,000, and that the value of the waste products alone is $10,000,000, you can see how science applied to an industry of that kind may have very profitable results.

I might also instance the baking industry to show the value of scientific research. A scientist in the United States, in seeking substitutes for sugar in the yeast, made a discovery which nets one firm over there no less than half a million dollars a year, and they were so appreciative of the fact that they gave the discoverer a gratuity of no less than $35,000.

We are also told that in the perfecting of what is called the tungsten lamp we have an annual saving in electrical power of over $2,000,000,000. These are instances of discoveries which, when applied to the great industries of this country, or any country, may produce a great monetary reward.

Another example I might mention is that of the great glass industry of the United States. Potash salts were used in connection with this industry, supplies of which were obtained from Germany. When war broke out that source of supply was cut off and it was thought for a time that the industry would be paralysed. However, they got their scientists to work and very shortly they produced a substitute and the industry was able to carry on its operations.

I might go on enumerating case after case where the application of science has been, and is to-day, of very great material value to the industries of this country. Up to the present time, Canada has no research institutions—we have practically been living off the brains of the world. I hope the Government will take this fact very seriously into consideration and give to our industries the advantages that they should have in order to enable them to compete with the other industries of the world. We have great natural resources in Canada with almost unlimited possibilities. We have, for example, as has been referred to already to-night, the important pulp industry, from which has been developed your great cellulose industry. Cellulose, I might say, is the basic product in the cell structure of all vegetable life, and without it you would have no food for either animal or man. Now, it has been found that by treating our pulpwood with caustic soda, pulp is produced. That treated with sulphates and sulphites under pressure produces other material. For example, the artificial silk industry has its basis there. We find that industry producing an article which takes on very intensive dyes, and this artificial silk industry in the United States was worth last year no less than $35,000,000. The treating of cellulose with nitric acid produce nitro-cellulose compounds, which were so important to us during the war. One could go on endlessly with the discoveries in connection with different industries—discoveries which may possibly result in increasing our wealth almost beyond our dreams.

Another example I might mention is the treatment of the waste products of the sawmill and the pulp mill by utilizing an experiment which was made by a scientist many years ago. This scientist found that by treating some old linen with sulphuric acid he produced a species of sugar, and by the fermentation of that sugar we get ethyl alcohol. By using the liquor from the pulp mills and the sawdust from the sawmills, we get ethyl alcohol which sells to-day at $7 a gallon. A load of sawdust, worth only 50 or 75 cents, will yield 10 gallons of ethyl alcohol, 95 per cent in strength, and a bushel of grain,—worth, roughly speaking, $1.50—will produce about two and a quarter gallons. Hon. gentlemen will therefore see the possibilities of science when applied to any industry. I could go on for an hour giving examples of how science applied to one industry and another will produce untold wealth.

I hope that the Government will delay no longer in establishing this Research Council and providing it with thoroughly equipped buildings and adequate help. I am glad to bear witness to-night to the efficiency of the gentleman at the head of the council, who has made a world-wide reputation through research. I know personally that he has refused the presidency of no less than five universities, and was asked to put in an application for the Chair of Physiology in the great University of Glasgow. I think we are fortunate indeed in having a man of his calibre to organize and direct this Research Council. I hope the Government will support him and accord that support at once. It is only by making practical application of the discoveries made by scientists that the industries of Canada can reap the benefit of them and the country can attain its proper status among the commercial nations of the world.

Mr. H. P. WHIDDEN (Brandon): It ought not to be hard for any hon. gentleman here to support the motion for the adop-

tion of this report. Time will not permit the mention of more than one or two of the many reasons why one is particularly interested in the proposed establishment of a Bureau of Standards and a Research Institute for the Dominion of Canada at the present time. Some Canadian people may think that the greater universities in our country should care for this work. It is not their function to do this form of work. They are not financially conditioned to provide the equipment. It is for them to furnish the researchers who will be selected, if an institute of this kind is established by the Government, and who will bring to their respective university mothers fame and distinction because of the further work which they carry on—not to show their scholastic attainments and their ability as discoverers but to show their capacity for furthering the development of the great natural resources of our country of which so much is being said in these days but for the scientific development of which so little is being done.

We are not trespassing in any way upon the field of university educational endeavour; we are doing that which Canada should do in its own interests. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Canada will need in the next generation enough researchers to introduce the great principles of conservation in connection with the carrying out of purpose (f) as contained in the report submitted by the chairman of the committee (Mr. Cronyn). That purpose is described to be:

> Researches undertaken to promote the utilization of the waste products of industry.

Our wealth will be greatly increased if we are prepared to convert the millions of dollars' worth of waste now unreclaimed and unconserved.

The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) has said that we have been too long trusting the brains of other parts of the world for leadership in research. And yet, Mr. Speaker, Professor McLennan—a most distinguished witness before the Special Committee of last session—told us of the magnificent qualifications of graduates of our Canadian universities who assisted him, an employee of the British Government, on the war-time research work of a most important character; and as a result of the work done by him, assisted by these young researchers, practical scientific young men, the enemy was handled in a way that otherwise would have been impossible for months. It is even more important in times of peace that we should make provision for our sons, and our daughters, too, —who will be ready to become researchers and so aid the great industrial concerns of our country—to develop those resources and to conserve to the very best end possible those interests and that wealth which are within our reach and possession.

It may be that the day of the production of the outstanding and conspicuous genius is past; the discoverers, the releasers of new found principles may not be increased in numbers in the coming generation; but Canada has already demonstrated that she is capable of producing young men and women who, if given the opportunity, are abundantly able to make use of the discoveries already at hand and so to recombine them that practical results will easily be within the range of attainment.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker that we all hope that the Government will very favourably consider the report that has been submitted to us by this committee for adoption.

Mr. W. D. COWAN (Regina): Mr. Speaker, I promise you that I will be exceedingly brief—in fact, at this time of night I would not say anything at all after the very conclusive speech made by the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), were it not that I feel it is advisable in the interests of our country that we rally all the support possible to the hon. member and his committee in their efforts to improve conditions in Canada.

As I see this report of the Committee of Scientific and Industrial Research, the adoption of which is moved by the member for London, the recommendation can be reduced to a very small compass indeed. They simply recommend that this Parliament establish a national brain for advising and directing that industrial expansion which we have all been so long wanting and clamouring for; they recommend that we establish a national brain for advising and directing that greater agricultural development which is so desirable; they recommend that we establish a national brain for advising and directing the development of our national resources which have been so much discussed. We have the brain power; there is no question about that. Individually we possess it; but collectively—well, we have absolutely nothing. And the purport of the proposal now is that we shall unite our people in one great national movement to secure the advantage of the brain power which our own people possess.

For the last two years particularly we have been clamouring for the development

of our national resources and for the expansion of our great industries. Wherever you go you hear the same thing—on our railway trains, in our hotels, in our clubs,—no matter where it is, you hear that one demand, that we develop our national resources, and that it is absolutely necessary that we increase our foreign trade if we are to retain our economic position. But up to the present time it has always been a general demand—and that will never get us anywhere. We must get down to basic business principles; we must know what we can do, and how we are going to do it. This proposal is to reduce this one question to the concrete. This Bureau to be established will show us what we can do, and how we can do it, and will give us a means of doing it.

Now, is it necessary for us to do that? It has been suggested to-night that we cannot afford the expense; and that is probably the only objection advanced. My opinion is that we cannot afford to do without this Bureau. What are the other nations doing? As has been stated to-night, Great Britain has embarked upon this work to a very large extent, and the United States is making very great strides in the same direction. What is going to be the effect on Canadian industry? Can we afford to lag behind our competitors? That is the important question. In business matters, in production, in quality of articles produced, can we afford to lag behind our competitors? Most emphatically I say we cannot afford to do so, and if we are to be in the race at all we must provide all the latest methods available in order that we may successfully compete with the other great nations of the world.

As I said a few minutes ago, the American nation is embarking upon this work to a very large extent. They have one great National Bureau, they have one or two other Bureaus of semi-public nature, and a great many of their industries have established research departments in connection with their various businesses. What does it mean? It means that all of those industrial establishments not only are going to be our most active competitors, but are going to have an effect upon Canada to a much greater extent than the industries of the United States have ever had before. One of the greatest complaints that we Canadians have is that the American industries, by reason of their excellence and their magnitude, have drained our country of our best men. American ingenuity today is largely Canadian ingenuity; American enterprise is largely Canadian enterprise. Young men who have left our farms —not driven off the farms, because no young man was ever driven off a Canadian farm—have been lured off the farms and to the country to the south by exceptional opportunities, high wages, and the chance of more congenial employment. That condition will increase as the sphere of activity in the United States increases; and unless we get busy and establish more favourable conditions in our own country, our young men will be taken away in larger numbers than heretofore. In my opinion the best kind of man who ever came into Canada was the man who was born in Canada. What we ought to do is to create conditions in Canada which will keep these young men in our own country.

In reply to any suggestion which may be made that we cannot afford to establish such an institute as is proposed, I repeat that we cannot afford to do without it. A number of instances have been given of what scientific research has accomplished in the way of producing wealth in Canada. Take one case which was spoken of in this House not very long ago, the case of Professor Saunders, who discovered a new grade of wheat. Would anybody dare to say that Professor Saunders just happened upon this new kind of wheat; that he dreamed about it one night and when he got up the next day discovered a field of wheat of a new variety? Not at all; it was the result of research and the work of his own brain. The consequence was an addition of millions of dollars to the wealth of the farmers of Canada, while he himself got practically nothing but honour. These instances could be multiplied by thousands. If such results can be accomplished individually, what would be the result of collective effort along the same line? We are simply asking that we unite these activities; that we concentrate them into one collective body; that we do as a nation what heretofore has been accomplished in the most haphazard way by individuals. We cannot afford to continue haphazard methods.

Let me give just one illustration of what is going on to-day. The member for London (Mr. Cronyn) recently conveyed to the Bureau of Standards at Washington a message which I had given him. The message was to the effect: According to reports of the Regina Board of Trade, every year millions of tons of flax are burned in our western country. You can go out in the autumn and see the flames rising up here and there all over the prairie where the farmers have set fire to their stacks of straw, including

flax straw. The question was, is that flax straw of any value? My hon. friend asked the Bureau of Standards at Washington if anything could be done with it. They said to us: Send us a ton of that straw and we will see whether or not we can manufacture paper or something else out of it. Now, I like their generosity; I like their friendship; I like the spirit which prompted their suggestion. But are we Canadians to be dependent upon a foreign nation for advice and direction in such matters as that? I do not believe in depending upon my competitors for anything, no matter how friendly they may be. I am a politician, they say—a mere politician, and a mighty poor one at that—but I tell you that I would hate like sixty to depend on the ex-leader of the Opposition for such political advice as I should wish to obtain. I like him, but when it comes to that kind of advice, I do not want it from him. So we should not depend upon the United States for advice and direction in these matters. No individual ever succeeded who depended upon others for his success, and the same may be said of a nation. I sincerely hope that this House will adopt the report of the Committee on Scientific and Industrial Research and as soon as possible establish the bureau which they are asking for.

Hon. A K. MACLEAN (Halifax): After the very comprehensive and informative address made this evening by the Chairman of the Committee (Mr. Cronyn) and the several very excellent addresses given by other gentlemen who are members of the committee, little or nothing remains to be said on this subject, and I intervene for a moment simply to express my cordial support of the recommendations of the committee.

Scientific research merely means the application of intelligence to industry. If that is correct, there should be no hesitation on the part of the Government and of Parliament in accepting the recommendations of the committee. Canada is a new country. Our industries are not too firmly established; they are generally not too well-off in a financial sense, and it is only natural that they should have devoted little time and little money to scientific research or the application of science to industry. As has been stated by several hon. members, the leading countries of the world today are exceedingly aggressive in extending the application of scientific research to industry; it is eminently desirable and necessary that they should do so in order to render themselves strong competitors among the nations of the world. If Canada is to maintain the splendid position which she won during the war as a competitor in international trade, it is necessary that we make a commencement in industrial and scientific research. That start, I submit, should be made at once. While one hesitates to make any recommendation to the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) for further expenditures; still I think that hon. members need not hesitate to support the recommendation of the committee, which involves a very substantial expenditure.

The question is, by what method are we to embark upon scientific research work in Canada? This work can only be advanced in one of three ways: by private industry, by our universities, or by a central laboratory supported by the state. As has been stated by one hon. gentleman, this is hardly a field for our universities to enter into at the present time. They are not equipped for it, and any plan of that kind would probably involve the Government in the disagreeable duty of assisting a great number of universities to carry on work which might well be done by a few of them. It is too much to expect that our industries, which are relatively small and still in their formative stages, should embark in any subtantial way upon research work; so we cannot look to that source for a comprehensive and aggressive campaign. We are brought, therefore to the suggestion of the committee, namely, the creation of a central state-owned and state-operated laboratory for the carrying on of research work. In my judgment the recommendations of the committee are worthy of approval and should receive the support of the House. I do trust that the Government will see fit during the present session to ask Parliament to vote the sum of money mentioned in the committee's report. I am sure that if they do so, they will be supported by the best judgment and intelligence of this country.

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (South Perth): Mr. Speaker, only the very great importance of this subject would seem to justify me in taking up a few minutes of the time of the House at this late hour, but at the risk of interfering with the comfort of members I wish to add to what has already been said, a few words in support of the adoption of the report of the committee which has been so ably presided over by the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), and which report has been supported tonight by a number of very excellent addresses.

One of the most urgent calls to Canada to-day is to develop its vast natural resources, to reach out for the most scientific methods of using those resources in industry, and to further the utilization of the vast amount of waste products of our industries. When we begin to feel, as we have scarcely yet felt, the keen pressure of the great economic burden imposed on this young country by our participation in the great war, Canadians will have a sharp awakening and will shake off the lethargy and apathy regarding this great question. We must see that that awakening does not come too late. The world to-day is calling for our foodstuffs, our minerals and their products, our timber, and for numerous other articles which are the product of this country.

Never in past history has such a favourable time been offered for the development of our resources. The demand is urgent, prices are high. The door of national opportunity is ajar. The chance now offers for Canada to enter. We have the resources, the energy, the capital, the labour. We need science applied to the untouched stores of our national and natural wealth to transform these vast resources into actual values in order that we may the more easily bear our war burden.

The war has opened a new era, and Canada, whose day is just beginning, has more to expect from the auspicious age that is dawning for the world than almost any other nation. To achieve great things in the new peace it is as necessary to be in the highest state of preparedness as it was for achieving great things in the war.

The recent great war has been followed by a trade war. As far as possible every country is putting its industrial house in order with a view to holding its place in the coming commercial struggle. In many countries increased attention is being devoted to scientific research as an instrument of enhanced industrial power. To-day modern methods are essential to success in industry. The manufacturer rapidly recognized that pure science is a practical thing, and that science and industry are complements of each other. To the scientist at least it is very apparent that the enormously rich undeveloped resources of Canada cannot be utilized to the best advantage of the Canadian people unless our industries have the assistance of thoroughly trained scientific experts.

While the war illustrated that scientific research was of vital concern, so it will demonstrate that it is in peace just as vital to the national safety. Let us for a moment look at some of the things science did for us in this war—and I wish to add my word of praise for the splendid part played by the scientists of Canada. It is probably unknown to the Canadian people what an important part was played in the successful scientific operations of the war by the men of scientific training who went from Canada to Great Britain. Prior to the recent conflict, America and Canada were supplied almost entirely by Germany with synthetic drugs and chemicals, with dye stuffs and with potash. That is all changed, and we through the efforts of our scientific experts, are now quite independent of Germany for all these products.

Take potash, for example. Until 1915, when Germany placed an embargo on potash export, the whole world was supplied from the mines in Saxony, and after the supply from Germany was stopped the price rose from $40 per ton to from $350 to $500 per ton, making it practically impossible for the Canadian or American farmer to utilize it. This created a great need, and scientists set to work. A certain scientific man undertook to preserve the orange groves of Southern California from destruction by dust from cement plants, and during his experiments discovered that cement dust contained large quantities of potash which could be extracted in quantities as great as 1¾ lb. per barrel of cement, or a total possible of 75,000 tons per year from United States and Canadian plants; thus discovering a new source of potash which supplied some of the lack. Blast furnaces also show large quantities of potash salts in the waste gas from the furnaces. This is estimated to produce 500,000 tons per year. Potash is also obtained from kelp on the Pacific coast. There are large quantities of feldspar in Canada, which also contains more or less potash. All these sources, practically utilized, have provided the means of supplying the needs of Canada with all the potash that is at present required. In that way men of science overcame the need for German potash.

To illustrate in a more practical way the value of scientific research, perhaps I can choose no better method than to give some examples of what has been done, and if I quote American examples it is because they provide better illustrations than any in Canada. We can often learn from the operations of private enterprise, and these illustrations which I intend to give to the House to-night are the efforts of private

enterprise to improve their conditions through the utilization of science.

Prior to the war America produced none of the finest optical glass; that all came from Germany. When the supply was cut off the research men of Bausch and Lomb of Rochester went to work and produced a glass equal to the best previously imported.

The General Electric Company of Schenectady keeps a laboratory at an annual cost of $500,000, and employs 75 investigators, all experts. One product of this laboratory was the tungsten lamp, the general use of which effects a saving of probably several hundred millions of dollars every year in the cost of our electric lighting. To show what value this company places on scientific research, let me say that in 1918 this company expended $2,000,000 on research work.

Let us see what some other concerns are doing in this line of work. The Dupont Company, of Wilmington, Delaware, established a research laboratory in 1908, and in that year expended $200,000 on research work. In 1918, a war year, the company spent $2,000,000; from 1912 to 1915 they expended $1,200,000, in research; and by so doing they claim they effected a saving of $14,000,000. They now employ 1,100 chemists.

The Eastman Kodak Co. employs 40 research workers at an annual cost of $150,000.

The Western Electric Company, of New York, spent in 1918, a war year, $2,500,000 in research work.

A well known chemist in the United States was approached by a group of firms who had spent $100,000 on a problem without results. They told him they were willing to spend $100,000 more and to wait five years for a solution of the problem. Three research men were put to work and solved the problem at a cost of only $2,000.

Forty years ago cotton seed by-products were a dead waste. To-day they are worth over $300,000,000 per year. The research worker did it. Now, if any private enterprise feels justified in spending large sums because returns are being obtained that warrant these expenditures and if private concerns obtain such results from their investments and their efforts I see no reason why Canada should hesitate in embarking on work of this kind.

Let me quote Dr. Stratton of the United States Bureau of Standards for further illustrations. He says:

> If there is any one good which has come to the United States out of the war it is their scientific industrial development.

And further he says:

> One of the problems of builders and architects has been to know the strength of steel required for structural work. The Bureau of Standards by actual tests established standards upon which all buildings, bridges, shipbuilding, etc., can be carried on with safety. It is estimated that in this connection the amount saved to the industries in one year by preventing faulty construction will pay for all the experimental work of the whole Bureau many times over.

Let us look at Canada for a moment in connection with the fuel question of this country. At this time of our country's history, when the fuel problem is becoming acute and when a substitute for American coal is eagerly sought, it is most gratifying to know that our own Canadian scientific workers have made very satisfactory progress in so modifying our lignites of the western provinces as to make them available for heating the homes of Western Canada. There is every prospect that in the near future the immense fields of lignite in the West will be commercially available; and thus will be solved one of the great problems of that western country at an immense industrial advantage to Canada and a vast saving to our people.

The problem in Canada to-day is very different from what it was ten years ago. There is a great deal of difference in conditions when coal is sold at $15 a ton from the conditions that existed when it was sold at $6 a ton, and this one question alone, it seems to me, is sufficient to warrant the Government in going any length and in making any expenditure in order to make available the western coal for the people of that great and growing country. Let me quote the opinion of another man on this subject. I quote him because he represents that great body of citizens of Great Britain, the Labour Unions. About one year after the beginning of the war there was issued a white paper signed by Arthur Henderson, then a member of the British Cabinet. In that is found the following:

> It is impossible to contemplate without considerable apprehension the situation that will arise at the end of the war unless our scientific resources have previously been enlarged and organized to meet it.
>
> It appears incontrovertible that if we are to advance or even maintain our industrial position we must as a nation aim at such a development of scientific and industrial research as will place us in a position to expand and strengthen our industries and to compete successfully with the most highly organized of our rivals.

I advocate the establishment in Canada of a Scientific Research Institute for two chief general reasons:

First: We need it for the development of our vast natural resources. Nature has been most lavish with her gifts to Canada. She makes no mistakes, but having given unto us so bountifully she expects us to utilize what she has bestowed upon us. Many of our natural resources are not easily made available for the use of our people, but one of the most powerful weapons available to man for the solution of Nature's problems is scientific research. As I said before, we require the development and large utilization of our natural resources to enable us to more easily carry our war burden, and for that reason research has become to us a fundamental and patriotic duty which can neither be ignored nor neglected without imperilling our national welfare. It will better enable us to increase production and eliminate waste.

Second: We require such an Institute as an aid to Canadian industry. Efficiency and science must go hand in hand if industry is to attain its best place. Just as science forged the most effective weapons of the late war so she must forge the weapons of industry. Without proper means for research our industries will be heavily handicapped in their endeavours to compete with their foreign rivals. If an American farmer reaped his crop with a self-binder and the Canadian farmer with the old-fashioned sickle the Canadian would be inviting economic death. Science is the self-binder of the crop of industry. Let us make use of it.

There is much talk of Capital and Labour these days in connection with industry. It is gradually dawning on men's minds that there is a third force in making industry successful, viz: management.

But there is a fourth:

To these three, Capital, Labour and Management, we must now add Science.

I desire to congratulate the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Denis) on the very excellent remarks he made to-night on this subject. As a representative of that great province, which is so rapidly advancing in industry, I believe he has given a lead to his fellow-members from Quebec on this question. It almost seems that he has a vision of the future greatness of that province as one of the large industrial centres of this country. That position can be attained effectively and satisfactorily only through the agency of science. I am very much pleased to have heard the hon. member add his word of commendation of this plan now proposed.

[Mr. Steele.]

In conclusion, let me say that one of the most urgent duties of the Canadian people to-day is the application of science to the development of our natural resources and to the building up of our industries. These will bring to this country a new era of progress and prosperity. I therefore join with those who have already spoken in urging upon the Government as strongly as I can the necessity and advisability of adopting the report and carrying out the recommendations which it has laid before the House. It is not a matter of expenditure; this is an investment which will return to the country a hundredfold all that is invested.

Mr. T. M. M. TWEEDIE (West Calgary): One of the greatest of the many problems that confront Canada to-day is the burden of debt that has been incurred by reason of the war, and the necessity that exists for making some provision in future, from the point of view of trade, to take care of our obligations. It has been well emphasized to-night that science and industry at the present time throughout the civilized world go hand in hand. We will be able to discharge our obligation according as we can develop our industries, our trade and our natural resources. It seems rather difficult to incur at the present time an obligation that involves an expenditure of $500,000 in connection with the establishment of a national institute of research such as has been suggested by the report which was submitted to the House, but I submit that this House should look upon the expenditure as an investment from which there will be large return and which will be for the general benefit and advancement of the country.

It is true that there is a world-wide agitation in all civilized countries in connection with the movement for scientific research. It is also true that Germany was in pre-war days probably one of the most progressive countries that we had along that line and that there was no country which was more negligent in that respect, until five years ago, than Great Britain. There was, I understand, no public appropriation to any extent except the sums which were given to the Royal Society and the National Research Institute. But when the war broke on the world, Great Britain suddenly realized the position in which she found herself in so far as scientific research in the Empire were concerned, and I believe that had it not been for the inherent knowledge, ability and versatility of the scientists of the Anglo-Saxon race, the British

people would not have been able to cope, along scientific lines, with the German Empire so successfully as they did.

Five years ago Great Britain realized the position in which she was placed and an organization was started which was known as the Honorary Advisory Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, and as a result of the inquiries they made and the information they gathered there was subsequently formed the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research. The Imperial Government appropriated at that time £1,000,000 to be expended in the next five years, or approximately $1,000,000 a year, and they have made an annual appropriation of $200,000 for the purpose of carrying on scientific research work. They were alive to the situation. They realized the necessity for the establishment of such a department of the Government and of such research work if they were to regain and retain the share of the world's trade which they had enjoyed prior to the war. In addition to that they are establishing in the various industries in England what are known as trade associations. The manufacturers in the various industries, in their respective lines, unite together for the purpose of forming these associations, establishing their laboratories and arranging for their own private subscriptions. They receive a grant of pound for pound from the Imperial Government. There are in existence in Great Britain some twenty of these associations and there are some fifteen more being formed.

In the United States we find that they have their national Bureau of Chemistry on which they spend $700,000 annually. They also have their Bureau of Standards upon which they spend $2,000,000 annually. To that Bureau they have recently attached a laboratory which will be devoted to industrial research on most comprehensive lines at an expense of $1,000,000. There are also a large number of laboratories established throughout the United States in connection with individual plants some of which have been referred to by the last speaker. The Western Electric Company expend for this purpose $2,000,000 annually, the General Electric Company $500,000, the National Electric Company $2,000,000, and the Dupont Company $2,000,000. The United States had over 2,000 research laboratories attached to various industries. As new industries arise they form their own associations somewhat along the lines of the trade associations that have been established in Great Britain. Recently the oil interests have united and raised $1,000,000 for the purpose of carrying on industrial research work in connection with their business.

We also find that in Japan the national research laboratory is being established and that they have received from the Imperial Government for that purpose an appropriation of $4,000,000 which it is expected will be increased to $8,000,000. In Australia they are establishing an institute for scientific research through the generosity of Mr. Thomas Cawthron, who left a large legacy for that purpose. In New Zealand they are establishing an organization somewhat along the lines of our Advisory Council. France and Italy are contemplating the establishment of national institutes for research. The lesson that these figures teach to us is that all these countries in the world are alive to the actual necessity of undertaking scientific research for the purpose of developing their industries, protecting their trade and putting their finances on a sound basis.

We have had, year after year since 1916, an agitation for the establishment of a research institute in the Dominion of Canada, and I believe that this Government can ill afford not to yield to the recommendations of the committee and to the calls which are coming from the various parts of this country and various industries for the establishment of an institution of this kind, at the earliest possible moment.

In 1916, by Order in Council, an honorary Advisory Council for Scientific and Industrial Research in Canada was established, and it is certainly very interesting and illuminating to note the various committees connected with it. We have the honorary Advisory Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, the Associate Committee on Chemistry, the Associate Committee on Mining and Metallurgy, the British Columbia Honorary Advisory Committee, and other branches. If we look through the list the of members of these various committees we find men standing high in the intellectual, scientific, agricultural and commercial life of this country These men have been gathering information and data from time to time, and if we look through the reports for 1918 and 1919 we will find that in each of these years they have submitted to them problems dealing with 45 or 50 different subjects which require the attention of skilled, trained scientists. We must realize that the men who are represented on these

committees, while they are eminent in the various professions, and occupations in which they are engaged, are men who have been serving this country in that capacity for the last five years free of charge. They are men who have other duties to perform, they are men who cannot be expected to go into detail, and deal with each of these questions which are submitted; they can only advise the Government and, to a very limited extent, those who are engaged in these industries. I submit that, as an appreciation of the work which these men have done during the past five years, and in view of the necessities of the time, the Government should at once proceed with the establishment of this Bureau of National Research in the Dominion, and place at its disposal an appropriation which would at least enable the work to be started this year.

Mr. W. K. BALDWIN (Stanstead): Inasmuch as on a former occasion, when blaming the Government for the vast expenditure of money, I advocated the creation of a Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, I think I should be guilty of negligence to-night if I allowed the opportunity to pass without saying a few words in support of the present proposition. We know that this country is a land of most wonderful resources, the fringe of which we have scarcely more than touched. Iron is an article for which there is no substitute—which is used by everybody throughout the wide world—yet we know that we are importing ninety-five per cent of the supplies we need from foreign countries. The states of Minnesota and Michigan, and I believe Alabama, are rich in iron deposits; but in our opinion there is untold wealth in the iron ores of Ontario and Quebec as well as of the Maritime Provinces. We have schools of science to which our young men resort but to perfect themselves they go to the Massachusetts Technical School. We have in Canada enormous water-powers and great mineral and agricultural wealth. Reference has been made to the by-products of our industries and to the fact that many sources of potential wealth are at present not utilized. We need in this country a Department of Scientific Research that will minister to the needs of our young men and keep them at home. We know that during the past two months several of our brainy men have left this country—men whom we could ill afford to lose—because we could not give them adequate salaries. I believe the patriotism and love of country which exists among our young men is such that, after they have received scientific and technical training we could retain their services could we only provide them with two-thirds of the stipend they would derive in the United States.

Attention has been drawn to-night to the use that is being made of sawdust, an article that formerly was dumped into our rivers and constituted a menace to navigation. I believe there is at present being organized in Montreal a company to work up the by-products of pulp-mills. That company, I understand, are already at work with their suction pumps and turning out a valuable commodity.

The establishment of this Bureau is a splendid move, and as a business man I shall support the measure. To many of us the subjects relating to science are extremely technical in their nature. For example, even in the case of well-informed men, it is easy to puzzle them by asking them to define electricity. We have no satisfactory definition of what it is; we know that it is a manifestation of nature. I have been able to puzzle pretty brilliant men who have spent two or three years in scientific study, some of whom have graduated in science, by asking them what a kilowatt is.

In establishing this department let us go cautiously. Do not let us squander money, but let us start by building upon a firm foundation. Then we can afford the aid that will be necessary to a growing department to assist in developing the great resources of this country and the tremendous possibilities that are within our reach. I am very pleased to support the measure.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: After a week of political controversy it is a somewhat pleasing experience to be able to speak, even at this late hour, upon a great national problem as to which there appears to be unanimity of thought and feeling. Having begun the week by making a special plea to my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) to permit us to adjourn at a reasonable hour each night, I shall on the present occasion make my remarks very brief. My reason for rising is that I do not wish to let this opportunity go by without in the first place extending my congratulations to the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn) for his very lucid and eloquent exposition of the report of the committee, and the exceedingly industrious and earnest manner in which he has sought to further the committee's work, and to bring to the

attention of the Government and of Parliament the significance of the establishment of a National Research Institute for Canada. I desire also, Mr. Speaker, to lend to that project such support as a word from this side of the House may afford. One is greatly tempted—if one has any appreciation of the importance of scientific research in its relation not only to production in industry, but also to the advancement of human well-being—to speak at considerable length upon a subject such as this; but I shall resist the temptation except to the extent of one reference to what seems to me the significance in a large way of our consideration of this project at this particular moment. Two or three of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken this evening have referred to the great scientist, Pasteur, of the contribution which he made to industry and of how illuminating his work and his life have been in revealing, not only the service that science can render to industry, but, as I have already remarked, the service which it also renders to the advancement of human well-being. At the time of the foundation of the Pasteur Institute, in commemoration of his work, in Paris—I think it was in 1888—this great scientist was so overcome with the reception tendered him by the statesmen and scientists of France, that he gave to his son a document which he had previously prepared to read to the gathering, and in that document there appeared the following paragraph which I think, in a way, is epoch-marking in its significance:

"Two contrary laws seem to be wrestling with each other nowadays: the one, a law of blood and of death, ever imagining new means of destruction, and forcing nations to be constantly ready for the battlefield—the other, a law of peace, work, and health, ever evolving new means of delivering man from the scourges which beset him. The one seeks violent conquests, the other the relief of humanity. The latter places one human above any victory; while the former would sacrifice hundreds of thousands of lives to the ambition of one. Which of these two laws shall ultimately prevail, God alone knows."

Since Pasteur uttered those words, we have seen something of the operation of the law of blood and of death. We have seen something of the ambitions of a single individual which have resulted in the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of lives. Clearly, we have now come to a time when we begin to see again the furthering in a large way of the operation of the law of peace, work and health, which seeks to relieve mankind of the burdens which oppress it and to advance human well-being and human progress.

Scientific research can be employed as the handmaid either of the forces of destruction or of those of creation and advancement, and in this particular proposal which is being considered at the moment in the report which the committee has brought down there is presented to this country a project which will go far, I believe, towards a realization of the application of the law of peace, work, and health in all that pertains to our social, industrial, and commercial life. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I should be sorry to let this occasion go by without expressing the hope that the report of the committee will not only be accepted unanimously—as it is certain to be—but also that it will be carried out as speedily as possible once it is accepted by the Government.

There is another reason why I find particular pleasure in supporting this recommendation. When I had the privilege of being Minister of Labour it was my good fortune to have the opportunity of recommending to my colleagues the appointment of a royal commission on industrial training and technical education. That commission was appointed, and as hon. members know, a very valuable report was prepared by it, one section of which is devoted to this important question of industrial research. Were one anxious to supplement what has been said this evening in support of the importance of an Industrial Research Institute one might quote at great length from this document issued by the Government, and which has recommended the very same kind of project so well emphasized by the committee that have given this matter such careful consideration.

Therefore, with the report of the Royal Commission and with the unanimous finding of a select committee of this House, it seems to me that there is little left for the members of this House to do but to express appreciation to the gentlemen who have worked so industriously, so carefully, and so thoughtfully in regard to this important subject, and to assure the Government that if the recommendations of the committee are carried out they will meet with the approval of every one.

One further thought occurs to me, speaking of industrial research in particular, and that is that this is a day when a great deal is being said about the importance of increased production. Men are too apt to think of production as being dependent wholly upon what economists used to

speak of as land, labour and capital, or natural resources, labour and capital, forgetting altogether the enormous significance, as regards production, of scientific research. And it is to emphasize what scientific research means, not in one direction only, but in all directions, that I am taking just a moment longer to refer to that point.

All of the work of labour is vastly enhanced and increased in its opportunity and in its rewards by the extent to which scientific research is applied to the problems of industry. The return to capital, and the possibility of greatly increased returns, is similarly enhanced; and so far as the community is concerned its well-being is also enhanced in the same way. I think in our discussion of commercial and industrial problems we are too much inclined to forget the work carried on in the libraries and laboratories by men who are little heard of in public, but who, after all, perhaps, more than any other class in society, are responsible for the progress of mankind. If the Government by establishing an institute of the kind suggested here can in this Dominion help to promote scientific research in ways which I hope will not only parallel and rival, but will in some respects possibly outrun, what has been done in other countries, we shall not only contribute to our own industrial, social and commercial well-being, but we shall help, I believe in the advancement of other nations as well.

Let me say also that scientific reseach in industry is not only the handmaid of these different factors of production; it seems to me it is not less the handmaid, and the necessary handmaid, of governmental policies in such matters as transportation, commerce, immigration, colonization, or any other particular policy which relates to the commercial and industrial life of the country. Unless scientific research is applied in all of these particular branches, the outcome of any policy adopted by a government will never be what it should be in the development of the country's welfare.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I particularly welcome what this report seems to suggest in the way of closer co-operation between the universities of our country and governmental administration. I think that everything is to be gained by having the universities and the government brought into close touch with each other. University men should take as large a part as possible in the affairs of their country, in its government and in the administration of its departments, and our governments should, I think, do as much as they reasonably can to encourage and make possible the work of our universities on a scale which is befitting the great opportunities confronting them—and as one hon. member said this evening, there is no doubt whatever that our universities are not in a position to cope single-handed with the great needs of scientific research. In promoting scientific research, the Government must co-operate with the universities, and I was glad to hear my hon. friend from London emphasize as clearly as he did, and in that fine, eloquent and, if I may so describe it, imaginative way he has of expressing himself, that the universities would receive a greater assistance through an Industrial Research Institute of this kind than could be possible without such an undertaking.

I have great pleasure indeed as a member of this House in supporting most heartily the recommendations of the committee. It is gratifying to see that those recommendations are unanimous. I think we owe a word of thanks to all the members of the committee, and especially to the chairman who has given so much of his time and thought to the work of that committee.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): What I have to say to-night will be exceedingly short.

Mr. BELAND: And sweet.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I wish I could in the brevity of my remarks make them as pithy in one direction as I am sure the Chairman of the Committee would wish; but there are limitations of course which we find ourselves in contact with, and which, whether we wish it or not, restrain in many ways the practical embodiment of the sympathies and goodwill of the Government.

I have been particularly pleased with the tone of the debate—not speaking of tone in the usual way, but in regard to the line of intelligent appreciation and presentation of the subject itself. Not merely a sentimental support has been given, but a support of insight and of real connection between the mind and the heart of the speaker and the principles of the subject under discussion.

As one heard successive speakers talking of the marvellous things which had been done by science, and which we ourselves had forgotten in a good many respects until they were brought to our attention to-night, one wondered why people run into other channels for the wonders of romance. Really

the greatest romances, particularly of the last centuries, have been found in the development of scientific thought and in the scientific research carried on by the quiet workers of the world. They come upon us one after the other; the story passes, and then we are apt to forget. When we have a summing up, such as we have had to-night, we are impressed with the wonderful phases of the development of humanity which has taken place during the last fifty, sixty or one hundred years.

As to the matter which is directly before us, I will spare the blushes of the member for London (Mr. Cronyn) by not reiterating what has already been said by many of those who have spoken. But while sparing his blushes, I do not want him to think that I do not in my heart thank him for the work which he and his willing and efficient committee have performed in connection with this matter and for the way in which they have presented the subject to us to-night. We must not forget, either, that during the last five years, as was mentioned by the member for Calgary West (Mr. Tweedie) we have been doing a little towards maintaining and extending the interest in this matter through the Advisory Research Council. Things of this kind proceed step by step,—here a little, and there a little. Without a doubt we are working up to the point where we shall have in Canada some such efficient mechanism as has been described here to-night. I wish we could work it out now, but there are considerations which make that difficult. I am not, however, without hope that we may, even this year, make a beginning in the direction of carrying out the report—something, at least, which will be an earnest of the completion of the project as soon as possible. In a way, it is a kind of irony that the very thing which has made it particularly necessary that an impetus should be given to scientific research and the alliance of scientific effort with industrial development, the war, has so crippled us that we cannot do what we would like to do in this respect. Science does two things: it puts within the power of the destructive elements of war vast enginery and machinery for completing the destruction upon which it is bent, and almost at the same time it stretches out the hand of solace, comfort, help to the victims of the destruction which it has thus helped to create. If the war has made wounds, deep and gaping, and broad, and if science has helped to make those wounds, science to-day is putting all its resources and its effort into the healing of those wounds, into the bringing of a normal period and, subsequently, a more progressive period of development in all these matters, not leaving out that which is probably the greatest good that can come from the development of science,—the betterment of the world and the greater wellbeing of all those who live in it. For after all, science is to be judged, not by the material development which it first brings about, but by the extent to which it promotes the comfort, happiness and uplift of the people; by the general good which it accomplishes for the world.

I want to reiterate my thanks and the thanks of the Government for the good work which has been done by the member for London and his committee, and to assure them that it will not be allowed to pass without fruit. I hope that something may be done at an early day; that if all we would like to do cannot be accomplished, at least a beginning may be made. I shall bring the matter to the attention of my colleagues, and I know that I shall have a sympathetic set of colleagues, whether or not we shall be able to cross all the ditches and make all the progress we would like to make at this particular time.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Right Hon. Sir George Foster the House adjourned at twelve o'clock (midnight).

Monday, May 10, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

BATTLEFIELDS MEMORIAL.

Hon. S. C. MEWBURN (East Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I move, seconded by Mr. McCurdy:

That the first Report of the Special Committee appointed to consider and report upon the question of what Memorials, if any, should be erected on the battlefields of the late war, be commended to the consideration of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the absence of the customary notice this motion can, of course, be entertained only by unanimous consent of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY AT WASHINGTON.

ANNOUNCEMENT THAT HIS MAJESTY WILL ACCREDIT A CANADIAN PLENIPOTENTIARY TO THE UNITED STATES.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I desire

to make a statement which, from the importance of its character, I shall read, with the permission of the House. It has reference to negotiations which have for some time been going on between the British and the Canadian Governments in respect of Canadian representation at Washington. The negotiations have been concluded, and to-day a statement will have been made in the House of Commons in London, and I desire that the House of Commons here shall have cognizance of the matter at the same time.

As a result of recent discussions an arrangement has been concluded between the British and Canadian Governments to provide more complete representation at Washington of Canadian interests than has hitherto existed. Accordingly, it has been agreed that His Majesty, on advice of his Canadian ministers, shall appoint a Minister Plenipotentiary who will have charge of Canadian affairs and will at all times be the ordinary channel of communication with the United States Government in matters of purely Canadian concern, acting upon instructions from and reporting direct to the Canadian Government. In the absence of the Ambassador the Canadian minister will take charge of the whole Embassy and of the representation of Imperial as well as Canadian interests. He will be accredited by His Majesty to the President with the necessary powers for the purpose.

This new arrangement will not denote any departure either on the part of the British Government or of the Canadian Government from the principle of the diplomatic unity of the British Empire.

The need for this important step has been fully realized by both Governments for some time. For a good many years there has been direct communication between Washington and Ottawa, but the constantly increasing importance of Canadian interests in the United States has made it apparent that Canada should be represented there in some distinctive manner, for this would doubtless tend to expedite negotiations, and naturally first-hand acquaintance with Canadian conditions would promote good understanding. In view of the peculiarly close relations that have always existed between the people of Canada and those of the United States, it is confidently expected as well that this new step will have the very desirable result of maintaining and strengthening the friendly relations and co-operation between the British Empire and the United States.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Inasmuch as the right hon. Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) has asked the permission of the House to make a statement, I should like to ask the House to give me permission to say a word with reference thereto, if not now, then on the first appropriate occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I feel sure that the House would be only too happy to give the hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) an opportunity to give expression to his views on the memorandum just read, but I do not think it is desirable that there should be any general debate on the subject unless there is some specific motion before the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. the leader of the Opposition shall have liberty to speak.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried, carried.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING: I wish to ask my right hon. friend if he will be good enough to see that all the correspondence in reference to this matter is laid on the Table at the earliest possible moment. My purpose in rising now is not to refer at the moment particularly to the far-reaching and important step the Government has taken but rather to express surprise that Parliament has not been acquainted with the correspondence in reference to this matter before the whole matter was finally concluded. If I understand the announcement which my right hon. friend has just made, it is to the effect that the whole transaction is finally settled as between the Government of Great Britain, the Canadian Government and the United States Government, and Parliament has had no opportunity whatever of giving any consideration to the matter in its far-reaching inter-Imperial and international bearings. I think that is not the course which the Government should have taken. Parliament should have been fully apprised of and given opportunity to discuss the essential matters relating to this far-reaching step before the Government came to any final decision in connection with it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As this is not the time for discussion I do not propose to enter into the second part of the question raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King). I would merely say that all the available papers in connection with the negotiations will be brought down as quickly as possible and presented to the House.

RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF PUBLIC SERVICE.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization) moved for leave

to introduce Bill No. 120 to provide for the retirement of certain members of the public service.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. CALDER: This Bill is very similar to one which was introduced, if I am not mistaken, at the session before last. Its purpose is to provide a plan or scheme whereby certain members of the public service who, on account of old age or disability or for other cause, should be retired from the service. The Bill contains two methods whereby that may be done. In the case of those who are retired at or over sixty years of age the Bill provides for an annuity. In the case of those who are retired under sixty years of age the Bill provides for a lump sum gratuity. The details can be discussed on the second reading of the Bill or in the committee stage.

Mr. BELAND: That does not refer at all to the retirement of members of the Government?

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SENATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 118, for the relief of James Lewis Price.—Mr. MacNutt.

Bill No. 119, for the relief of Frederick Tristram Clark.—Mr. Burnham.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CAHILL: I wish to ask the Government when we may expect the fourth volume of the Auditor General's report.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Has not that blessed fourth volume come down yet?

Mr. CAHILL: Not that I have seen.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I promised it two or three times and now I think I will have to hand that responsibility over to some of my colleagues.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have been waiting for it just as impatiently as the hon. gentleman has. I know that all the proofs have been read and I am told it is coming down any day. However I have not seen it yet. The moment it comes down it will be laid on the table of the House.

Mr. CAHILL: I would like to ask the Government seriously if they would bring down the Auditor General's report at as early a date as possible.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It will be brought down at the earliest possible moment.

MENNONITES LEAVING FOR THE UNITED STATES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PEDLOW: I would like to repeat the question asked by me on Friday last and which, the right hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) informed me could not be answered because the hon. the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) was not in the House at the time. My question was based upon press reports which appeared in the Friday morning papers to the effect that the Mennonites of Manitoba——

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman would serve his purpose quite as well by simply asking an answer to the question he submitted on Friday last.

Mr. PEDLOW: In deference to the wish of the Chair I would ask the Minister of Immigration and Colonization to answer the question asked by me in the House on Friday afternoon last.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): As the hon. gentleman's question was not brought to my attention I have not had an opportunity of reading it. I shall read it in Hansard and give a reply to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILL.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 114, for the relief of William Edward Vinall.—Mr. MacNutt.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADA GAZETTE.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Is there any law or rule or regulation under which all Government notices must be published three times at least in the Canada Gazette?
2. Must these notices be published accordingly in both French and English?
3. If so, is that practice followed in every case for Government notices?
4. If not, did it ever exist?

5. If it did exist, when was it changed, and why?

6. Did the Editor of the Canada Gazette receive orders from some authority, on the 17th October, 1919, to publish Government notices only once in the said Canada Gazette, except notices from the Interior Department for Dominion Lands?

7. Did the Board of Commerce protest against this practice because none of their notices were legal if not thrice published in the Canada Gazette?

Rt. Hon. ARTHUR SIFTON:

1. The general law regulating insertions in the Canada Gazette is contained in Chap. 80, R.S.C., Section 33, which prescribes that "All Proclamations issued by the Governor General or under the authority of the Governor in Council, and all official notices, Orders in Council, Regulations, advertisements and documents relating to the Dominion of Canada, or matters under the control of the Parliament thereof, and requiring publication, shall be published in the Canada Gazette, unless some other mode of publication thereof is required by law."

There are variations in the prescriptions of the several departmental acts, and of the rules and regulations of departments, boards and commissions, as to the number of insertions of documents and notices in the Canada Gazette. This department is not aware that under any law, rule or regulation all Government notices must be published three times at least in the Canada Gazette.

2. There does not seem to exist any general definite rule under which Government notices must be published in both French and English.

3. 4 and 5. Answered by No. 2.

6. No.

7. The Board of Commerce was created by legislation passed the 7th of July, 1919. When the Board of Commerce sent their first notice for publication in the Canada Gazette, it asked for three insertions, but in subsequent requests no mention was made of the provision in the law that three insertions were required, and it was not until February 26, 1920, that the Department of Public Printing was advised that three insertions were called for by the Board of Commerce Act for all the notices of that organization, since which time the rule has been observed.

GOVERNMENT SHIPYARD AT SOREL.

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Is the Government shipyard at St. Joseph de Sorel included in the assets of Canada?

2. If so, for what amount?

[Mr. Tobin.]

3. What is the total amount invested and chargeable to capital on said shipyard since its establishment?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Yes. Expenditures on the shipyard at St. Joseph de Sorel are included in the item "Improvements to St. Lawrence," set out on the assets side of the balance sheet of the Dominion as published in the Public Accounts. These capital charges, however, are not taken into consideration in determining the net debt of Canada.

2 and 3. Summary of expenditure in connection with "Improvements to St. Lawrence" including shipyard and dredging fleet is, as follows:—

	Cost of Dredging	Expenditure for plant, shops, survey, etc.
Montreal Harbour Commissioners 1851-1888	$ 3,402,494.35	$ 535,869.65
Department of Public Works 1889-1904..	1,784,579.86	2,105,483.02
Department of Marine 1904-1920...	10,621,831.60	4,583,747.54
Totals.. ...	15,808,905.81	7,225,100.21

C.N.R. BONDS GUARANTEED BY ALBERTA.

Mr. SHAW:

1. Did the Government take over all the lines of the Canadian Northern Railway whose bonds have been guaranteed by the Alberta Government?

2. Did the Alberta Government guarantee the bonds of a line of the Canadian Northern Railway from Calgary south to Macleod and from Macleod west to Pincher Creek?

3. Were these bonds disposed of? If so, what was the amount raised?

4. Is it the intention to use this money for the construction of the said line?

4. Can this money be used for any other purpose than the construction of the line for which the guarantee was given?

6. What is the policy in regard to the construction of this line?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. The two lines referred to are included in the total of 955 miles guaranteed by the province of Alberta, of this guarantee, bonds of 675 miles amounting to $9,726,-364.26 were either sold or pledged and total proceeds from same were $8,860,048.09.

4. Under the provisions of the Trust Deed the moneys cannot be used for any purpose other than the construction of the railway lines mentioned in the schedule to the Trust Deed.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. Construction of these lines cannot be proceeded with this year owing to financial, labour and other conditions.

TORONTO HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to contribute to the improvements in the Harbour of Toronto in the same proportion as in the other large harbours of the Dominion?
2. If not, why not?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1 and 2. Up to the commencement of the Canadian Stewart Co. contract for Toronto Harbour improvements which was the portion of the comprehensive scheme of development to be done at the direct cost of the Government, there has been expended by the Department of Public Works in the improvement of Toronto Harbour the sum of $2,323,191.75.

Since that date, there has been expended on the harbour by the Department of Public Works, the sum of $3,691,068.01, and further work, estimated to cost $1,500,000, is to be proceeded with during construction season of 1920 and 1921.

TRIAL OF WINNIPEG STRIKERS.

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Was the Dominion Government represented by cousel at the recent trials of A. A. Heaps, Reverend W. Ivens, W. A. Pritchard, R. J. Johns, George Armstrong, John Queen and R. E. Bray, before the Court of King's Bench, Criminal Side, of the Province of Manitoba?
2. Did the Dominion Government, or any official thereof, retain or appoint any of the counsel representing the Crown at said trials?
3. If so, who were advocates who were so retained and appointed by the Dominion Government or any of its officials?
4. What amount of costs has the Government paid, or will be called upon to pay in the said trials?

Rt. Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Messrs. Andrews, Andrews, Burbidge and Bastedo, J. B. Coyne, K.C., Travers Sweatman, I. Pitblado and W. W. Richardson.

4. Amount paid to date $104,271.09. Further accounts amounting to nearly $50,000 are before the department for taxation.

INCOME TAX INSPECTOR, KINGSTON.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Who is the Dominion Income Tax Inspector at Kingston, when was he appointed, and what salary does he receive?
2. What territory is included in his district?
3. How many persons are employed on the staff of the said inspector and what is the total rate per month of salary paid to them?
4. How much has been paid in salaries and other expenses to the said inspector and his staff from the opening of said office to March 31, 1920?
5. What amounts have been collected in income taxes at the Kingston office for each year since the appointment of the inspector?
6. What amounts have been collected from rural and urban sources respectively in the Kingston district?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. George A. Macdonald; 1st March, 1918; $200 per month.

2. Fiscal year, 1919, the counties of Leeds, Frontenac, Lennox and Addington, Hastings, Prince Edward, Northumberland and Peterborough. Fiscal year, 1920, Leeds, Frontenac, Lennox and Addington.

3. Fiscal year, 1920: Kingston, 18; Brockville, 3. Kingston, $1,438.66; Brockville, $300.

4. $28,763.26.

5. Fiscal year, 1919: $151,863.12; fiscal year, 1920; $274,387.97.

6. Urban tax collected, $421,957.07; rural tax collected, $4,294.02; total, $426,251.09.

CIVIL SERVICE CLASSIFICATION.

*Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Referring to the classification of the Civil Service of Canada of September, 1919, why did the commission discriminate in classifying the position of "Secretary to Executive"?
2. What secretaries to deputy heads have been classified as "Secretary to Executive"?
3. Why was the title of "Secretary Stenographer" in the official classification list of July, 1919, omitted in that of September, 1919?
4. Is it the intention of the commission to rectify the omission?

Rt. Hon. ARTHUR SIFTON:

1. The Government is not aware that any discrimination was shown in classifying positions in the class "Secretary to Executive." Positions were classified by the Civil Service Commission on the basis of the duties and responsibilities exercised by the incumbents of the positions.

2. It has been found advisable to discontinue the class "Secretary to Executive" as appearing in the September issue of the classification and it is replaced by a class "Secretary to Executive" with lower qualification requirements and a salary range of $1,500, $1,620, $1,740, $1,860. Positions previously classified as "Secretary to Executive" are now under review by the commission and the incumbents of these positions will be classified as principal clerk, head clerk or in other appropriate classes.

3. The class "secretary-stenographer" was omitted from the September edition of the classification because of its great similarity to the class senior clerk stenographer but it has since been combined with the lowered class secretary to executive.

4. Answered by No. 3.

CANADA WHEAT BOARD.

Mr. ANDREWS:

1. When does the term of the present Wheat Board expire?
2. Does the Government contemplate renewing its term of office?
3. When will the participation certificates be issued?
4. Does the Government expect that the farmers will get any cash payment for these certificates?

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The Wheat Board was constituted to market the wheat crop of 1919, and its term of office will expire when that has in effect been accomplished, probably about September 1.

2. The Government has not so far contemplated doing so.

3. Participation certificates are issued as wheat is sold by the owners, but full payment of participation certificates cannot be made until all the crop has been marketed, and payments therefor, and expenses connected therewith, have been adjusted.

4. Certainly. The Wheat Board has already notified the holders that they may reasonably count on receiving at least 40 cents per bushel.

IMPORTS INTO CANADA.

Mr. RINFRET:

1. What was the amount of imports, during 1919, from United States, England, France, Italy and Belgium?
2. What was the amount of imports from the same countries during the first three months of 1920?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Value of imports entered for consumption during 1919:

From United States	$740,114,584
" England	87,530,259
" France	6,784,860
" Italy	706,358
" Belgium	359,103

2. Value of imports entered for consumption during first three months of 1920:

From United States	$229,790,119
" England	56,923,619
" France	4,867,689
" Italy	418,396
" Belgium	552,358

[Mr. Sifton.]

HERMAN J. DAGER.

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. Is there a person named Herman J. Dager, in the Inland Revenue Department?
2. If so, when was he appointed?
3. What is his nationality?
4. By whom was he recommended?
5. Was he ever appointed a Preventive Officer of the Inland Revenue Department?
6. What is his salary?
7. What other sources of income has he from the department?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. No, but he was formerly in the department.
2. October 6, 1898.
3. Canadian.
4. Sir Henri Joly, as Minister of Inland Revenue.
5. No.
6. Answered by No. 1.
7. Answered by No. 1.

GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPH OPERATORS.

Mr. SAVARD:

1. Have the Government telegraph operators received the bonus granted to other civil servants?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to grant them the bonus in the future?
3. If not, what is the reason these employees, who give their whole time to the service of the Government, are not given the benefit of the bonus the same as other Government employees?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.
2. No.
3. Standard rates of pay, corresponding to those of the commercial telegraph companies, are paid Government telegraph employees, and being in receipt of prevailing wages they are not entitled, under the regulations, to receive any bonus.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY FUND.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. What amount of the Federal Emergency Fund of $40,000,000 for the relief of returned soldiers, voted at last session, has been expended?
2. What amount was expended in each province?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: 1 and 2. The total expenditure by the Federal Emergency Appropriation Department out of the $40,000,000 voted last session will run between $5,000,000 and $5,500,000. The branches of the fund in the western provinces have until May 15 to pay Soldiers' Settlement cases, claims for which originated prior to April 24. These payments were authorized under Order in Council passed May 4 and

the branches have until May 15 to complete their payments. The official returns from the western branches will, therefore, not be received in full until some time after that date.

Advances to Branches in the Respective Provinces to 24th April, 1920, less Refunds to date.

Province.	Advance.
Alberta	$1,065,000 00
British Columbia	970,000 00
Manitoba	325,000 00
New Brunswick	57,175 67
Nova Scotia	200,000 00
Ontario	1,258,982 21
Quebec	1,242,577 68
Prince Edward Island	22,800 00
Saskatchewan	450,000 00
Yukon	10,000 00
Total	$5,601,535 56

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

SIR DONALD MANN'S PRIVATE CAR.

1. Did Sir Donald Mann have a private car?
2. If so, was it taken over by the Government when they bought the Canadian Northern railway?
3. If not, why?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.
2 Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie):

1. What was the total amount of drawback for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1920, paid to textile manufacturers on (a) raw cotton, and (b) cotton yarns?
2. What was the total amount of drawback for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1920, paid to textile manufacturers on (a) raw wool, and (b) woollen yarns?

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Do the inspectors in charge of terminal elevators, under the Board of Grain Commissioners, have full authority to inspect grain, as provided for in the Canada Grain Act?
2. If not, why not?
3. If so, do the inspectors issue the requisite inspection certificates, with their signatures attached thereto, as evidence of such inspection?
4. Has the Chief Inspector or his immediate assistant, in charge of terminal elevators, authority to change such inspection, without consent of the inspector directly in charge of a terminal elevator?
5. If so, is this practice provided for in the Canada Grain Act?
6. Are inspection certificates, either inwards or outwards, signed in blank by an officer under the Board of Grain Commissioners, and then filled in afterwards by a clerk?
7. Are western inspection certificates signed in blank by the Chief Inspector or one of his officers, and then filled in by an officer in the Eastern Inspection District?
8. Is the inward and outward inspection at terminal elevators identically the same?
9. Does the Canada Grain Act provide for the inspection of grain into terminal elevators, from steamers and barges?
10. If so, does the inward or outward inspection govern?
11. How much grain has the Government elevator, Port Arthur, handled since September 1, 1919, to May 1, 1920?
12. How much grain did the above elevator handle during the following crop years: 1913-14, 1914-15, 1915-16, 1916-17, 1917-18, 1918-19?
13. What was the cost per bushel in handling grain in the Government elevator, Port Arthur, for the above crop years, and for the period, September 1, 1919, to May 1, 1920?
14. Does the above cost include any provision for interest on investment and management?
15. What was the revenue per bushel for the above period: (a) including as revenue, money derived from the sale of overages, screenings and scalpings; (b) excluding as revenue, money derived from the sale of overages, screenings and scalpings?
16. How many employees were engaged in the above elevator during the above periods?
17. What is the name of the senior officer or manager who superintended the operations of the Government elevatoras under the Department of Trade and Commerce for the above periods?
18. Do all the Government elevators carry insurance on grain stored therein, in accordance with law?
19. If not, why the discrimination against the other commercially-owned elevators, and on whose authority is the law broken?
20. Section 95, subsection 7, of the Canada Grain Act provides for the confiscation of overages over one-quarter of one per cent to the Government. Are the Board of Grain Commissioners keeping strict accounting of all grain going into and out of terminal elevators, including screenings and scalpings, so as to arrive at the above figures?
21. Has the Registration Department, under the Board of Grain Commissioners, full information tabulated showing the gross weight in and gross weight out of terminal elevators?
22. What change was made by the Board of Grain Commissioners in the wording of the outward weight certificates?
23. When was the change made?
24. Was the weight certificate, as worded, considered faulty up to the time of the change?
25. If not, why was the change in the wording made?
26. Has the Canada Wheat Board an officer at Fort William, whose duty it is to check the grades given by the inspection department under the Department of Trade and Commerce, on all grain shipped for and on account of the Canada Wheat Board?
27. If so, how many officers are engaged in this office, their names and salaries?
28. If so, what is the necessity of two Government officials doing the one task?
29. If so, are the expenses incidental to this office deducted from the money, which ought rightly be given to the farmers, for the participation certificates issued?

30. Does the Canada Wheat Board accept the inspection certificates as issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce, without reservation?

31. Did the Canada Wheat Board always avail itself of the highest market for all wheat sold for and on account of the producers?

32. Since the Government has taken over the control of the wheat business, has this had a tendency to reduce the work of the Board of Grain Commissioners?

33. If so, have the number of employees under the Board of Grain Commissioners been reduced, for the purposes of economical administration?

34. Is the administration of the Canada Grain Act self-sustaining?

35. If not, how are the deficits made up from year to year and on whose authority?

36. What salaries are paid to the secretary of the Board of Grain Commissioners and the secretary of the Canada Wheat Board?

37. Do the public terminal elevators at Fort William or Port Arthur purchase and sell grain from time to time, contrary to the Canada Grain Act?

38. If so, on whose authority?

39. Section 48 of the Canada Grain Act provided for the fixing of grades other than statutory grades, by the Grain Standards Board. Has this board fixed the composition and grades of: (a) screenings, (b) scalpings?

40. If not, why not?

41. If not, who has fixed the composition and grades up to the present time, and on what authority?

42. If fixed, what are they?

43. Are the original dockages taken from the grain returned to the producer or the buyer of the warehouse receipt covering the specific parcel?

44. If not, why not?

45. How long has the Government, through the Department of Agriculture, handled standard stock food ex terminal elevators?

46. Has the venture been profitable?

47. What is the surplus or deficit for each year?

COMMERCIAL FEEDING STUFFS.

On the motion of Hon. S. F. Tolmie (Minister of Agriculture) it was resolved that to-morrow the House do consider in Committee of the Whole a resolution declaring it expedient to bring in a measure to regulate the sale and inspection of commercial feeding stuffs, bran, shorts, middlings, and chop feeds.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. Martin Burrell (Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue) it was resolved that to-morrow the House do consider in Committee of the Whole a resolution to amend the Inland Revenue Act, Chapter 51 of the revised statutes of 1906, with respect to chemical stills, standard leaf tobacco, distilling without a license, excise duty on spirits, etc.

[Mr. Stevens.]

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Burrell it was resolved that to-morrow the House consider in Committee of the Whole a resolution to amend the Post Office Act, Chapter 56 of the revised statutes, 1906, with respect to the registration fee on letters, the postage rate on newspapers and periodical publications, etc.

TRANSFER OF PICTOU HARBOUR.

On the motion of Hon. C. C. Ballantyne (Minister of Marine) the House went into Committee of the Whole on the following proposed resolution.

Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Resolved, That it is expedient to repeal the Acts relating to the Harbour of Pictou, in the province of Nova Scotia, and to transfer the property, rights and assets now held by the Harbour Commissioners to His Majesty in the right of Canada, and to provide that His Majesty shall assume and discharge all the obligations and liabilities of the said commissioners.

Mr. DUFF: Will the minister kindly explain the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Its object is to permit of the introduction of a Bill to permit of the transfer of the Harbour of Pictou, Nova Scotia, from the Department of Marine to the Department of Public Works. The reason for the transfer is that the revenue of Pictou Harbour is less than the expenditures in connection with it. The revenue for the seven years from 1913 to 1919, inclusive, amounted to $3,388, whereas the expenditure was $3,840. While the harbour is under a Harbour Commission, no moneys can be spent to repair the wharfs there unless the revenue permits of that being done; but the committee will notice that according to the figures I have given the expenditure during the period referred to has been greater than the revenue. The commission is unable to make the necessary repairs to the wharf as matters stand, and therefore it is proposed—if hon. gentlemen agree to the present resolution and to the Bill which is to be based upon it—that the harbour shall be transferred from the Department of Marine to the Department of Public Works.

Mr. DUFF: What has been the yearly revenue from the wharfs in question and what property is it proposed to repair?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The revenue is derived from what is known as wharfage dues and the revenue for the past seven years

has been as follows: 1913, $678; 1914, $789; 1915, $999; 1916, $356; 1917, $253; 1918, $151; 1919, $162. Hon. members will notice that there has been a gradual decrease in the receipts year by year and that in 1919 the revenue amounted to only $162, and in 1918 to $151. Under present conditions there is no opportunity to repair any of the Government wharfs at Pictou. If the hon. member for that constituency (Mr. McGregor) is in the House he will be in a position to give more detailed information upon the subject.

Mr. DUFF: I would like to know if the wharfs from which this revenue is derived are Government wharfs or private wharfs; also what liabilities the Government have to assume in connection with this transfer?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Department of Public works built the wharfs many years ago. I find that the first Harbour Commission was appointed in the year 1873. The commission is composed of Mr. D. Sutherland, chairman, (appointed October 19, 1912), and Messrs. Thomas Canlie, Hugh Murray, William Fraser and George H. Macdonald.

Wharves are usually built by the Department of Public Works and then transferred to the Department of Marine. In this case the local board has been collecting the dues and doing the necessary repairs since 1873. Owing to the decline of business the revenue has been decreasing, and I am informed that the necessary repairs cannot now be taken care of by the revenue. The Department of Marine has not the necessary authority to attend to the work, but the Department of Public Works could do so if the committee passes this resolution.

Mr. COPP: What is the cause of the decline in revenue from year to year?

Mr. McGREGOR: It will be noticed by the figures given by the minister that the revenue collected previous to the war was quite considerable, but during recent years it has fallen off to practically nothing, and consequently the Harbour Commission is not able to maintain the three wharves in repair. These wharves will come under the control of the Public Works Department if this Bill passes. I may say that the commissioners have always given their services gratuitously, being public-spirited citizens. The expenditure in future will be greater by reason of the fact that a large amount of money has been spent by the Public Works Department in deepening and straightening the channel of the East river to Trenton and New Glasgow and constructing locks, and it is in the public interest that this work should be taken care of by the Public Works Department.

Mr. DUFF: Were these wharves built by the Government?

Mr. McGREGOR: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: What are the liabilities that the Government have to take over?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: So far as I know the Public Works Department will not take over any liabilities. The sole object of the resolution and of the Bill based upon it is that the necessary repairs may be made by the Public Works Department. If the Marine Department had the necessary authority to do these repairs, of course, I would not be asking hon. members to pass this resolution. But I think the committee will agree that an important habour like Pictou must be kept up, and it cannot be unless the proposed transfer is made.

Mr. DUFF: My only reason for asking is that the resolution states:

> —and to provide that His Majesty shall assume and discharge all the obligations and liabilities of the said commissioners.

As regards the Government taking over the property, I think it is the right and proper thing to do, and I have no objection to this course being taken; all I am asking for is information before the resolution is passed, and I think I am entitled to such information.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member has all the information that the Government is in possession of. This is simply a transfer of the harbour to the Public Works Department, and I am not aware that there are any liabilities to be assumed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: While I do not object to this resolution, I must say that there are other wharves, and piers, and docks in the Dominion which have been absolutely ignored for the last eight or ten years. I refer particularly to such works built on the Baie de Chaleur and on the St. Lawrence; many of such wharves and piers have been damaged by storms and not one dollar's worth of repairs made. Speaking for my own constituency, I for one do not ask the Government to spend any money on those works, for I realize that the country is passing through a great financial crisis, and in view of the heavy taxation which is impending it is the desire of every man and woman that any heavy commitments should be very seriously considered

by the Government before they are undertaken. Since the beginning of the war public works from Halifax to Vancouver have been built which, having regard to our tremendous financial obligations, might well have been delayed. I need not name any of those public works, but they are to be found in every province. With the very heavy tax bills which await them the electors will not stand for any but absolutely urgent expenditure on piers, wharves or docks for the next few years, and I hope when those expenditures are proposed to the Minister of Finance in council that he will blue-pencil any which are not absolutely necessary. I could give a long list of public wharves built by the Government which were very useful to our fishing population, but which have been completely abandoned,—particularly when they were situated in constituencies represented by members of the Opposition. But under the circumstances I do not begrudge the refusal of the Government to meet our requests for repairs to those public works. However, I appeal to my hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) not to commit the country to any non-urgent expenditure while every elector is expecting the visit of the tax collector with heavy demands to meet the huge debt which confronts this country.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I wish to assure the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) that the Government have no intention of constructing new wharves or of spending large sums of money at the harbour of Pictou. In proof of that I might say that the new Estimates do not contain one single dollar for this harbour. The Government would be at perfect liberty to repair the harbours to which my hon. friend refers, but so far as Pictou is concerned, even if the wharves were falling to pieces the Pictou Harbour Commissioners have not the necessary revenue which would enable them to effect repairs, and the Department of Marine have no authority to spend money other than what is derived from the harbour dues, and so on. I am merely asking that this transfer be made; I want to make it plain that it is not the intention of the Government to spend any large sum of money on Pictou harbour.

Mr. CANNON: The minister says that no liabilities are being assumed by the Government in this respect. If there are obligations or liabilities, why say in the resolution:

> And to provide that His Majesty shall assume and discharge all the obligations and liabilities of the said commissioners.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is merely legal phraseology; the transfer is provided of the liabilities from the local harbour board to His Majesty. I have been informed by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McGregor) that there are no current liabilities.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What amounts are paid out by the Harbour Commission for salaries?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The only money that is expended is $200 a year to the harbour master. The harbour commissioners give their services gratuitously.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would suggest that the liabilities referred to in this resolution include liabilities incurred through neglect on the part of the Government to keep the harbour in a proper state of repair.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am glad that the harbour of Pictou is so fully qualified to become Government property. The wharves are falling to pieces; the revenue is not nearly equal to the expenditure, and the minister evidently has found the conditions to be such that the property should be acquired by the Government. I would like to know whether a report has been made with regard to this matter, either to the minister or to the Department of Public Works. Let me tell the minister at once that I am in favour of the public ownership of harbours. The harbours of Sydney and North Sydney are now free ports; ships coming in have nothing to pay; no harbour dues are collected. When the transfer which this resolution proposes has been effected, will the harbour dues no longer be payable in the harbour of Pictou? I should like to know also whether this change has been made at the request of the Harbour Commissioners. In connection with the harbour of North Sydney the authority of the commission was simply cancelled and in that way the properties were vested in the Government. The harbour master at that port is a Government official; he looks after ships which do business in the harbour. But at North Sydney any obligation of the commision was looked after by themselves; no obligations were assumed by the Government except the future obligation of effecting the necessary improvements and repairs. If similar conditions are to apply to the harbour of Pictou and the property is transferred to the Government free from obligation, I have no objection to the proposal; I think it is a step in advance.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We want to do the same with Pictou as was done with North

Sydney. The port is now in possession of His Majesty, the Harbour Commissioners being merely trustees or managers. The object of the resolution is to do away with the commission and to make Pictou a free harbour. The Harbour Commissioners waited upon the Government some time ago and urged that this be done.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are any bonds or other liabilities outstanding against the harbour?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I had a careful investigation made before proposing the resolution. There are no liabilities whatever.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: When the minister says that it is proposed to make Pictou a free harbour, does he mean that wharfage dues will no longer be collected, that sick mariners' dues will not be charged, and that the ordinary expenses of shipping which apply at other ports will not apply at Pictou?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As soon as this transfer is made, no wharfage dues will be charged at Pictou. Sick mariners' dues, which are separately covered by statute, will still be charged.

Mr. CAHILL: Why make a difference between Pictou harbour and other harbours and wharves? As I understand the matter, when the Public Works Department builds a wharf at any point, that wharf is handed over for management and collection of dues to the Department of Marine, and apparently that has been done in this case. When, however the question of expenditure is involved or when it is proposed to make a wharf free, it is handed back to the Department of Public Works. What led the Government to come to the conclusion that this wharf in preference to others should be free and should be handed back to the Department of Public Works for maintenance when other wharves have to pay wharfage dues?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Generally speaking, wharves throughout Canada are not only constructed by the Department of Public Works but maintained under that department except where there is a good deal of shipping. The large ports of Montreal, Vancouver, Quebec, have, of course harbour commissions which administer the ports for the Crown. Then there are smaller ports similar to Pictou, at which there has been a good deal of shipping, and it has been the custom for many years for the Department of Public Works to transfer such wharves to the Department of Marine. Had the shipping at Pictou harbour kept up and the revenue likewise kept up, I would not be asking hon. members now to pass this resolution. I would not want to convey to the committee the impression that the wharves at Pictou harbour are in a dilapidated condition. They are, I am informed, in very good condition but some repairs will have to be made probably next year, and the revenue has not been sufficient to pay even the harbourmaster who draws a salary of $200 a year. There would not be a twenty-five cent piece left out of revenue for repairs, and in the public interest, if repairs are necessary, they ought to be done at the expense of the public. There is nothing now in the Estimates for repairs to this harbour, but next year or some other year there may be, and, therefore, I am asking the transfer to be made now.

Mr. CAHILL: I have in mind some wharves on the Timiskaming lakes, which wharves are in charge of the Marine Department which collects wharfage dues there. I want to know why this particular dock is picked out as one for special treatment as against wharves on smaller lakes and inland waters where the farmers have to pay charges for the privileges of taking their goods over the docks both in shipping the goods out and in shipping them in. For instance, at Haileybury and Ville Marie the farmers have to pay dues for the privilege of shipping their hay over the docks to the market; they have no railroad, and they tell me that in the last few years they have been suffering quite a hardship in having to pay what they consider very high wharfage charges at those points.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the condition of the wharf to which my hon. friend refers is such that it needs repairs and the revenue is not sufficient to cover the cost of making those repairs, then it would be quite in order for the hon. member to ask whatever Government happened to be in power at the time, to make a transfer, the same as I am asking now. There is, however, a difference between local wharves as compared with an important harbour such as Pictou. I have been informed that $1,000,000 has been spent on Pictou harbour; that there are large and important locks there, to look after which engineers are required, and the revenue does not permit of that. I am quite sure the hon. member would not want an expenditure that has been made, amounting now to $1,000,000, not to be properly looked after. The harbour commissioners

4 p.m.

have not revenue enough to do the work; the Department of Marine has not the authority to do it, and I hope hon. members will agree with me that this transfer is not going to mean any very heavy additional expense to the country.

Mr. CAHILL: The wharf to which I refer has a larger revenue than the wharf about which the minister is speaking, and I am sure the people there deserve just the same treatment as the people at Pictou or at any other place. In fact, they deserve perhaps a little better treatment because they are pioneers opening up a new country. Has the Government any set plan as to how these different wharves throughout the country are administered and why should they select one particular wharf for special treatment? Is it the policy of the Government that when a wharf becomes dilapidated under the administration of the Marine Department to transfer it back to the Public Works Department, and then when repairs are made, to transfer it back again to the Marine Department?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The general policy is that wharves at which there is any large quantity of shipping, are transferred to the Department of Marine. In the case of Haileybury wharf, I should understand from the remarks of my hon. friend that the revenue is quite sufficient to keep that wharf in a proper state of repair. But supposing, for argument's sake, that were not so, it would be quite in order for the Minister of Marine to ask that that wharf be transferred from the Marine Department to the Public Works Department. If the revenue had kept up at Pictou harbour the same as it has apparently kept up at Haileybury harbour, I should not be asking that this resolution pass.

Mr. BUREAU: How many harbour commissioners are there at Pictou and by whom are they appointed?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Governor in Council appoints the harbour commissioners. The following harbour commissioners were appointed on October 19, 1912; Mr. D. Sutherland, chairman; Mr. Thomas Cantley, Mr. Hugh Murray, Captain William Fraser and George H. Macdonald. None of these five commissioners receive any remuneration.

Mr. BUREAU: According to the wording of this resolution, I understand this commission exists by virtue of a statute and that the minister is now asking for the repeal of that statute. These commissioners who administer the harbour of Pictou are appointed under this particular law which created the harbour of Pictou. Is it the intention of the minister hereafter to have some employees of his department or another commission or somebody else look after the harbour, because after this commission goes out of existence, there will be nobody to look after the harbour except the Department of Marine.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: When this resolution and the Bill founded on it are passed, the responsibility of the harbour of Pictou is transferred from the Marine Department to the Public Works Department, and the Public Works Department, I am informed, already have engineers at Pictou who would have to take on the additional duty of looking after the locks and wharves there. This is simply a transfer of responsibility from one department of the Government to another.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The resolution does not seem to be very well worded. It reads:

> Resolved, that it is expedient to repeal the Acts relating to the harbour of Pictou, in the province of Nova Scotia, and to transfer the property, rights and assets now held by the harbour commissioners to His Majesty in the right of Canada, and to provide that His Majesty shall assume and discharge all the obligations and liabilities of the said commissioners.

Does that mean, according to my hon. friend, that after the transfer of the property to the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Public Works will simply carry on the usual work of administering that property and repairing it, or does it mean something more, namely, that according to the language used in the resolution, there are really liabilities? If not, why use the words:

> And to provide that His Majesty shall assume and discharge all the obligations and liabilities of the said commissioners.

The minister, of course, states that a rigid inspection has taken place under the direction of some officer of his department, and that he has personal knowledge that there are no liabilities at all to be assumed by the Government.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This resolution has been passed upon by parliamentary counsel, and I must accept his phraseology and defer to his knowledge in the matter. The commissioners are going to be relieved of all their authority and henceforth the responsibility will be vested in the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. LEMIEUX: According to the inspection of the books made by my hon. friend's officers there are no liabilities as implied in the words of the resolution. The meaning of the word "liabilities" is generally understood.

Mr. DUFF: Before the resolution carries I should like to have it distinctly understood in what sense the harbour of Pictou will be free when the Bill which is to be based upon the resolution becomes law. I should not like the plain unqualified statement to reach the shipping men that the harbour is going to be free. In my opinion, if the resolution and the subsequent Bill are passed, the shippers of goods in Pictou harbour will have to pay the same wharfage dues as do people who use any other public wharves in Canada. The same applies to ships going in or out of Pictou harbour. They will have to pay the same pilotage dues as ships in other parts of the country, so the same harbour dues and all other fees so that in these respects Pictou harbour will not be any different from other ports in Canada.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is right

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wonder if my hon. friend would submit the report which the accountant made in regard to the books of the Harbour Commission of Pictou. I am always afraid of assuming new liabilities. I have recently passed St. John, N.B., which is a great city that I much admire. I remember some years ago the Government assumed the liabilities and obligations of the harbour of St. John, and they proved very heavy indeed; and although I do not imagine that the same huge expenditure will be made in the harbour of Pictou, yet I am always suspicious of any future or past liabilities assumed by the Government in regard to harbours. As I say, I have just seen St. John and I can guess how many millions were sunk in the Bay of Fundy, and I should not like to assume responsibilities of the same proportions in connection with any other harbour in Canada.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If it is the pleasure of the committee to pass this resolution, I shall be very glad, when we are in committee on the Bill, to give all the assets and liabilities in detail.

Mr. BUREAU: As I understand any schedule of tolls for the harbour, and all dues, dockage, moorage, etc., are to be submitted to the Minister of Marine, and these are to be subject to his approval. I understand from the minister that the Harbour Commission is to go out of existence and that the harbour will come under the control of the Department of Public Works. How is it to be administered? Is the Department of Public Works going to be the supreme authority to regulate tolls and charges and to appoint those whom it pleases the minister or the deputy minister to put in charge of the department, or is it the intention to have some commission or other to supervise the harbour?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is not the intention to re-appoint the commission there. The harbour at Pictou will be under the Department of Public Works just like hundreds of other harbours throughout Canada. The only important change that will be made will be in regard to wharfage dues, or, as some people call them, "top" wharfage dues, which will disappear with the local harbour commission itself. The responsibility for the harbour and the property of the Crown in connection therewith will rest entirely with the Minister of Public Works, and as the Department of Public Works has local engineers down there now no additional expenditures will be entailed. It will simply mean a little more work for the engineers of the Department of Public Works located at Pictou; they, instead of the local harbour board, will have to look after the harbour, the locks and piers.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that there will be no more harbour dues on steamers going to Pictou and that the port will be free.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It will be a free port in the sense indicated my the hon. member (Mr. Duff). The pilotage dues and sick mariners' dues will be charged, but the small fees levied on the cargoes of ships inbound and outbound will be abolished.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the minister say that in future his policy will be to hand over to the Public Works Department the properties of any harbours which are in financial difficulties?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That will be the policy of the Government.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think the minister will wisely come to the conclusion that it is small business to collect dues from these wharves in different parts of the country. I remember well, many years before the minister came into the House, when a Bill was passed by which these wharves were to be taken over by the Marine Department and dues were to be charged. There was a vigorous opposition to the Bill and it

was only by reason of the fact that it was a Government measure under a minister who is now a judge of the Supreme Court, the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, that it was passed. But there was never any other opinion than that these wharves were built for the public convenience of people who as a rule are located in isolated places where, unless there were wharves, they could not get any benefit from passing ships. For many years the Government had no intention whatever of making any charge. It is quite proper of course that there should be a man to look after the wharves and to see that they do not fall into disrepair, but it is not worth while for any Government to collect these small fees that are charged. The minister is going to abolish the system in Pictou, and the sooner he applies it to the other harbours of the same class the better. Pictou harbour is an important one. In my own county there are many harbours that are not under the control of the board but they have Government wharves which are indispensable; and the policy inaugurated within the last few years of collecting wharfage in these places is in my opinion highly undesirable. I trust that the policy to be established in regard to Pictou harbour will extend to every other place in Nova Scotia where there are public wharves on which fees are now collected.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 121 respecting the harbour of Pictou in Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a first time.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT, 1907, AMENDMENT.

The House resumed from May 4 consideration in committee of Bill No. 57 (from the Senate) to amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907—Hon. Mr. Meighen—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 2—signatures requisite for applications to refer disputes to boards and for statutory declarations accompanying them:

Mr. MEIGHEN: The reason for the adjournment of this clause was the calling the attention of the committee by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) to the amendment of 1910 and to the fact that that evidently was overlooked in the preparation of this Bill. That is quite correct and it should not have been overlooked. It is the intention of the Minister of Labour that clause 3 of the amendment of 1910, which is the clause referred to by the leader of the Opposition, shall still be law. I therefore beg to move:

That clause 2 be amended by adding thereto the following after the word "Act" in the first line thereof the following:

"As amended by section 3 of chapter 29 of the statutes of 1910."

That is the part that repeals section 3 of the statutes of 1910.

And by changing the semicolon at the end of subclause (b) thereof to a period; and by adding to paragraph (d) of the new section 16 the following words:

"Where a dispute directly affects employees in more than one province, and such employees are members of a trade union having a general committee authorized to carry on negotiations in disputes between employers and employees, and so recognized by the employers, may be signed by the chairman or president, and by the secretary of the said committee."

These words sought to be added by the amendment are the exact words that are inserted by section 3 of the amendment of 1910.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before this clause as amended carries I should like once again to direct the minister's attention to the effect of the changes he is proposing as to the manner in which the application shall be made for a board of conciliation and investigation under this Act. The minister has made a change, at the suggestion of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. McDonald) in regard to subsection (d). If he is to be logical and consistent he will have to make a similar change when he comes to subsection (e), which is part of the same section, and such a change is certain to occasion some discussion. If he does not make it there will be discussion just the same because of the amendment he is now proposing. In order to make clear the significance of what is being done, and which I think should not be done, let me state the purpose of the original sections.

The existing sections are to provide a method by which an application for a board of conciliation and investigation is to be made. There are two kinds of situations to be taken into account. One is where an application is to be made by a union, or by men who are members of a union, and the other is where the application comes from those who are not members of a union. The law as it exists requires that before an application can be made to the Government for the appointment of a board of conciliation and investigation where it affects union members there shall be a majority vote of those who are members of the union. That is to say that if a meeting of

the union is being held and if members wish to make application for a board a vote of the members present will have to be taken so that there will be something of record to show that the matter has been considered and that there was an actual majority in favour of making the application. There is a further provision as regards special meetings, that a notice shall be posted stating the object for which the meeting is called and that a ballot shall be taken at the meeting in reference to the particular subject in dispute. The minister is doing away with any necessity of calling any special meeting of the union to consider the matter, and is proposing to do away altogether with the necessity of taking any vote, with the result that if an application is made to the department a dispute may arise on the question as to whether a majority of those who belong to the union really made an application. Some employer might take exception to a board being granted on the ground that the majority required by the Act did not vote in favour of the application. There is, under the amendment proposed, no means of deciding that fact other than by taking the word of the particular persons who put in the application. As the Act stands to-day there is a recorded vote to which reference can be made and which is all sufficient to satisfy the minister as to the application having been made in the right way.

Now we come to the application to be made by any group of men who are not members of a trade union in regard to a dispute that arises. The Act at present requires that three days' notice shall be posted and that a vote shall be taken of the men who attend a meeting to discuss the question of an application to the Government for a board of conciliation and investigation. All parties know about it, those that are interested attend. If the majority decide in favour of an application for a board, they have a right to obtain a board in that way; a record of the vote on the application has been made, and it is beyond dispute. This has worked out, as far as I know, perfectly satisfactorily. It has occasioned trouble or embarrassment to no one. The minister now proposes to do away with that precaution and to say that there shall be no vote taken, he proposes to do away with the necessity of posting a three days' notice in regard to the calling of a meeting and simply to permit any group of men, without a vote and without a meeting, without any reference to any special matter in dispute, to make application to the Government for a board. I think the effect of it will be to create all kinds of difficulties for the minister in granting, or in determining whether he has the right or not to grant, a board, and I think it will, in many cases, act prejudicially to the interests of all concerned. I also think that it may lead to an undue interference with an established business by enabling any two men where it suits particular individuals, to go around with a sheet of paper and solicit the names of different men who may or may not belong to a union, and, obtaining the required number of names, to secure from the Government the right to have the whole machinery of the Act set in motion.

In this connection I must point out the bearing of another amendment which the minister has suggested—which I think is entirely wrong. Under the law as it stood, witness fees were based on the rates allowed in the different provinces. But the minister has changed that provision so as to allow the payment of a minimum of $4 a day to witnesses, although when the Minister of Labour introduced the measure in the other House he asked that the minimum should be only $2 a day. Some discussion took place there as to the $2 not being a sufficient amount for experts, and the figure was changed to $4 so as to arrive at an all round figure which may apply to all classes of witnesses. The effect of bringing in this amendment along with the permission to allow payment of $4 to all witnesses will be simply this: In regard to a large number of disputes that will be dealt with under this law, any two individuals in a mining camp, or anywhere else, who think that they would like to start an investigation into a business of a particular concern will go around among the members of a camp, tell them that if they so wish they will be called as witnesses in regard to a particular investigation and that they will get $4 a day as witnesses; and if these two persons get a majority, without any vote, without any meeting, without any discussion on the question one way or the other,—if the law is carried out, the Government will have to grant a board for such investigation. Now opening the door to possible proceedings of that kind is mischievous. It will only help, I think, in some quarters to bring the Act into question in a way it has not been brought into question in the past. I would therefore like to make this last appeal to the minister—before he changes a section of the law which has not, so far as I am aware been embarrassing to any of the parties con-

cerned—that he leave well enough alone and not make these unnecessary amendments.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The leader of the Opposition should remember that the author of this Bill is not myself but the Minister of Labour who administers the Act. The committee, of course, is well aware of that. The leader of the Opposition has before argued the point that he now re-introduces. It is a fact that the Minister of Labour contemplates by this amendment that a board may be requested in any single case (1) either by the calling of a meeting and the securing of a majority of all the members affected at that meeting, or (2) by securing a majority without calling a meeting, and saying to the minister that such majority duly authorizing two of the officers to ask for the board has been secured. The minister is of opinion that if over one-half want the board, that should be sufficient evidence to him of the desire of the men at least. Though that half may not have voted at a meeting, if they make the request by petition he thinks that should be sufficient and he thinks it is a much better safeguard against abuse—the requirement of the majority imperatively in every case—than was the provision of the old law that in many cases enabled a very small minority to act simply because that small minority happened to be the majority present at a meeting. That is his opinion, and I must say it does seem most reasonable. I do not for a moment think the leader of the Opposition has anything but the good of the Act in view, but he will recognize that what he suggests would be a restriction on the men. If time shows that that restriction is requisite the Minister of Labour may come back with an amendment to that end; but I would be very much surprised if time should show it to be requisite. Now that is the sum and substance of the whole matter. To repeat in one sentence: The minister is of the opinion, and I commend his view to the committee, that a majority of the men should have the right to ask a board if that majority is certain, though not evidenced by a vote at a meeting duly called. So long as there is a majority he does not want to restrict the right; but there must be a majority as distinct from the old prerequisite which required nothing more than a majority present at a meeting though that might not be more than 10 per cent of the men affected.

The Minister of Labour intends by the amendment of clause 4, which has already been passed, that $4 should be the minimum for an allowance to witnesses inclusive of expenses, believing that all witnesses should get the same throughout Canada. I would not apprehend that men should be anxious for a board in order that they might substitute $4, inclusive of expenses, for the wages they were drawing. It would seem to me that they would be paying quite a heavy penalty for the board if that were their only object in asking for it.

Mr. CROTHERS: I am sorry I was not present when these amendments were before the committee a few days ago, but I desire to say a word or two with respect to them even at this late stage.

I think that the provision in subsection D of section 16 is entirely too loose. It reads:

> by employees who are members of a trade union, by two of its officers duly authorized by a majority of the members of the union.

What does the word "duly" mean? It will cause any amount of dispute and confusion to arise. I would suggest that the word "duly" be stricken out entirely and that the paragraph should read:

> "By two of its officers authorized in writing."

It would be well to have the authority given in writing otherwise you will find a man saying: "You told me on the street corner to do so and so" and the response being made "No, I never told you anything of the sort." Whereas if the request received from the man on the street corner were signed by him it would be much better. As I see it the provision in its present form is useless.

Then take the provision that there shall be a minimum sum of $4 allowed for witness fees. The provision should not be in that form because a "minimum" of $4 means that the payments may be a great deal more than that amount. I have no objection whatever to the provision going through if the word "minimum" is stricken out. If the provision is left in its present form you will have people in one province claiming that they ought to get $6 or $8 a day because the Act only mentions a minimum. If the sum is fixed at $4 without any reference to minimum I have no objection to it. Then the witness will get $4 whether it is in the province of Prince Edward Island or the province of British Columbia. Leave the provision as it is and it will result in all sorts of disputes because I know the kind of claims

that are put forth for witness fees and allowances of that kind.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I share the views which have been expressed by the ex-Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) I think the $4 well represents what may be due a witness for spending his day in the interest of social justice, and no encouragement to demands for a greater amount should be given by allowing the word "minimum" to remain. On the other hand, I agree with my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) that in these days of labour unrest no encouragement should be given to agitators or ill-advised persons who by their simple whim might direct a strike to take place unless a board is granted. I think that evidence of the desire of the men to have a board appointed should be very clearly demonstrated, not by mere word of mouth but in writing, as my hon. friend the ex-minister says—at all events it should be a document authenticated by the signatures of responsible people holding an official position in the union or in the local organization of the employees.

We must not do anything to bring this legislation into contempt. Let me say to my hon. friend who is now piloting the Bill through the House (Mr. Meighen) that this legislation—the credit for the drafting of which, I need not say, must be given to my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition—enjoys to-day a world reputation. As my hon. friend knows, it has been adopted by several states of the Union, by some of the British dominions, and now there is before the French Parliament legislation based on our Industrial Disputes Act. Before I left France a few months ago it was my pleasure and my pride to hand over to the President of the Council, M. Millerand, all data, statistics and literature on what is generally called the Lemieux Act. He was preparing legislation for compulsory investigation and arbitration in certain cases of industrial disputes, and he repeated to me what he had said on previous occasions, that he knew of no better legislation to settle industrial troubles than the Canadian legislation. I would ask my hon. friend who is piloting the amendments to this legislation through the House to be very careful not to "denature" the spirit of this legislation—not to so amend it as to bring it into contempt by the people. Therefore I would ask him not to press the amendment which he has just moved whereby some employees might at any given moment by a mere whim ask for a board when no board was really needed. The desirability of putting the machinery of the Act into motion is always a very delicate question for the Minister of Labour to decide, and it must be known throughout the land that the machinery is put into motion only on a real stated case when there is autenticated evidence that a grievance exists and that a board is needed.

Mr. NICHOLSON (East Algoma): It seems to me that there is a misapprehension in the minds of both the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) with regard to the intent of the amendments of this Act. The original clause provides:

> If made by employees members of a trade union shall be signed by two of its officers duly authorized by a majority vote of the members of the union, or by a vote taken by ballot of the members of the union present at a meeting called on not less than three days' notice for the purpose of discussing the question.

The amendment provides:

> That if by its employees members of a union authority shall be by a majority vote of all the members of that particular union, and not by a majority at any particular meeting.

That is, the majority of the members present at any particular meeting as provided for in the original clause. So that instead of making it easier, the amendment is simply providing that the request shall represent the desire of a majority of the members of the union affected, employing the words introduced by the minister on the suggestion of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. McDonald).

With regard to the second objection raised by the hon. leader of the Opposition, I am not going to be dogmatic in regard to it, but I think if you read clause (e) you will find that provision is clearly made for calling a meeting on three days' notice and taking a vote where the men affected are not members of a union.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is that my hon. friend's impression of the amendment?

Mr. NICHOLSON (East Algoma): I would say so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend will read the amendment he will find he is quite mistaken.

Mr. NICHOLSON (East Algoma): The amendment reads:

> By employees some or all of whom are not members of a trade union, by two of their

number duly uthorized by a majority of such employees. If such authorization is obtained in whole or in part by a vote at a meeting, such meeting shall be called on not less than three days' notice and the vote shall be by ballot.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The amendment now means that if by any chance they should take a vote and decide to make application they cannot take a vote unless there has been three days' notice of the meeting given. The old law said that there must be three days' notice given, and then a vote at the meeting would decide whether or not an application would be made. The amendment is quite different and changes the whole effect of the clause. As it is now the amendment proposed leaves it open to any two men to go around in any camp or community that is unorganized, get a certain number of names, and thereby compel the granting of a board. I am sure that my hon. friend the present Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Robertson) and his predecessor (Mr. Crothers) will agree with me that that is not a wise change in the Act. I believe that the intent of the Minister of Labour is thoroughly good, but as given expression to in these amendments it is thoroughly bad, and I hope that the amendments will not be persisted in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should make reference to the new suggestion that has been made and which has been supplemented by the remarks of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). I would feel like taking the responsibility of accepting an amendment, moving it myself for that matter, to make it clearer that the authorization must be in writing, because I feel that that is the intention of the minister, following the expression used as the Bill was submitted to this House. If that is done in clause (d), it would require also to be done in clause (e); so I move:

—to further amend clause 2 by striking out the word "duly" where it appears in the twenty-third and twenty-ninth lines of the first page of the Bill and by adding after the word "authorized" where it appears in both of the said lines, the words "in writing."

The remarks I made before, of course, apply to the request of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). It is one of the infirmities under which our system suffers that in one House the minister responsible, and who has the actual administration, cannot be present. That is inevitable, either in the House or in the Senate, and it happens now that we suffer under that in the House of Commons The minister in charge of this Bill undoubtedly believes in the Act and in the principle underlying it. He has had to do with the administration of the Act for many years in his capacity as member and officer of the trade union, and for some considerable time in his capacity as Minister of Labour. He thinks the Act is to be improved by enabling a majority to express itself in any way. It is conceivable, of course, that the provisions of the Act may be abused even now, but he is removing one source of abuse, the case where a mere minority may put the whole Act into operation,—because even if three days' notice is given, members of a trade union may find it difficult to attend a meeting. He is removing that, and having removed it he does not feel like going further and hampering further the employees. He thinks that if it is difficult to hold a meeting the men ought to be allowed to express themselves by petition in writing. That being his deliberate view, and that view being not open, in my humble judgment,—which, I admit, is not worth very much—to serious objection, I do not feel like taking the responsibility of going further in the way of amendment to the clause.

Mr. CROTHERS: The amendment proposed by the minister does not sufficiently safeguard the interests of all parties concerned. I am inclined to the belief that the workingmen ought to have an opportunity of discussing matters of so much importance. If this amendment carries, any individual can go round and get Tom, Dick and Harry to sign this paper asking for a board. On the other hand, if the men gathered together in a meeting they would have full opportunity of discussing the situation, pro and con, and it might be found that few were in favour of asking for a board. I believe that the interests of the workingmen, the employer and the public will be best served if the men have an opportunity of discussing the matter before a board is asked for. Much difficulty may be created if the principle of the amendment is adopted.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Crothers). Hon. members on both sides should regard favourably the presentation of any just grievance by the workingmen. But on the other hand, we must not allow the workingmen to be worked by some ingenious agitator who may easily go from one mine to another, from one establishment to another, and endeavour to create trouble between capital and labour. I want to give this legislation a proper working basis and to see that when put into motion the machinery of

the law shall not be hampered. But let us not forget that there are in all countries people who are attempting to create—the word may seem to be a little strong—revolution. The workingmen are amply protected by this legislation; my hon. friend should not insist upon affording a weapon which agitators may use to bring the legislation into contempt. Has there been any petition from any labour organization asking for this amendment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I could not say as to that, but I stated when the Bill was here before that the amendment in its present form was approved by the Trades and Labour Congress through its executive. That is my information from the Minister of Labour.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I travelled lately with Mr. Tom Moore, and we discussed this legislation. He did not suggest any such amendment as this, but he did suggest, as the leader of the Opposition did when the matter was previously discussed, that a provision making the legislation applicable to constables should be inserted in the Act. I would like to have the views of Mr. Moore with regard to this proposed amendment, because he is a level-headed labour man; he is not an agitator.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know anything about Mr. Moore's opinion; I stated exactly what the Minister of Labour told me,—that the executive of the Trades and Labour Congress had approved of the Bill—and in this respect it has not been altered since that approval. Now, I realize that the remarks of hon. gentlemen on this question are not without some force, but this must be kept in mind; the Bill as now recommended to the committee provides that application for a board must be authorized by a majority of the men affected if a meeting is called. That is a considerable restriction, but it is necessary in order that men may not suffer through the action of a mere minority. The meeting may have been held a long way off and it may have been very difficult for many of the men to attend, and if they do not attend they may be precipitated by a mere minority into a situation of which they do not approve. Consequently it has been thought wise to say that there must be a majority. That being the case, it does seem to me that it is going too far to say that the expression of the majority must be made at a meeting. surely if a meeting is very inconvenient; if, for example, men are separated and a long way from each other, they ought to be allowed to express their will, the mere desire for a board, by another method, so long as you insist that the majority shall sign. It seems to me that they should not be denied that privilege and that convenience so long as the majority insistence is there. It is adding a very serious restriction to say that there must be a majority of all the members affected and that they must so express themselves at a meeting. That is the deliberate opinion of the Minister of Labour, and that being the case I do not feel that I would be justified in doing anything other than what I have done.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: For many years the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress, through their executive, have waited on the Government once a year. I have looked at the proceedings as reported and I have found nothing in any representations which they have made through the executive at that meeting which pertains at all to the changes now proposed. I am perfectly sure that such representations have not been made as coming from any discussions or resolutions of the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress. What I think has probably happened is that, as regards paragraph (d) one or two members of the executive have expressed to the minister the opinion that where there is a trade union, they would prefer to leave to the trade union leaders the matter of getting a majority of the union to ask for a board instead of having a meeting. I can understand their wishes in that matter. The minister, however, has gone further than that; he has added paragraph (e) to some extent paralleling paragraph (d). Paragraph (e) deals with men who are not organized at all or some of whom are organized, and in seeking to meet the wishes of others in regard to paragraph (d) he has got into a difficulty, he never foresaw as regards paragraph (e). According to the Bill as it stands now, any two men can go around and secure signatures, and even if the minister puts in the amendment of the hon. member for Elgin West (Mr. Crothers), that is, to add the words " in writing," that will not alter matters for they will get the signatures in writing. Therefore, notwithstanding what the motives of those two men may be, the Government will be compelled to grant a board and to allow the company's business to be examined by the different representatives who would be put on that board. If the door is left open in that way, opportunity is going to be given for all kinds of mischievous proceedings, and inas-

much as this paragraph is the one that relates simply to proceedings asking for a board, the minister would be well advised to leave this section alone for the present. If the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress, through their executive, ask for this change at a subsequent session, we shall then be justified in considering the matter further. But in the absence of any representations in writing which the minister can present to Parliament, I do not think that simply for the sake of forcing this through, he ought to go contrary to what I believe would be the wish of the Minister of Labour himself if he were in a position to be in this House and to see the effect of the amendment as it is pointed out at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has read the arguments presented by the hon. member including the ones bearing on this very point.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I laid them before the minister separately at the time, and he told me that this Bill had been laid before the executive of the Congress and had been approved. I did not say that the Congress had, either in writing or in any other way, requested this change, and I do not know whether they did or not. I merely know that it is the opinion of the minister—and as to its correctness I have not the faintest doubt in the world—that this change has been approved by the Congress.

There is something to which the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) referred to which I did not refer. I think if my memory serves me right, the Bill as introduced provided a uniform allowance of $4 a day, but objection was raised in the other House—we are all abandoning the rule now, so I shall have to follow suit—that there would be no provision at all for two cases. I am not sure whether the two cases were mentioned, but one was, and the one that was mentioned was that there was no provision that would enable the board to rely upon the attendance of expert witnesses. Consequently, a minimum was fixed. The other case is this.

5 p.m. Very often boards are held at points where it is impossible that $4 will be sufficient to cover anything like remuneration and expense, or even expenses alone. Usually, this fee will do so, and the minister feels that $4 will be virtually the uniform charge everywhere, but he submitted to the argument that it would not cover every case and consequently, he yielded the point and had the fee of $4 fixed as the minimum.

Mr. CROTHERS: In Ontario, I understand expert witnesses are paid a very much larger fee than the ordinary witness fee.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Section 34 of the Act reads:

> Every person who is summoned and duly attends as a witness shall be entitled to an allowance for expenses according to the scale for the time being in force with respect to witnesses in civil suits in the superior courts in the province where the inquiry is being conducted.

I understand now that we fix the amount of the witness fee at $4.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As a minimum.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend says that this word "minimum" is to protect the case of an expert.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what was urged in the Senate.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is not necessary. In the Quebec courts an expert is entitled to a larger fee than an ordinary witness receives. Of course, it has to be established that he is an expert. In my own practice I have seen quite often—and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) knows it too—that such expert witnesses as architects, doctors or civil engineers appearing before a court are entitled by the laws of the province to a special fee. Therefore, my hon. friend is opening a dangerous ground for fees which, under ordinary circumstances, might be quite satisfactory at the fixed sum of $4.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was the minister's intention to fix the fee at $4.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why say "minimum"?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I must admit I do not see much force in the objection to which I referred and which was raised in the Senate. It would seem to me the objection was covered, but it is easy to conceive of cases where, for example, if the inquiry were held, say in Ottawa and men were brought here, it would take $4 a day to pay their expenses; they would be getting less than they were getting before. This is an allowance to cover expenses and fees. The section does not refer to fees at all. It reads:

> Every person who is summoned and duly attends as a witness shall be entitled to an allowance for expenses according to the scale for the time being in force—

Mr. LEMIEUX: "With respect to witnesses in civil suits."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, the allowance is to witnesses in civil suits; it is an allowance for expenses. As I understand it, the whole allowance they will get now is $4.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A minimum of $4.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I mean. But the minimum of $4 is to cover everything the witness gets, because everything he gets is an expense allowance. That is what I am arguing.

Mr. CROTHERS: A man's transportation is over and above the amount he gets per day?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, he gets transportation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Minister of Justice knows that after a case is finished, the witnesses will go before a registrar of the court or the prothonotary and have their fees taxed. Those fees include their travelling allowance and expenses for being called as witnesses in the case. If they stay one day, two days, three days, a week they are paid so much per day in addition to their travelling expenses.

Mr. MORPHY: The question raised by this section involves an addition to the rights and powers of the workman, making it easier for him to obtain a board under the Act, and in that sense, I think the change is to be commended. There may be, although such have not been clearly pointed out within my hearing, special cases where it is difficult to obtain a meeting, but I would understand that in 99 cases out of 100, a meeting of the men belonging to a union could easily be convened because they will more or less live in the same neighbourhood. As regards the form of the section, I think it is rather left-handedly drawn, and I would suggest that it would be much clearer, no matter what principle is to be adopted if it read in this way:

> The application and the declaration accompanying it shall be signed, if made, by two officers of any trade union so appearing who have been authorised in writing by a majority of the members thereof.

At present it reads:

> The application and the declaration accompanying it shall be signed, if made by employees who are members of a trade union, by two of its officers duly authorised by a majority of the members of the union.

I do not like that word "duly." I agree with my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) and my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) that it does not leave the form of authorization sufficiently clear in the public mind. One union might consider that it was duly authorized by one course of procedure, while another union might adopt an altogether different course, also under the conviction that it was duly authorized. The authorization should be clear and beyond dispute. I think that the section as it is proposed is undoubtedly adding to rather than taking from the powers of workmen to obtain boards, and in that respect it should be commended.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think that the explanation of the difficulties we are having at the moment arises from the fact that while there are two clauses which we have been discussing, some of us have had our minds fixed only on subsection (d) while others have been speaking in reference to subsection (e). The minister just a moment ago said that he had acquainted the Minister of Labour with what I had said and that that hon. gentleman was quite aware of the points I had raised. May I mention the fact that up to to-day I have not discussed subsection (e) at all. The point I am raising in regard to subsection (e) I was reserving until we had reached that subsection, and in discussing subsection (d) I pointed out at the time these objections: first of all, of departing from the requirement that a vote be taken and registered in a record, and secondly, that some notice of the meeting be made compulsory so that those interested should be present. These sections were in the previous Act in the provisions corresponding with subsection (d) of this Act, and it would have been well to retain them in that subsection. However, they have been stricken out; and while I can quite understand that officers of unions may have made representations to the minister that they preferred to have subsection (d) in the form in which he now proposes it, I will venture the opinion that no representative of any union ever asked the minister to change subsection (e) to the form in which it now stands, and I am perfectly sure the Minister of Labour does not yet perceive the full significance of this subsection as it now stands or he would not permit it to come before this committee. May I suggest to my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Morphy) a concrete case and leave it to his own judgment as to whether he thinks it wise that the change proposed

should be made? Let us assume that the street railway system of Stratford is operated by men, none of whom are members of a trade union. The men that work on that railway may or may not be organized; I am not sure; but I am assuming for the sake of argument that none of them are members of a trade union. Under the amendment now being introduced, any person who has a grievance against the railway system of Stratford can go to any two men employed on that railway and persuade them to circulate a petition among their fellow-workers asking for a board of investigation into the operations of that railway system. They may say: "There are certain things which we desire to bring out in regard to this company's business, and we can bring them out if we obtain a board, because we can put on that board any person we please and so bring the company into court, so to speak." They can investigate the books of the company, compel the production of documents, examine witnesses under oath, and drag the business of that transportation system into a court of investigation and have its affairs inquired into at the expense of the Government, all at the instance of any two men who, for any consideration that may be offered them, can contrive to secure enough names to a petition asking for a board. Would my hon. friend from North Perth wish to have the great public utilities of this country—the street railways, the railway systems of Canada, the coal mines, the metalliferous mines, the telegraphs, the telephones, and all other great public service utilities—would my hon. friend, I say, desire to have these large and important enterprises subjected to interference of that kind on the part of people who may happen to be nothing but mischief makers? If he would not, he cannot support the amendment, which reads:

by two of their number duly authorized by a majority of such employees.

The old Act required that there should be a majority vote, and further, that there should be a notice of three days so that every one likely to be affected could attend the meeting and say whether or not the application should be put in. I am as sure as that I am standing here that the Minister of Labour would not for one moment bring in the amendment if he saw its significance. I am sure he has not seen it, and I therefore again ask my hon. friend not to press it at this time.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON (Algoma): The leader of the Opposition apparently desires what I was asking for when the Bill was before the House a few evenings ago, and that is, that before a board shall be asked for there shall have been an expression of opinion by a very substantial number of those who were interested and not at the instance of two or three sore heads, if I may use that expression. Under the law as is has hitherto stood, all that was necessary was for two agitators to arrange to call a meeting by giving three days' notice. There might be half a dozen men or so at the meeting, which might be called at such time and in such manner as might not meet the convenience of the employees generally. But if a majority of the men present at that meeting voted in favour of the application then they had the right to demand a board. Under the amendment as it has been introduced there must be a majority of all the men. Now, the assumption of my hon. friend that agitators can go around and get a written authorization asking for a board simply at the request of some who might desire to embarrass the company for which they were working, must be based on the previous assumption that the men, to say the very least, have very little sense of responsibility in regard to their work or in regard to what they owe the public; and if that is the case, surely it is a safeguard to provide that the board shall be granted only at the demand of a majority of all the men and not because a very limited minority, as would undoubtedly happen in many instances, might ask for it. Under the Act as it stands at pr s-ent all that is required is that there shall be a majority of those present. I am not betraying any confidence when I say that I have discussed this subject personally with members of trades unions and also with the Minister of Labour, and I think that this provision is a wise one. It provides that there shall be a responsible body of employees behind any application for a Board of Conciliation. As stated by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve, there are agitators throughout the length and breadth of this country who are ready to take advantage of any opportunity which may be inadvertently afforded them to create disturbance. It would be unwise to leave the door open for them to call meetings recklessly:

Mr. LEMIEUX: And take a surprise vote:

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): Yes. Yet, if it were possible for a small number of men to convene a meeting and call for a

board, just such conditions as are apprehended might be brought about.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the committee will readily concede that I have not tried to push this Bill unduly either in the House or in Committee. This is the third period to which it has been postponed, and if I had any doubt as to the Minister of Labour properly apprehending the clause I would ask that the committee rise again. But I have no doubt in the matter, because I know that the minister understands that he is here giving power to a majority to express itself by petition without a meeting, as well as power to a majority to express itself by petition at a meeting. He is giving that power to the majority whether they are all members of a trade union and likewise giving it to a majority whether they are not all members of a trade union but he feels that he can rely on the sense of responsibility of the majority, and, insisting on the majority, he does not feel like adding any other restrictions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We are experiencing this afternoon one of the inconveniences of our constitution or of the rules of the House. Ingenious, able, persuasive and eloquent as my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior is, yet everybody feels that there is a strong doubt running through his mind as to whether this amendment is a wise one. He himself expresses quite cautiously, of course, regret that the minister in charge of the Department of Labour, one of the most important, if not the most important, during the present crisis, is not allowed to come and explain his legislation before this House as he has explained it before the other House. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) is about to present amendments to the British North America Act. Has not the time come for some amendment which will enable ministers of the Crown to appear in each Chamber as their presence is needed according to the requirements of the legislation promoted in Parliament? We have an example this afternoon, because we must all realize that, notwithstanding the great ability of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, it would be a great advantage if the Minister of Labour were allowed to come on the floor of this House and explain why this amendment is proposed. We have an illustration this afternoon of the illogical position in which ministers are placed. In a few days legislation will be brought into this House which would require under ordinary circumstances the presence of the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General is asking Parliament to increase his right of taxing the people of Canada. He will not be on the floor of this House to explain his legislation. Why not have here what they have in other countries—responsible ministers passing from one Chamber to another and explaining their legislation? There is nothing contrary to common sense in that, it is pure logic, and as the British constitution is the result of precedent coming slowly down from one generation to another, why not in this House, where progress is the banner word upon every one's lips, amend the constitution so as to permit a minister of the Crown to appear in each Chamber? Perhaps the Minister of Labour would be able to convince us that this amendment is wise, but apparently it is not a wise amendment since we find objection to it on both sides of the House.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McKENZIE: I noticed in the public press that the president of the labour organization of the province of Nova Scotia was on his way from Sydney to Ottawa about this Bill. Has there been any communication between that official and the department in reference to the Bill? If he is coming here for that purpose I would be sorry if he should find the door shut and that nothing could be done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know anything about the incident that the hon. gentleman refers to. I would really in all kindness though suggest that as the Bill was before the Senate for several weeks, he started a little late to come all the way from Sydney.

Mr. McKENZIE: It only takes two days.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have their representatives here in the officers of the Department of Trades and Labour Congress. I feel sure that if the Minister of Labour had had any knowledge of this gentleman coming and had felt that it was worth while to ask that this Bill be deferred, he would have indicated that fact to me. He has not done so.

Mr. McKENZIE: Coming from a very large labour centre, I know something of the opinions of the labour men and I am not afraid to allow them to decide any business they may have before them. I think the minister will search in vain for any trouble resulting from the right which they enjoy of calling a meeting and deciding what shall be done. It is a time-honoured custom before a meeting is held to call their lodge together. Everybody interested at-

tends and at that lodge meeting they decide to call this meeting of which three days' notice is required to be given. It is not called in a haphazard manner, the business is prepared beforehand and at that meeting the attendance is generally pretty large indeed, and there is a great deal of deliberation as to whether or not they will ask for a board. I would not like to see that right taken away.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is to a certain extent. Now a majority can be obtained without a meeting at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is an added right.

Mr. McKENZIE: Once that is done they will never come together at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister say that under this provision they can get a majority by signing a petition and that after that is done they can have a meeting? I do not understand that to be the meaning of it; I understand that they must either accept one alternative or the other. The better way is to leave it to themselves to decide whether they want a board or not. We have had this system in practice for many years and I have never heard of any of those snap verdicts to which reference has been made this afternoon. In a mining camps or mining centres, when there is a possibility of a strike in the air a snap verdict is impossible. The people are all together, they are on the qui vive as to what is going on, and if a meeting is properly advertised for three days, I can assure the minister that the difficulty would be to find a place large enough to hold those who would attend. I would be sorry to see that right taken away or any curtailment of the benefit that comes from open discussion of what is really being asked for and what the requirements are. We are doing away with a very salutary remedy. The desire is in every one's mind to tell what his grievances are. Conclusions may be reached at that meeting quite different from the ideas they entertain when they get together. The minister knows the proverbial notion about signing a petition, and that in olden times the view as to petitions was "I will get enough men to sign a petition to behead the King if you give me permission to go around." Almost everybody will sign a petition; it is not like passing a vote at a public meeting. Coming as I do from a large labour centre and having been all my life in close touch with labour men I cannot allow this provision to pass without protesting against taking away any of the methods by which these men are now transacting their business, and substituting for it something that, to say the least, is not as democratic as the present system.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have only one word to say in reply to my hon. friend. I would suggest that the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) transfer the adjective "ingenious" which he applied to me to his friend to his right (Mr. McKenzie) who seeks to oppose this amendment on the ground that it takes something away from the working man, namely the right to discuss his grievance at a meeting. That right is preserved to him intact and I think he will exercise it in virtually every case. But he has the added right if he chooses, to express his will by writing; no right is taken away.

Clause approved of on vote; Yeas 36, Nays, 29.

Bill reported and amendments read the first and second time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When shall the Bill be read a third time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I suppose as the minister is determined to force the Bill through in its present form he might as well do so now as later on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the unanimous consent of the House that the Bill be read a third time.

Mr. CANNON: I do not consent to the third reading of the Bill now. It is an important measure and we should follow the parliamentary rule with respect to it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion for third reading stands.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Doherty Bill No. 108 to amend the Exchequer Court Act was read a second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—constitution of the court.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister please explain the object of this section.

Mr. DOHERTY: The present section modifies the existing law only to the extent of designating the judges as the president and one puisne judge. At present under the Exchequer Court Act the court

is constituted of a judge and an assistant. Last session the Judges' Act—which provides for the salaries of the judges of the Exchequer Court (it apparently then being in contemplation to add a third judge) made provision for the salaries of the president of the court and two judges. Now we find ourselves in the anomalous position, that whereas under the Exchequer Court Act the court was declared to be composed of a judge and an assistant judge, in the Act providing for salaries, provision is made for salaries for the president and two puisne judges. One object of this Bill is to bring these two Acts into agreement. I was not present last year when the legislation providing salaries for two puisne judges went through, but apparently at that time it was in contemplation that the court should consist of two puisne judges in addition to the president. On reflection it has been thought that that is not necessary at the present time, and that by making a provision—which will be found in a subsequent section of the Bill—conferring certain powers to deal with matters of practice upon the Registrar, we would be able to get along very nicely with the president and one puisne judge. Of course an amendment to the Judges' Act will be necessary to make that Act correspond with the present Bill. At present we have one judge of the Exchequer Court and an assistant judge, in the future we will have a president and one puisne judge.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does the Government contemplate making any new appointments?

Mr. DOHERTY: This Bill does not involve any new appointments for the present. The court now consists of the judge who will be the president and an assistant judge, and the latter will naturally be the new puisne judge.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I certainly favour the change making the assistant judge a puisne judge, especially in view of the fact that he is so efficient a judge and possesses the confidence of all litigants in the country. I do not know why an exception is made in regard to the power to make general rules. Why should this power be confined to the president of the court? The rules of any other court are generally adopted by the judges of that court, the puisne judges acting in common with the president.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is the law as it stands at the present time. But here, I might point out, you have a court composed of two judges, and supposing those two judges did not agree on a particular rule, it would not be possible to make that rule. I think that is a sufficient reason why we should designate the president.

Mr. FORTIER: I think it would be more regular to call the president the "chief justice," following the practice in our Superior Courts.

Mr. DOHERTY: Parliament at the session of 1919 decided that question, when some understanding was come to in regard to it with the members of the court: While there may be some advantages in uniformity, still I do not know that any evil is done by using this designation, "President of the Exchequer Court," and it being already on the statute book I did not see any sufficient reason to change it.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Power to appoint a deputy judge.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: This is rather an extraordinary section. I would like the minister to explain it.

Mr. DOHERTY: Under section 140 of the Exchequer Court Act any person may be appointed a judge of the court who is or has been judge of a superior court or of a county court or who is a barrister of ten years' standing at the bar of any of the provinces. This section merely refers to those qualifications.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is it not an innovation to appoint a judge temporarily?

Mr. DOHERTY: To make such an appointment would be an innovation; but to make a provision for deputy judges is not at all an innovation. For instance, there is provision in our law for the appointment of deputy judges in the county court under similar circumstances; and under the law as it stands there is provision for the appointment of a deputy judge for the Exchequer Court. That provision required modification because there was only one judge and—

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I quite understand that there are temporary appointments, but what I want to direct the attention of the minister to is that under this amendment a temporary judge appointed at the pleasure of the Governor in Council might be appointed to try one particular case. I think that is objectionable, and that it would be better legislation to select a temporary judge from members of the bench.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is perhaps ground for objection on that account. This particular wording has been adopted because in the past it was found that if you appoint a deputy judge to act during the absence or illness of a judge, you have no definite thing that settles the moment when such absence or illness ceases. Therefore it was thought that the Governor in Council might be trusted to terminate the office of a deputy judge when the purpose of his appointment has been served. However, I would have no objection to make that read:

or upon a certificate of the President of the Court that the purpose to be served had been accomplished.—

or something like that, so that we would have an official declaration of when the powers terminated. Before making that amendment, however, there is another amendment which occurs to me, and which I think will commend itself to the committee. It seems to me that perhaps it is objectionable that the Governor in Council should have, as under the present terms of the section, general power to appoint a deputy judge for any reason which he deems sufficient. I think there should be some check on that power. Therefore I desire to move that the section be amended by inserting in line twenty-two between the words "or" and "for" the words "at the request of the President." The section would then read:

The Governor in Council may, in the case of the sickness or absence from Canada or engagement upon other duty of the President or the Puisne Judge, or, at the request of the President, for any other reason which he deems sufficient,—

and so on. The effect of that will be to limit the power of the Governor in Council to the three specified cases: Sickness, absence from Canada, or engagement upon other duties, of the president or of the puisne judge. I would be quite happy, however, if the hon. gentleman can suggest the language, to meet the objection which has been made.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is this not new legislation? I cannot recall a case where power has been vested in a judge to ask for the appointment, or practically to make the appointment, of a deputy judge.

Mr. DOHERTY: He will not appoint the deputy judge; he will simply request an appointment. If the President of the Court exposes the necessity for there being a deputy judge, then the Governor in Council is empowered to appoint one, but the President of the Court does not designate the man who shall be appointed, nor is the Governor in Council bound to make the appointment. There is analagous power in the case of the Superior Courts of the province of Quebec and the Court of Appeal. If the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal represents that by reason of illness or some other impediment preventing one of the judges from carrying out his duties there is occasion for such an appointment, there is power to appoint an assistant judge. So with the Superior Court, and my impression is, with other provincial courts. Quite recently we made a similar provision for the purpose of providing an acting judge in the Supreme Court in cases where there might be occasion for doing so. This power to appoint a deputy judge has always existed in regard to the Exchequer Court. The difference is that we have to provide not merely for cases of absence or illness of the president or of the puisne judge, but also for absence through other causes which we cannot at the moment specify. For instance, the parties interested might be close relatives of the president of the court or of the puisne judge; there are many cases where a judge might find himself disqualified. These general terms were adopted to avoid the necessity for foreseeing all these cases. At the same time we are putting such a check upon the exercise of the power that there need be no apprehension that it will be unduly exercised. It cannot be exercised unless the President of the Court asks for it, and if the reasons given are deemed insufficient there is no obligation on the Governor in Council to exercise it.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not object to the authority being in the Governor in Council to appoint an assistant or deputy judge for the time being and for special cause. If the minister will provide that the selection shall be made from among the judges of the Superior Court in the province where the action arises, I shall have no objection.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is not proposed that the selection should be limited to judges of the Superior Court, because if you did that you might be taking away from his own work a man who could not very well be spared. The qualifications required in the man to be appointed are exactly the same as will be required of a man to be appointed as judge, that is, he should be a judge of a Superior or County court, or a barrister of ten years' standing in the province. I do not think that the deputy judge should be required to possess greater qualifications than the judge himself.

Mr. McKENZIE: A barrister of ten years' standing does not become a competent judge all at once. We have seven Supreme Court judges in Nova Scotia, and I do not think that any occasion would arise to prevent any one of them from stepping outside his usual work to try a special case. I assume that conditions in other provinces are the same. There should be some provision to secure for the purposes of this provision an experienced man who is in the public eye and against whose appointment there could be no reasonable objection.

Mr. DOHERTY: This is only to provide for possible cases, which will be very few and far between. If one of these judges dies, the public will have to accept a barrister of ten years' standing as the permanent judge. Is there any very great danger that that barrister of ten years' standing would not be competent to act as deputy judge? The qualifications sufficient to justify a man's selection as permanent head of the court ought to be sufficient to justify his employment as deputy judge. Under this Bill, you may appoint as deputy judge a judge of another court if he be available, but to make it essential that you should take him away creates a situation where you may be embarrassed because there are courts and judges who have all the work they can do.

Mr. FORTIER: As these extraordinary powers are being asked for probably on account of increased business before that tribunal, instead of appointing a temporary judge, why not have a third judge appointed permanently?

Mr. DOHERTY: That has been considered, and we have given to the registrar certain powers contained in a subsequent section of this Bill, thus providing ample man-power, if I may use that expression, to carry on all the work of the court so long as that man-power is available. But it is to be foreseen that you may have accidents when your actual men are not all available, and this is merely to provide that when that accident happens, we shall be able to call somebody in to do the work. The hon. gentleman's remedy would be to provide more men than are necessary to do the work, as a rule, because occassionally you may require, not an additional judge, but just somebody to take the place of a man who drops out on account of illness or some other cause of that kind. We have, as I have said, satisfied ourselves with conferring on the registrar the powers contained in a subsequent section, so that we shall have quite sufficient to attend to this work, with the presiding and the puisne judges as long as they are both available. But in the uncertainty of human events, we have to provide for the accidental cases where one of them might not be available, and we take the means of providing a temporary person instead of loading the country with a permanent judge at a permanent salary so as to have somebody, perhaps, for one week in the year, when he may be required to take the place of a judge who is ill.

Mr. FORTIER: What salary will you give to this temporary judge?

Mr. DOHERTY: No provision is made in this Bill for a special salary to this deputy judge, because we cannot tell for how long we may want him. We may want him only for a week. We shall not give him a permanent salary because he will not be a permanent judge; he will be appointed when occasion requires, and his powers will terminate when the occasion for them terminates and just as is done with deputy judges provided for in the county courts, no provision is made for a salary. In most instances deputy judges who have been appointed in connection with county courts have worked without salary. In some exceptional cases where a long period of time is involved or some exceptional heavy work has been put upon them, power has been asked to provide for remuneration for this temporary work. This is not a permanent position in any sense of the word at all; it is making provision for a possible occasional, temporary need.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This power conferred on the Governor in Council by this clause may not be used very frequently, but it creates a precedent. I think it is the first time we give the Governor in Council power to appoint temporary judges.

Mr. DOHERTY: The power already exists with regard to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What is the change then?

Mr. DOHERTY: The change as I pointed out is that in the present legislation, we are not limiting the power to specified cases of necessity.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at Eight o'clock.

Clause 2 agreed to.

On clause 3—registrar, appointment and salary:

Mr. McMASTER: I would draw the attention of the minister to tthe expression "reside and keep an office at the city of Ottawa, and be paid a salary." This might be interpreted to mean—what I do not believe to be the meaning intended—that out of his salary of $5,000 the person appointed must maintain an office. I presume that is not the intention, but I would suggest that the phraseology is somewhat unhappy

Mr. DOHERTY: The phraseology in that respect is that of the Act that is being amended. However, if my hon. friend thinks that the language is at all ambiguous I move to amend clause 3 by striking out the words "keep an" in the seventh line on page 2 of the Bill and replacing them with the words "have his," so that the clause will read:

—who shall hold office during pleasure, reside and have his office at the city of Ottawa, and be paid a salary of five thousand dollars per annum.

Amendment agreed to and clause as amended agreed to.

On the title:

Mr. McKENZIE: May I ask the minister a question in regard to clause 2 amending section 8 of the old Act?

The CHAIRMAN: That clause has been carried and only by unanimous consent can consideration of it be reopened. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the hon. member have leave to revert to clause 2?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was going to ask the minister what changes had been made.

Mr. DOHERTY: In the third line after the the word "or" and before the word "for" there were inserted the words "at the request of the president." There was some question as to the advisability of vesting in the Governor in Council the power of terminating at pleasure the office of the deputy judge appointed under this section, but I do not think it is reposing a very great deal of confidence in the Government to give them that power.

Mr. McKENZIE: What about the qualifications of the men appointed?

Mr. DOHERTY: The deputy must be absolutely the same class of man as the man who is eligible for appointment to the permanent office.

Bill as amended reported.

Mr. DOHERTY: If there is no objection I should like to have it read the third time now.

Mr. SPEAKER: It can, of course, be read the third time now only by unanimous consent.

Bill read the third time and passed.

DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT.

The House resumed from May 6, consideration in committee of Bill No. 12 (Hon. Mr. Guthrie) respecting the election of members of the House of Commons and the electoral franchise—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When progress was last reported upon this Bill, all of the clauses and schedules had been read and considered. Paragraph (k) of clause 2; clauses 29, 32, 37, 44, 45, 63 and 101; the amendmets proposed by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) to clause 37 and by the hon. the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) to clauses 29, 44 and 101, were allowed to stand for further consideration. Clauses 19 and 76, which provide for the expenditure of money, cannot be adopted until the House has concurred in the required resolution. The other clauses have been adopted. Clause 29 is under consideration. Mr. Guthrie has moved to amend clause 29 by adding to subclause 2 the following words:

Provided that no disability imposed by paragraph (b) of subsection four of section eight of "The Naturalization Act," chapter thirty-eight of the statutes of 1919 (first session) shall disentitle a person on that ground alone to the said Certificate.

Mr. Euler has moved in amendment to the amendment to strike out in its entirely subclause 2 of clause 29 of the Bill. The question is on the sub-amendment.

Mr. McKENZIE: When this committee rose the other evening I was dealing with the amendment of the hon. member of South Waterloo (Mr. Euler) striking subclause 2 of section 29 out of the Act. The contention is that all the purpose of a franchise Act of a liberal and proper kind can be served by the enactment of the first paragraph of clause 29 and that the second paragraph is not necessary and is merely making it difficult for a certain class of people who are entitled to vote to

exercise the right of the franchise. The first part of section 29 reads as follows:

> Save as in this Act otherwise provided, every person, male or female, shall be qualified to vote at the election of a member, who, not being an Indian ordinarily resident on an Indian reservation,
>
> (a) is a British subject by birth or naturalization; and,
>
> (b) is of the full age of twenty-one years; and,
>
> (c) has ordinarily resided in Canada for at least twelve months and in the electoral district wherein such person seeks to vote for at least two months immediately preceding the issue of the writ of election.

The contention is that all that is necessary to provide for the qualification of everyone is to stipulate that he is a Briish subject, is twenty-one years of age, has resided in Canada for twelve months and has resided in the district in which he seeks to vote for two months. That has been the rule since Confederation. I was saying, the other evening when we ended the day's debate, that, if that is not the intention of the Government and if they are determined to put this Act through, it should be made as easy as possible for applicants who must apply for the certificate provided for under subsection 2 of section 29 to get that certificate. As it is now, there is only one class of officials to whom applicants can apply, that is judges of the Supreme and County Courts. I think that both these classes of judges are entitled to hear applications for naturalization under the present Naturalization Act. The subsection says that applications shall be heard before the people who are authorized to hear applications under the Naturalization Act. I would also point out that women, young men or old men, who may need these certificates, are just as important and deserving a class as men who were seeking to get away from service under the Military Service Act and that the same facilities for application should be given to these men and women who will seek these certificates that were given to men who were applying for exemption. Under the law providing for exemption there were thirty courts in the three counties of Cape Breton, Richmond and Victoria. In that large district there is only one judge residing at Sydney and if this Act goes through any person looking for a certificate and residing in the counties of Richmond, Cape Breton or Victoria must go to that one judge in order to make application. I submit this is an extraordinary measure as some will be 150 miles away from this judge's office in the city of Sydney, and it is practically impossible for people at the extreme ends of these districts, or for that matter in other parts of the districts, except in Syndey, to apply for the certificate. I further said to the minister—and I wish to receive some attention in connection with this matter—that there are not sufficient grounds given for the application. The specific grounds upon which one applies for this certificate are not set out at all. On page 83 of the Bill itself there are certain classes of questions prescribed in connection with Form K 2, as follows:

> Interrogatories to be administered orally, under oath or affirmation, to applicants in person for registration as voters.

The questions that shall be asked of the applicant are made perfectly clear. He will be asked:

> 1. What is your surname?
> 2. What is your full Christian name or names?
> 3. Where is your ordinary place of residence and what is your post office address?
> 4. What is your occupation?
> 5. Do you now reside in polling division No. ..... (or as the case may be) of the electoral district of..... for which you now apply to be registered?
> 6. Are you of the full age of twenty-one years?
> 7. Are you a British subject?
> 8. Are you such by birth or by naturalization? State which.
> 9. If by naturalization when and how were you naturalized?
> 10. Have you a certificate from a judge entitling you to be registered as a voter?

These questions—there are some more—make it perfectly clear to the applicant for registration what he has to answer, and if any person feels that he cannot answer them he need not go to the trouble of applying. I submit that when a person has to go a long distance, perhaps 150 or 200 miles, to a judge for the certificate which will be required under subsection 2, he at least should have some conception of the questions that he would be required to answer when he comes before the judge. I presume that an application can be made on behalf of the applicant by a lawyer or some other person who is entitled to appear before the court. A lawyer preparing a case under subclause 2 of section 29 has very little intimation of the kind of material in the shape of evidence that he will be expected to put before the judge. If this Bill must pass and this requirement is to be exacted from people before they can vote, the least that can be done is to give those people some idea of what they will have to answer. Under the Naturalization Act it is well laid down what the applicant has to do, what he has to know, what he must provide for; and if he cannot comply with

those requisites it will be absolutely unnecessary for him to apply.

On another occasion I pointed out the rights of the men and the women who will be disfranchised by section 2 unless they get a certificate. I think it was the minister himself who pointed out that these people never had the right to vote, and consequently are not suffering any loss; that the granting of the franchise is a privilege that must, in some special way, be conferred upon an individual. I do not think that that argument is as strong as it might appear. Even if it were all right and worthy of its full face value, the Act of 1918 which conferred the right to vote upon women in Canada explicitly gave them the franchise. I am only dealing with women who were British subjects on the 24th of May, 1918. The Act referred to gave votes to women in express terms; and if they are to be deprived—in an indirect way by the words of subsection 2 of section 29 of the Franchise Act—of the right to vote, we are depriving them of a right which they now hold and can exercise until this Bill goes into force. I need not tell the minister or this committee that the right to vote is a property right. It is regarded not only in this country, but in Great Britain and in other countries of equal civilization, absolutely as a property right, and interference with it is regarded as an interference with a property right. Thus if a man is deprived of his vote by any individual putting obstacles in his way he can go into the courts of the country and sue for damages. That is not anything new, it has been done over and over again, showing conclusively that the exercise of the right to the franchise is tangible absolute property, and the taking of it away from a man is taking away his property. I submit, therefore, that if the minister insists upon passing subclause 2 now before the committee, he will be passing a law that takes away from thousands of women in Canada a right which they now possess and which may be called their tangible and absolute property. Now let me deal with the other point, that unless the right to vote is conferred upon a British subject he does not possess it. The old Act says:

> An Alien to whom a certificate of naturalization is granted shall, within Canada be entitled to all political and other rights, powers and privileges, and be subject to all obligations to which a natural born British subject is entitled.

I am sure that no person possessing ordinary common sense would for one moment argue that does not imply the right to vote. Such a person has got to have all political and other rights, powers and privileges of a British subject born on British soil. Will any person say that a British subject, born on British soil, is not entitled to vote if he is otherwise qualified? I submit that he is so entitled and that this was the purpose of the old Naturalization Act, chapter 77 of the Revised Statutes. The present Act, which was passed after the war began, and after we were given every opportunity of fully considering its effects provides as follows:

> A person to whom a certificate of Naturalization is granted by the Secretary of State of Canada shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, be entitled to all political and other rights, powers and privileges, and be subject to all obligations, duties and liabilities, to which a natural-born British subject is entitled or subject, and as from the date of his naturalization have to all intents and purposes the status of a natural-born British subject.

That is the Act we passed in 1919, and that is the law to-day without any amendment or interference of any kind. I submit again that there is no question as to what is implied in the statement "entitled to all political and other rights, powers and privileges;" it means of course that a man has the right to vote. Take the case of a Belgian woman who before the war came to this country and married a Canadian. Under our law she became a British subject. Such a woman, let us say, has remained in this country, has made the Dominion her own country, so to speak. She has been standing by us and has continued on the most friendly terms; but when we come to give the vote we say to that Belgian woman, a British subject and a citizen of this country: You cannot vote; because of a disturbance in this country, when we got into a bad humour, we are going to visit the sins and iniquities of another country upon you; and although you have for years been a British subject, although you have given birth to and brought up children in this country, although you have worshipped at the shrines where Canadian men and women worship, although you have fulfilled all the obligations of British citizenship and we have nothing to say against you—nevertheless when you come to the poll on election day we must refuse you the right to British citizenship. We ask hon. gentlemen opposite, why? I do not wish to use any strong language here, but I do not think there is a man living within the four corners of Canada who can give a satisfactory answer as to why a woman of that class should be deprived of the right of

exercising the franchise in common with her husband.

I have already pointed out that I would not have so much fault to find with the Government in this connection if they had limited themselves to the disabilities which they have enforced in paragraph (b) of subsection 4, of clause 8 of the Naturalization Act—chapter 38 of the statutes of last year—and deprived aliens from enemy countries of the right to become naturalized for ten years. There would at least be some consistency about such action; they would be meting out the same treatment to those people when it came to naturalization as in the case of the exercise of the franchise. But we have widened the application of the proposed law altogether and made it apply to everybody who crosses the Atlantic to Canada unless they come from a British country. A German woman who went to the United States some years ago, became an American citizen there, and then located in Canada, or a Turkish woman who became naturalized in the United States and then came to this country, would have a right to vote; but a refined woman who came from France, or other friendly country in Europe, and passed all the educational tests of the class to which she belongs, would have no such right. Even a coloured woman, as has already been pointed out, or some other woman of no refinement at all, belonging to Mexico or some country of Central America, who marries a man and comes to Canada, has the right to the franchise. Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that we are here sowing the seeds of difficulties and differences which the youngest member of this Chamber will not live to see the end of.

Why, Sir, we are teaching foreigners to respect our flag—and that is a proper thing to do; we are teaching foreigners young and old to sing "God save the King"; we are telling them that they are entitled to all the rights and privileges which we possess. On our days of celebration, on the Queen's birthday and Dominion Day, we gather the children together and ask them to salute the flag, to sing "God save the King," to be loyal to our King and country; and the little ones of foreign extraction are glad to join our own children, and their parents are proud to see them participating in those exercises. But when on election day those little foreigners find that the mothers of other children go to the polls to exercise that great right of British subjects—the right to choose their rulers, and they come home full of pride in their adopted country and say, "Mother, everybody is going to vote to-day. In the country we came from we had very little to do with anything like this, but here everybody has the right to say who shall govern. Mother, have you been down to vote?" And that poor mother will have to say, "I am not allowed to vote. This flag which we are so proud to salute, this King whose life you are singing that God may prolong so he may, through this Parliament, continue to reign over us—that flag, that King and that Parliament have disfranchised me and I have no right to vote like other British subjects."

Mr. BUREAU: Shame!

Mr. LAPOINTE: Three times shame!

Mr. McKENZIE: Let me tell you, Sir, that we are bringing humiliation to the hearts and minds of those youngsters that they will never forget and never forgive, and we are bringing humiliation to the parents that they will never forget and never forgive. And what is it all for? I would like to be able to answer that question, but I cannot.

The policy of this great country should be, as we have been taught often during this session, to make the most of the foreigner in our midst, to confer upon him the right to vote, to exact from him all the duties of a citizen, so that we may have a better and a more united country. Not very long ago the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) quite properly initiated a discussion as to what we were doing for the children of our foreigners to put them on the same footing educationally with our own children; and every one was anxious that ways and means should be found to educate not only those children but the parents themselves in the principles of our Government and the ideals of our nation. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) recently proposed a resolution calling upon all of us to get together and see what we could do for our foreign population, and he said that we were too slow in bringnig them into proper line with our national ideals and principles of government and were not making the most of their talents. Well, we were all willing to fall in line with the hon. member, and also with the hon. member for Frontenac, in doing whatever was possible to advance the interests of these foreigners, and so advance our own. But when, immediately after those fervent speeches, it comes down to the first practical test, we say to these foreigners, "Away with you! We know you not. No privilege is coming to you so long as we can keep it from you.

I submit, Sir, that it is not worth while for the minister and the Government to take those drastic steps for any results that they expect to get therefrom. I hope that their better judgment will prevail, and that the minister in charge of this Bill will withdraw this objectionable clause, so that every British subject in this country may be in a position on election day to exercise his God-given right to say who shall rule over him for the next five years.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to detain the committee at any great length, but I feel that it is my duty to supplement the powerful appeal we have just had from the hon. member for Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie), succeeding, as it does, to many others. I feel it is my duty to emphasize the central anomaly of this clause. I have neither the legal knowledge nor the desire to go into any detail on the matter. But it has been stated again and again that the ministry and their supporters are proposing to pass a clause whereby a negress married to a Mexican shall be able to vote in this British country under the British flag, while by the same clause that right will be denied to numerous women coming from the countries of Europe, whether those countries are inhabited by our Allies or by those who were recently our enemies. And this is the twentieth year of the twentieth century!

It is an anachronism, it is an injustice, it is an absurdity; and with all the power of voice and thought I protest against such legislation going on the statute book of a British country. It is a disgrace. If I had my way this session would last a good deal longer while every member who feels this in his blood made his protest, as we have tried to make it.

I endorse the first remarks which fell from my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) last Thursday, when he said that it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this question. It is important because it goes to the very fundamentals of the differences which have divided parties throughout the British Empire ever since franchise reform was spoken of. It goes to the very root of the matter, and it raises in acute form the difference between reaction or toryism on the one hand and progressive, democratic or liberal views upon the other. For my part, I am proud to be associated with those who stand on this matter for the progressive and the broad view as against the reactionary and restricted view. That is the question regarded from the political standpoint as a matter of justice and decency.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Now, one cannot be surprised at an honest Tory like my hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie supporting a clause like this, because he has told us whence he derives his information on electoral matters. He says that in matters of franchise and things relating to the constitution he would rather follow Edmund Burke than the humble individual now addressing this committee. But that was a very poor way to put the point. What he should have said was that he would rather follow Edmund Burke than the general opinion, as we had thought it was, of the whole of the electorate of Canada. I thought it was understood that we lived in a democratic country where Edmund Burke's views had long been forgotten. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my hon. friend has really studied Mr. Burke or whether the particular quotation on which he based himself the other night was given to him by some one. I am not going into this question at length; I do not want to go into it, because I should be very sorry to be called to order four times by the Chairman or to be called to order at all. But I think it is perfectly germane to the argument that I am trying to present and perfectly germane to the discussion of this clause to show how it is perfectly natural for a hoary-headed Tory to vote for the narrow and restricted view upon this question, especially when he derives his inspiration from Edmund Burke.

Now, Edmund Burke was one of the most colossal figures that ever sat in the British House of Commons. But after all, he lived one hundred and forty years ago. While other persons referred to in the debate the other night lived a great deal longer time ago and were good instructors on morals, I have never heard that we went to either the New or the Old Testament for instruction on the electoral franchise. I do not know how elections were conducted in Judaea, but we do not go there for our inspiration on the franchise. However, let us see the kind of inspiration we should get by going to Edmund Burke. Mr. Burke made a famous speech upon this very question of the representation of the people in the House of Commons. I do not propose to read the speech, I need not say; but I will read two or three extracts from it. He said:

> The reason for the Crown as it is, for the lords as they are, is my reason for the Commons as they are, the electors as they are.

And what is the fact about the Commons and the electors when Edmund Burk lived?

There were hardly any electors. The House of Commons was elected on a very narrow and restricted franchise under the dictation of the House of Lords. That is the condition under which Mr. Edmund Burke lived, and he argued for a continuance of that condition by saying he would have the Commons and the electors kept as they are, just as he wanted to keep the lords and the Crown as they were. I say that any one who derives his inspiration from that source would naturally vote for any clause restricting the franchise in any way imaginable. So Tories have always been; every successive extension of the suffrage has had to be wrung from them; has had to be beaten out of them. Now, let me give my hon. friend another quotation from his favourite and inspirer. Burke says again:

> Now, I ask, what advantage do you find that the places which abound in representation possess over others in which it is more scanty, in security for freedom, in security for justice, or in any one of those means of procuring temporal prosperity and eternal happiness, the ends for which society was formed?

That is a beautiful passage to guide the deliberations of a democratic assembly in what we suppose to be the democratic country of Canada! And yet Edmund Burke is the inspirer of at least some of the thought on the other side of the House. Well, I repeat, it is no wonder that votes from that source will go to restricted franchise. Then, he ended that speech with the famous passage which begins:

> I look with filial reverence on the constitution of my country.

The constitution was The King, to whom we are still all loyal; it was the House of Lords, and it was the House of Commons, created under a very narrow, restricted franchise, and unequal distribution, and at the bidding in many cases of the House of Lords. It was the day of rotten boroughs, the classes ruling and the people being told to be thankful that their temporal affairs and their eternal salvation were being looked after by their betters. That is the inspiration of my hon. friend from West Calgary, and it would be the inspiration of any one who had similar Tory proclivities coming down from so long ago.

But I am free to confess that I do not believe there are many Tories who would defend such a speech as that from which I have just quoted as applicable to present-day conditions. They ought to dissociate themselves, therefore, from the support of this clause, because after all, Mr. Chairman, for the last generation of men in this country there has been no difference, practically speaking, on questions of franchise between the different sides of politics.

But if it be true that not many Tories would derive their inspiration from that source, what am I to say of my Liberal-Unionist friends? Are they going to vote under the inspiration of Edmund Burke? Are they going to vote for giving to a negress a right which they refuse to French women? Are they going to vote for that, and then go back to the broad prairies and the clear air and the broader thoughts of Western Canada and expect their views to be accepted by the electorate? I see my hon. friend from Bow River (Mr. Halladay) in his place. I see my hon. friend from Strathcona (Mr. J. M. Douglas). There are very few Liberal Unionists in the Chamber. I see my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Henders), and I see my hon. friend from Fraser Valley (Mr. Stacey). I cannot count any other Liberal Unionists on that side. But I should like to appeal to these hon. gentlemen, who have been influenced by Liberal traditions and who have Liberal views. I put it to them plainly, and to those who act with them; are they going to vote for a clause which confers electoral rights upon negresses married to Mexicans in this broad, free, democratic country and in this twentieth century, which rights they refuse alike to alien women and to women of our allies coming from Europe? That is the simple question. I repeat that to vote for the clause is to vote for the enactment of an anachronism, an injustice and an absurdity.

There is no need to threaten the Government over the business; it will be very simple to have the clause dropped. We know that from what we have seen happen in the House in recent times. The other day, under the guidance of the minister, my hon. friend (Mr. Tweedie) wasted nearly a day of the time of this House when everybody who has the real interests of Canada at heart is trying to get to the end of the session—wasted it over an amendment. You know what happened to the amendment. At least, I do not think anybody does quite know—it disappeared; it is gone. All that happened was that my hon. friend from Neepawa (Mr. Davis), whom I should like to have had the honour of addressing on this question, rose and said: Now, you had better drop this thing—and dropped it was. They say that on the field of battle when men are in the

moment of defeat and panic they sometimes roar before they run. However that may be, the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Tweedie) the other day made a brave showing for sixty minutes; then he wandered out of the Chamber with the amendment which he had wasted a day over, in his back-tail pocket. There the amendment disappeared. They laughed best who laughed last in a matter of that kind. All that is necessary for any of my Liberal-Unionist friends who insist here that they should not support this thing, is not to vote against the Government—they will never get the chance of killing the Government in that way if I can trust recent experiences—but to tell the Government to kill the clause, and that will be done. The responsibility is a tremendous one. There is an old saying: "If you scratch a Russian, you will find a Tartar." Well, we have come to the time in this country when the people are asking: If you scratch a Unionist, do you find a Tory? That is a very serious question for my Liberal-Unionist friends to consider. I am very much afraid that this Government, having lost, one by one, their Liberal-Unionist representatives —to my great sorrow, we have a minister introducing this Franchise Act who has in his veins as good Liberal blood as ever flowed in Ontario—are bringing us to the position when the Unionism of the Government and the Liberalism of the Government will need a microscope to discover them and the broad reactionary Toryism of the aggregation will stand out in bold relief. The country will make no mistake about what it is dealing with; it will say: This Government formed upon a fifty-fifty basis has lost the red political blood; it has passed into a state of anaemic and degraded Edmund Burke Toryism, and the country will put it where it belongs.

I should like, if it be not too late, to appeal to the minister and to the other members of the Government. What is going to be gained by insisting upon a piece of legislation such as this? Why not drop the clause? From the party point of view, whom do hon. gentlemen think they are going to gain? I do not care to go behind the motives of those who support this monstrosity, for monstrosity it is tried by the single principle that I have endeavoured to lay down and emphasize. I found in the 1917 election that it was very doubtful, in many parts of the West at any rate, whether any party advantage was derived from the partial enfranchisement of women, that we had in that election. Men came to me and they said: "Do you mean to tell me it is true that Mrs. So-and-So has a vote and my wife has not?" I had to answer: "Yes, that is so." Then I knew what happened. Men who otherwise would have voted for me went straight to the ballot box and voted against me. From the party point of view, the proceeding is a very doubtful one. And the reason is not far to seek. The sense of justice and fairplay is so strongly ingrained in British peoples—I mean people under British institutions—that when an injustice is done, they will mark their reprobation of it by the first instrument that comes their way to handle, and I venture to think that though you debar women under this infamous clause, and those women possibly would vote against you, you will raise such a feeling amongst large numbers of your own supporters, male and female, that they will, by voting in another way, more than make up

9 p.m. for any gain you think you make —if you do think you make gain —by debarring certain women. But it is from the national point of view which has been so well put by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria that I plead with the Government. I was very much pleased with a remark the hon. member made the other day. He said: The war is over; eighteen months have elapsed since the Armistice was signed; it is our sacred duty, a duty to which I would fain believe that every one of us in this chamber is anxious to contribute his quota, to reconstruct this country, not only in its financial affairs, in its industrial life, in its economic life, but in what is far more important than that, by healing the mental wounds of war, by giving our people no grievance, by leaving them no sense of wrong, by establishing conditions under which we shall know that we are in a democratic country because every one of us has equal rights and democratic privileges. That is the ground upon which I would make my chief appeal to the ministry to drop this clause even at this period.

My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie), in his concluding words, did, far better than I could, that which I rose to my feet with the intention of doing. He pleaded with the Government not to give growing children a grievance, to leave no sense of grievance nor injustice, after all the harrowing times of war, in the minds of any of our people. The Government are making a distinction in favour of the women of Mexico and Negresses as against women coming from France, Belgium and other European countries. The Government are inflicting an injury upon the fair name of Canada; they

are inflicting a wrong upon certain people; they are creating a feeling of injustice; they are disgracing the statute book of this realm. I plead with the Government even now to see the error of their way and to drop this most iniquitous proposition. I shall have no hesitation whatever, but very great pleasure and pride, in voting with the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Euler).

Mr. BURNHAM: Just for a few minutes I should like to protest against the extraordinary position taken by my hon. friend (Mr. M. Clark). He would sacrifice, as I understand it, those people who came under this provision, provided, however, that the subclause shall not apply to any person born upon the continent of North America. In order that he should carry his point with regard to the others, he would sacrifice these people. As a matter of expediency or otherwise, or compliance with the Naturalization Act, we understand that those bringing in this Bill have found it necessary or advisable, for this occasion only, to make this limitation with a proviso, however, which attaches to itself a very great deal of importance and which the liberal-minded gentleman who has just sat down argues against in a most extraordinary way. He would have these people, to whom this franchise is extended, cut out rather than that those mentioned in the first part of the subclause should not be provided for as he has seen fit to assert they should be. This argument, therefore, of my hon. friend—I say this with all respect—nullifies itself. He has argued for the principle of the extension in the first part of the clause and absolutely and completely denied it in the second. I must confess that I am unable to comprehend such reasoning. It would have been far better not to have ridiculed the Mexican and the Negress, but, if you like, to have said that the Government were going too far in extending the franchise to the Mexicans and the Negresses, although I do not agree with him in that, provided they are intelligent people. But he has seen fit to ridicule their position and to say that the extension of the franchise to the Mexicans and Negresses is an absurdity in view of the first part of the clause. These pretty little jibes about scratching a Unionist and finding a Tory, and so forth, are very nice. But we do not have to scratch the farmers; they do that for themselves. I must confess that I think such remarks to be far from conducive to sane and reasonable discussion of the subject. It is not very dignified to quote the great Burke in one breath and try to throw contempt and ridicule upon this side of the House in the next. We know that Burke was a reactionary. We know of course that he stood for everything that was against the French revolution and seemed to be carried away by the Austrian princess who occupied the French throne at the time. But Burke nevertheless was an honourable man; he was a great man. Like others, he made his mistakes, and it is for us to sift the grain from the chaff and to appreciate and profit by whatever was right in that which he proclaimed. The great lesson of Burke to posterity, as I understand it, is the fact that his eminently philosophical mind clarified the situation and was above all things absolutely honest. He took some most extraordinary positions no doubt and was assailed by such men as Fox. But what he wrote regarding the sublime and beautiful will always appeal to us for the extraordinary and noble character of his mind and the loftiness of his conception, But I am well satisfied that the ministry, and the minister who is in charge of the Bill and who, as an hon. gentleman has well said, is a man of lofty and noble characteristics, have no personal motives in permitting the provision which this clause contains. And when the clause has served its purpose I am sure it will be repealed or amended.

Mr. BUREAU: After the next election.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BURNHAM: Honi soit qui mal y pense—evil be to him who evil thinks. If I made a statement that hon. gentlemen opposite construe as in the nature of an admission, I confess that I did so in the innocence of my mind. The unworthy meaning which hon. gentlemen opposite take pleasure in attaching to that statement certainly did not occur to me nor, I believe, to any other hon. member on this side.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. BURNHAM: Some people judge others according to their own standards.

Mr. BUREAU: To the pure all things are pure.

Mr. BURNHAM: Hon. gentlemen opposite ascribe to us motives the imputation of which, were they circumstanced as we are, they would no doubt resent. Let not hon. gentlemen judge others by themselves unless their standards are a little higher than those of the persons whom they

judge. The very strong indictment made by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) undoubtedly sounds well enough, but I must repeat that it carries with it its own condemnation and does not indicate, if it is examined closely enough, that the clause before the committee and the following out of the Naturalization Act are not well advised and proper.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is that the answer of the Government?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, if the minister and the Government will not be moved by the justice of the situation in regard to the amendment which is before the committee, I hope they will have regard for what should be owing their own sense of honour and obligation. When the minister who has charge of the Bill introduced it in this House he made a speech which called forth from different parts of the Chamber expressions of opinion more or less laudatory of the fair intention which the Government professed in regard to this legislation. The minister set forth what he claimed were the principles on which this legislation should proceed at the time of the introduction of the Bill, and on his subsequent address on the second reading, and when he had concluded the latter many of us on this side rose to express our appreciation of the spirit in which the Government proposed to deal with this all important legislation. I went out of my way to congratulate the minister on what I thought was his fair intent. I regret that it is now necessary to withdraw my words. In order that there may be no doubt about the matter I shall read to the committee the words which were spoken by the minister at the time and my own words in referring to the manner in which the hon. gentleman had introduced the measure. When he came before the House with the Bill on March 11 the minister said, as will be found in unrevised Hansard at page 353:

> Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might be permitted to explain briefly the Bill which I have just asked the leave of the House to introduce. The purpose of the Bill is threefold: In the first place, to fix a uniform franchise throughout the Dominion; in the second place, to provide a uniform method for the preparation of voters' lists; and, in the third place, to provide a simple and satisfactory method for the conduct of elections.
>
> The franchise is to be established upon very broad principles.

Now, I would ask hon. members to listen to what the minister says were the principles on which the franchise were to be founded:

> The only requirements will be those of British citizenship, residence in Canada for one year and in the particular constituency for two months, and the attainment of the age of twenty-one years; these requirements will apply in the case of male and female voters alike.

That was the statement which the minister gave to Parliament and to the country and which has occasioned, from one end of Canada to the other, expressions of opinion favourable to the Government regarding the manner in which they avowedly professed to deal with this all-important question. On March 25 the minister spoke in almost identical language on the second reading of the Bill, and after my hon. friend had taken his seat, in replying to him—having been impressed by the eloquence of his remarks and what seemed to me to be the fairness of them—I spoke as follows:

> Let me take the features of the Bill as my hon. friend has stated them. He points out, in the first place, that the purpose of the Bill is to fix a uniform franchise throughout the Dominion. With that purpose we are in entire accord.

A little further down:

> The franchise, my hon. friend says, is to be established upon very broad principles. The only requirements in regard to qualifications will be, he informs us, those of British citizenship, residence in Canada for one year, and in the particular constituency for two months, and attainment of the age of twenty-one years; these requirements to apply in the cases of male and female voters alike. Now, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be fairer than that, and all that we ask, as respects the qualifications there set out, is that the Government shall not profess one thing and do another; that it shall not give with one hand and withhold with the other as respects the provisions of this enactment, or their relation to any other statutes which have been passed in the past or which may be passed in the future by this Parliament.
>
> Is not that exactly the effect of this proposed legislation? When I had uttered those words I heard my right hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) say under his breath, but loud enough for me to hear, "Oh ye of little faith." The remark was not caught by the Hansard reporter, but when I heard these words of my right hon. friend I said to myself, thinking of the Government, "By their fruits ye shall know them." And it is by their fruits that we are judging them to-day, and that this country will judge them. I call upon hon. gentlemen opposite to comply with the pledge which they have given to this country. I ask them not to profess one thing before this Parliament at one time and then come along with legislation which takes away

rights which they profess they are giving. This is the kind of thing that creates dissatisfaction from one end of the country to the other, that produces unrest, and that shakes the very foundations of government itself. Either the minister should have come before this Parliament and said that the Government were going to give, as they did under the War-time Elections Act, certain rights to certain British subjects and withhold those rights from others, or he should not have made any professions of fair play. When he comes now and says the Government are going to take away from some certain rights which are given to others, the country will judge him as he deserves to be judged. When a minister with the approval of his fellow-ministers, professing British justice for all British subjects, comes here and seeks to withhold from thousands of men and women the same British rights which are being given to other British subjects, neither he nor those behind him are entitled to the slightest measure of support.

Let me contrast if you will with the kind of precedent which this Government is setting up at the present moment British ideas with respect to the rights of British subjects as we have been taught to uphold them from British precedent. Reference was made in this debate a day or two ago to the case of Don Pacifico, a Portuguese Jew, who happened to be in Greece at the time riots occurred there. What was the incident referred to? The house of this man was ransacked, papers were stolen and some articles of furniture were destroyed. When he could get no redress from the Government of Greece he appealed to the British Government for redress. On what ground was his plea based? On the ground that he was a naturalized British subject. How was that plea met by the British Foreign minister? Did he meet it as my hon. friend proposes to deal with the Jews of this country who will be affected by this measure? Did he say, "We have nothing to do with you?" Or, did he say that Great Britain would watch over the rights of British subjects, whoever or whenever they might be? Lord Palmerston ordered the British fleet into the Piræus; the British Ambassador left Greece and went aboard one of the British ships; the fleet took possession of the harbour and of Greek ships and held them until justice was done to this Portuguese Jew. Later on Lord Palmerston was taken to task in the House of Commons by the Opposition because he had nearly involved Britain and Europe in a war through an action that seemed arbitrary and high-handed. What did Lord Palmerston do? He addressed the House of Commons on the rights of British subjects. Let me read to the members of this House Lord Palmerston's words on that occasion. His utterance comes with striking appropriateness to the situation with which we are confronted at the present moment. Here are the words of Britain's Foreign Minister at that time when he was defending his action in sending the British fleet into the harbour of Piræus to see that justice was done to one Portuguese Jew:

> The government of a great country like this is undoubtedly an object for fair and legitimate ambition among men of all shades of opinion. It is a noble thing to be allowed to guide the policy and destinies of such a country; and if ever it were an object of honourable ambition, it must be more than ever so at the moment at which I am speaking.

That was in 1850, and the reference which follows is to the revolutions which shortly before had spread throughout Europe. How infinitely more applicable is the reference to Europe of the last few years?

> Whilst we have seen, as has been stated, Europe rocking from side to side, thrones shattered, institutions overthrown and destroyed—when almost every country in Europe has been the scene of conflict, which has deluged the land with blood, from the Atlantic to the Black Sea, from the Baltic to the Mediterranean—this country has presented a spectacle honourable to the people of England, and worthy of the admiration of the world. We have shown that liberty is compatible with order; we have shown that individual freedom is reconcilable with obedience to law; we have shown the example of a nation in which every class of society accepts with cheerfulness the lot which Providence has assigned it; whilst, at the same time, every individual is constantly striving to raise himself in the social scale, not by violence and illegality, but by persevering good conduct, and unremitting application of those moral and intellectual faculties with which his Creator has endowed him. I say, to govern such a people as this, is indeed an object worthy of the ambition of the noblest man who lives in the land; and therefore I find no fault with those who may have endeavoured to place themselves in so distinguished a position.
>
> We have not done anything in our foreign policy to forfeit the confidence of the country. * * * I fearlessly challenge the verdict which the House may give on the question now before it—whether the principles which have governed the foreign policy of the government, whose duty it was to afford protection to our subjects abroad, which we have considered the guide of our conduct, are proper and fitting; and whether, as in the days of the Roman, who held himself to be free from indignity when he called out 'Civis Romanus Sum', an Englishman shall be considered protected by the vigilant eye and strong arm of his government, against injustice and wrong?

That was the declaration of Lord Palmerston in regard to Britain's foreign policy as to the significance of being a British

subject. We have exactly the same considerations to take account of here to-day; the only difference is that we are dealing not with foreign policy but with our policy at home. We have even an identical case as respects every naturalized Jew affected by this legislation, the only possible difference is that instead of the rights of one Portuguese Jew as a British subject being affected the rights of many naturalized Jews and thousands of other British subjects in this country are being invaded by the legislation which the Government itself is seeking to force through. It cannot be denied that this section of the Bill subjects to a measure of indignity and thereby may deprive thousands of women, and many men of alien or foreign origin but who are British subjects, of rights which are given to others on the ground of their British citizenship. The section even takes away from thousands rights which have been already given to them as British subjects by the Government. Let the committee understand that clearly. This Parliament, through its naturalization law, gives to these men and women, who to all intents and purposes are being disfranchised by subsection 2, the right to be considered as British subjects. Parliament went farther than that, it passed an Act only two years ago giving every British subject, male or female, the right to the franchise. Why then does the Government at the present time deny to large numbers of persons a right which they have already given and which they profess to be willing to continue. I contend there is something here which all must stand up and contend for at the present time who are interested in British justice, in British fair play, and in maintaining in this Dominion and especially throughout the British Empire principles of justice and all that we should wish to imply when we use the term "British subject." I make this further appeal to the Government either to give us substantial reasons why we should destroy the traditions which have led us to consider that being a British subject, implies the same treatment for one and all, or to listen to the plea that is now being made on behalf of those British subjects who will suffer indignity as a result of the Government's proposed action.

Let me again, Mr. Chairman, plead with the Government, and with the minister, for the sake of their own honour as well as for the sake of justice in this matter, to do what at the outset they promised they would do, and what they are on record in Hansard as having said would be the guiding principle of this Bill. If the Government fails to do that, then we might just as well understand at the moment that in this Bill, from one end to the other, we may expect evidences of the same kind of manoeuvres and of the same kind of deception—because that is what it is—as we have found in this particular instance. Every member of this House is interested in giving to the people of Canada a franchise in which they will have confidence. This Government has tampered with the franchise in the last five years as no Government under the sun has ever tampered with a franchise, and they have got so into the habit of passing laws interfering with the rights of the people in the matter of their votes that it now seems but a relatively small thing to deny to thousands of people a fundamental right which, in the Government's own words, they profess to be giving to every one.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Chairman, I have heretofore, during the progress of this debate in committee discussed this clause at considerable length and I do not know that I could, at this late date, afford any more information upon the subject than is now in possession of hon. gentlemen. I must say, however, that I think it rather a late hour for my hon. friend from Red Deer, and also my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, to come forward with a display of indignation, which I am satisfied is but a mockery of their real feelings, in an attempt to show that the Government, in the clause now under discussion, has in any way endeavoured to deceive either the House or the public in regard to the proposals contained in this Bill. Personally I do not think I ever heard my hon. friend from Red Deer labour over a question as hard as he laboured to-night. He certainly spoke under great excitement and with great force; but the indignation which he was able to command in regard to what he called the quadroon vote and the Mexican vote, that was going to come into this country from the United States on more favourable terms than should be applied to the women of other countries was, in my judgment, the height of absurdity. My hon. friend from Red Deer knows, or should know—because he has lived long enough in Canada to know,—that this country is not favoured with any emigration of the negro population of the South, nor yet of the state of Mexico farther to the South—we have practically no residents of that part

of the globe in this country. It is true that in former days we had a considerable southern population who came into Canada to escape slavery and to choose freedom. But that population has been decreasing year by year in every riding in Canada where it existed, and within measurable distance, in all likelihood we shall have none of it, climatic conditions being the chief reason for this; and there is no Mexican population in Canada. So that when my hon. friend says that one reason why he will oppose this clause is because we are going to permit the quadroon and the Mexican woman to come here on better conditions than women from Europe, the matter to my mind resolves into an absolute absurdity quite unworthy of my hon. friend.

Now, with regard to the statement of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). Why, my hon. friend would have the House believe that in something I said on behalf of the Government I misled the House. My hon. friend knew every line in the Bill before it was introduced into this House at all. I especially requested a conference with him, and that conference was held several days before the Bill was introduced. That very question in section 29 was discussed between us, and I tell the House my hon. friend took no exception to the clause. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, on the day upon which the Bill obtained its first reading—the first day upon which the Bill came from the printer—I myself gave him a copy of the measure. Many days elapsed before the second reading of the measure; from time to time that step was put off at the request of my hon. friend in order that he and his friends might have a chance of studying the Bill. He knew every line and every clause of it, and so far as my knowledge goes he has taken no exception to it until this late date.

Now, how about the attitude of the House in regard to this matter? This very Parliament, elected in 1917, has on two occasions affirmed the principle and affirmed it unanimously, what does my hon. friend from Red Deer think of that statement? He was a member of the House in 1918, and I say he affirmed that principle—at all events he did not divide the House or vote or speak against it. He was a member of the House in 1919 when the By-Elections Act was passed which contained that very same clause. I say again that he affirmed the measure because he did not vote against or speak against it on either occasion, and that the Bill received the unanimous approval of the House. Therefore, I repeat, the same clause was unanimously affirmed twice, once in 1918, and once in 1919—although I may say that in 1918 that special clause—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: —as to the women born in North America was not included, but was subsequently included. Hon. members opposite know why. Ask my hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. Kennedy) or my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). At their request the clause was inserted. I think it is a fair and reasonable clause; I think it is a good clause and that it ought to be put there. But at all events we affirmed the principle in 1918 unanimously; we affirmed it in 1919 unanimously. It comes up in the House again, and after weeks of discussion and knowing full well the entire meaning and import of the section, my hon. friend waits until this late date before he utters a word in protest against it.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Does the minister mean to say that there was no protest made against that clause in 1919?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I say there was comment, but nobody divided the House on it, and I have the right to assume that it passed the House unanimously, otherwise the House would have divided on it. What did the Farmers' party, the Farmers' Government, in the province of Ontario do at the present session? They took that clause line by line and put it in the Ontario Act. Now my hon. friend from Red Deer is supposed to be very close to the United Farmer Government of the province of Ontario. When his speech appears in Hansard to-morrow will he send a copy of it to the Prime Minister of Ontario? Will he point out to that gentleman the tremendous outrage that the Ontario Government is going to perpetrate by allowing the quadron and the Mexican woman to come into this country and vote upon more advantageous terms than the woman of Europe? The whole thing is an absurdity. The clause is a fair and reasonable one; it does not create discrimination and is not a hardship. Oh, my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition says, we brought these people to the country, we made them British subjects, and then we broke faith with them. Does he not know that the fact that a man is a British subject does not carry the franchise? Does he not know that the franchise in every civilized country

of the world is a conferred right? It is so in Canada and in every other country so far as I know.

Mr. CAHILL: Who confers the right?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The government of the country confers the right upon terms that the Parliament shall agree upon—

Mr. CAHILL: No, the people.

Mr. GUTHRIE: —and Parliament so far has not conferred the franchise upon these women. Now we do not disfranchise them by this clause. We make a special provision that they shall be enfranchised and entitled to vote. If the clause was a disfranchising clause, as it appeared in the Bill when first introduced, there would be some solid foundation for the arguments of hon. members opposite; but it is not a disfranchising clause; it is an enabling clause under certain wise restrictions, so that any woman who by operation of law is considered to be a British subject shall still be entitled to vote. All she has to do is to go through the simple process of obtaining that certificate.

Now, why all the fuss? There is no disfranchisement; at the very most there may be a very slight inconvenience. I believe that it is a proper safeguard. I do not believe that the doors should be thrown wide open at the present time. I do not believe that women from certain countries in Europe should come here and vote a year after their arrival, simply by reason of their marriage, without any inquiry with practically no opportunity for inquiry; while at the same moment an unmarried woman from the United States coming into Canada would have to wait five years before she could vote. There would be real discrimination. The Act provides against such discrimination, and simply at the cost of a little inconvenience proposes to allow these persons who are British subjects by operation of law to exercise their franchise to the fullest extent, but asks them to prove their right to it by showing their qualification upon a short inquiry before a judge.

I see nothing unreasonable in the section, and I must ask the committee to vote down the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler).

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I simply rise to ask the minister a question on a concrete case that was brought to my attention recently. Thirty years ago a gentleman came here from France with his wife and his seven-year-old son. After a while he applied for naturalization papers; he received

them; and therefore according to the Naturalization Act his wife and his son became British subjects. When the war broke out the son took the first boat for France and engaged in the war; he was decorated with the Military Medal and the Legion of Honour. His mother was at the head of all the war charities in Montreal, and she also was decorated by the Government of France. Now, the question I wish to ask is this: Does subsection 2 of section 29 apply to the son; will he have to go before a judge before he can vote?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes. He is a British subject by operation of law, so is his mother, and both of them under this section will have to get certificates.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister mentioned having conferred with me in regard to this Bill before it was brought into the House. In virtue of the statement the minister has made, I think it is only fair for me to say that he did ask me to come to his room the day before he introduced the Bill; that he then outlined to me its principal features, and in explaining the part which dealt with the principle of the qualifications for the franchise he gave, as far as I remember, the same statement which he gave in speaking to the House on the first reading and which will be found in Hansard as follows:

> The only requirements will be those of British citizenship, residence in Canada for one year and in the particular constituency for two months, and the attainment of the age of twenty-one years; these requirements will apply in the case of male and female voters alike.

At the time of our interview I asked whether there were any exceptions to those requirements and the minister mentioned that in the case of British Columbia, where the provincial laws do not recognize the right of certain Asiatics to vote, this law took cognizance of the situation there to that extent. That was the only exception that the minister mentioned to me. When the minister introduced the Bill at the first reading, recalling this exception I put the question to him and his answer will be found in Hansard of that same day.

> Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King (Leader of the Opposition): My hon. friend has said that the basis of the franchise under the proposed Act is citizenship. Is there any exception to that rule?
>
> Mr. Guthrie: Yes, there is an exception which was provided under the Act of last session. It provides that where any person is disqualified by reason of race under the laws of any province from voting at any election in the province, the disqualification is continued for the purpose of Dominion elections.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Was I not asked immediately afterwards a question on this very point?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will complete the quotation:

> Mr. Mackenzie King: May I inquire when copies of the Bill will be available?
> Mr. Guthrie: I expect that it will be printed in two or three days.
> Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It was on the second reading that my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) put the question.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is absolutely all that took place at our interview and on the first reading. That is the statement that went out to the country, and it was because of that statement that the country got the impression that those were the only requirements for the franchise and that the Bill was a fair one. Therefore I am asking the Government to have regard for their honourable obligation as given to Parliament and to the country.

Mr. CRERAR: Mr. Chairman, I entertain no hope that any words I may utter will induce the Government to withdraw this clause after the emphatic declaration made by the minister (Mr. Guthrie). And yet it does seem to me that this clause throws a very grave discrimination against certain citizens of this country who have claimed to be, and who in their inmost hearts consider themselves to be citizens of Canada.

My hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) who has charge of this Bill rather developped some heat in his reply to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) and of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). I could wish that he had displayed as much logic as heat in his reply. It is well known that the By-Elections Act of the first session of 1918 was passed in the closing days of the session for the specific purpose of caring for certain by-elections which should have been held months before, and, in some cases, years before. It is scarcely fair, I submit, on the part of the hon. minister to charge those of us who desire to see this section withdrawn with inconsistency in that regard. The circumstances under which the special By-Elections Act was passed are well known to the House and, I believe, to the country.

My hon. friend the minister argues that the fact that no Mexican, no quadroon, no negress, will come to Canada is a sufficient reason why the discrimination in this clause should be made. But I put the question to my hon. friend: Supposing a negress does come to Canada under the circumstances stated by my hon. friend from Red Deer, will she, or will she not, be entitled to vote and claim citizenship? That is the question. It simply begs the question to state that because none of those people may come to Canada the clause should stand as it is. The fact remains, whatever arguments the minister and those behind him may advance to the contrary, this discrimination lies in this clause, and nothing that he or any of those behind him may say will read it out as long as the clause stands in its present form. Why should that anomaly exist? Is it a fair and sound principle to lay down in our franchise law? I submit, it is not, and I would ask the minister and the Government to have regard to that consideration. Our Franchise Act is fundamental to our whole system of government, because by it is determined who shall have the right to a say in the election of representatives in the House of Commons. We cannot continue these discriminations in our Franchise Act and keep the honour of our country free before the world. That is the point I make, and I appeal to the Government, not because of the honour of the Government, but for the sake of the honour of Canada, to consent to the withdrawal of this amendment.

Mr. BUREAU: I have listened with interest to the speeches delivered to-night asking that this clause be struck from the Bill. When I saw the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) get up I thought that he would give some reason why the amendment should be withdrawn and the clause should stand. But I find it very hard to get accustomed to the answers of the Government to hon. members. The Acting Solicitor General said that what hon. gentlemen had represented was a display of indignation which was but a mockery. When I made some representations to the minister the other day to the effect that the poor were discriminated against, that also was a mockery according to the minister. When we submitted an amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne asking that the Government go before the people, hon. gentlemen on the other side replied by saying that we were not serious. But the country expects an answer from the Government. To say that our contentions are mockery and simulation is simply to use words; it is not giving an answer. The

Acting Solicitor General himself may say that we are putting on mock indignation, but he does not seem to travel very easily when he tries to answer the arguments which are put forward why this clause should be struck out. He tells my leader (Mr. Mackenzie King) that he should not complain. He says: I had an interview with you before the Bill was brought down; I mentioned this clause 29; why did you not object? Why, Mr. Chairman, how could you expect the leader of the Opposition to discuss a measure which he had not had time to read or to analyse, when the minister himself confesses, with the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), that if the words as printed in the Bill conveyed the meaning attributed to them by my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), that had not been the intention of the Government and they would have to be changed? I want to quote my hon. friend's words to show what was the position of the Government when this Bill was being discussed, because with all the strength of the opinion of officers of the House behind them and all the legal talent that they could muster on the other side, evidently the Bill as brought down did not convey exactly what the Government had in mind. On May 5, my hon. friend from North Waterloo having pointed out that this clause was not a fair clause and that it would disfranchise certain people, the Acting Solicitor General as reported on page 2126 of unrevised Hansard, said:

> The question raised by my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) is not without some complexity. Under the Bill as originally introduced—clause 29, subclause 2—the intention of the Government in framing the clause was hardly expressed by the language used, as was pointed out on the second reading of the Bill by the Minister of the Interior.

Now, it does not behoove the Acting Solicitor General to reproach my leader with not having jumped at the meaning of the clause when the Government itself could not express its view in the legislation which they were submitting. The proof of the pudding is in the eating; the Acting Solicitor General has since brought down an amendment with a view to correcting the clause. He went on to say:

> The effect of the clause as originally drawn, and now printed in the Bill, would be to disqualify a certain number of people in this country who had heretofore become British subjects by operation of law. The people who would have been thus disqualified, were the section allowed to remain in its present condition, were the wives and children of those who had come to this country from foreign countries and obtained naturalization in Canada during their minority. As the committee is well aware, the wife of an alien who becomes naturalized in this country, under our law, becomes a British subject. The wife did not have to appear and obtain the certificate of naturalization—she became a British subject by operation of law by the fact of her marriage. Under the old common law idea she merged her existence, her identity became merged in her husband, and by operation of law she became a British subject. So it was also with the children who were minors at the time the parent became a British subject. Not so with the children who had come to the age of twenty-one years. They retained their original citizenship until they should themselves apply for naturalization in this country. My hon. friend from North Waterloo was, I think, the first to point out, during the debate on the second reading of this Bill, that the clause as drawn, had the effect of depriving a certain number of British subjects of the right to the franchise. The Minister of the Interior very promptly informed the House that such was not intended—that if that were the interpretation of the language of the section it did not convey the intention of the Government—and he promised the House that when the Bill came up again an amendment would be introduced to give effect to the intention of the Government, which was to maintain the right of those persons who had become naturalized by operation of law to all their rights, including the right of the franchise.

That is plain English; it could not be plainer. Yet the Acting Solicitor General now reproaches my leader because he did not, before the Bill was submitted to the House, find out that this clause disfranchised a certain number of persons. He says further:

> Now the amendment which I have just had the honour of moving is intended to cure that defect in the section as it is printed in the present Bill, and I would ask the committee to examine the language of that amendment. In my humble opinion the language of the amendment does cure the defect; but if there be any doubt on that point I have no hesitation in saying the Government has no desire to create a doubt on the subject, and we will employ any language that may be necessary to make the matter plain and free from doubt.

What do we ask, Sir? We ask that this subsection be struck out. The Acting Solicitor General answers by saying that there are hardly any negroes in this country. Well, that is not the point; it is the principle that counts. Let me give an example. Suppose an ignorant negro woman comes from the South. She is the wife of a man who is a British subject. A refined woman, highly educated, comes to Canada from France or Belgium. She speaks the language of the country. She employs this negro woman as a servant. People of high standing in the community entrust to this French woman the training and instruction

of their children. Election day comes, and this French woman, trained in literature, well versed in sciences, her husband a British subject, is deprived of her right to vote because she was born in France; and the negro wench who scrubs her floors goes down to the poll and has a voice in saying what shall be the fate of this country. Is there any sense in that? I say, no.

When people who come to this country want to analyse what rights they are going to get, they are not going to take the census to find out how many women of any given national origin there are in this country; but they are going to take the law and proceed by comparison, and they will find out the injustice—yes, I say further, the iniquity—of this legislation on the continent of North America. Hon. gentlemen opposite jeer at the fact that my friends bring up the case of the Mexicans. These people, however few or many come here, do not speak the language of the country, while the French and the Belgians do; but the former can go to the poll and vote, while these women of higher education, more refinement, speaking the language of this country, are going to be deprived of the right to vote. What answer do we receive? "Pretended indignation." "Mockery." I do not think that is fair. If the Government are sincere when they call upon us to discuss this question, or if they are sincere when they say they find any good purpose in inserting this provision, let them give us reasons, not words, not opinions. This clause must have something behind it. The answer is: There are very few of these people. Well, if few, why disfranchise them? If there are a large number of them, then you are committing an injustice on those people and you ought not to disfranchise them. My opinion—I expressed it before— is this: I think there are a great number of these women who ought to have the right to vote. But the Government fear less the judgment of a Nigger or a Mexican than they fear the judgment of educated, refined and cultured women. The feelings of those women, who come from France, Belgium or any other of the Allied countries, are such that any acts of autocracy as are being committed daily they would fear more than the other women would. This is an additional method of endeavouring to make votes as the cost of an injustice. My hon. friends opposite claim that they want to give a fair franchise; but if we make any suggestion or point out anything that we think unfair, we are jeered and laughed at. The only reason I can think of for the way in which they dismiss our arguments and our appeals to cut out this clause is that they fear that some votes may go against them. My hon. friends might just as well come out boldly and in a manly way. Why do you not disfranchise every man and every woman in this country who will not vote for the Union Government—or what used to be a Union Government? Then, possibly we would not have to scratch in order to find out what you want? You dare not do this openly; but you want, by small cuts here and there to try to disfranchise as many open-minded, patriotic people as you dare, in order to gain a political advantage; you are depriving these people of the most sacred right vested in a subject, namely, the right to vote.

Some of my friends argue that this is a privilege. It is not a privilege; it is a right. When I come here and acquire British citizenship, the only way in which I can exercise my right as a citizen is by going to the polls and saying in what way my country shall be run. I want to have a vote and a voice in the legislation of this country and to be able to say who shall be my representative, who shall voice my views in the Parliament of Canada. The time when the franchise is being exercised is the only time in a man's existence when every man is equal before the law; that is the only time when the poor man can walk up to the poll alongside of the millionaire and say: "For once you have not the best of me; my vote is the same value as yours." Now you are going to deprive these people of the most sacred right they have. You say: That is a privilege we give them. I say: It is a right to which they are entitled, and it is a crime to deprive them of that right.

10 p.m.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have already expressed my opinion on the amendment and on this clause, but I wish only to state the facts as they are with regard to a statement of the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie). If there is one thing to which this House and the country are entitled, it is to have the facts as they are, and we should not be deceived,—I understand my hon. friend did not do this intentionally—as to the facts of the case. No statement of my hon. friend was received with so many cheers and so much enthusiasm by hon. gentlemen on the other side as his statement that when this clause was proposed to be inserted in the law of last year, there was no protest from this side of the House.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did not say that there was no protest.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend said that in the first instance, and then he said: You did not divide the House, and I take that as if there was no protest, as if it were unanimous; there was no protest. Does my hon. friend say that again?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I said that it was commented on.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Did my hon. friend say that there was no division of the House?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, I think I did.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, I have Hansard of last year, 1919, when this clause was being discussed by the committee of the House, and at the end of the discussion, the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) said, as reported on page 4650:

Mr. JACOBS: I move in sub-amendment that subclause 2 be struck out.

Amendment negatived.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Was there a division in the House on it? I do not remember.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If my hon. friend wants more than that, I am going to give him more. As reported on page 4659, on the motion of Mr. Carvell for the third reading of the Bill, Mr. Jacobs said:

I move, in amendment, that this Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of striking out subsection (2) of section 5 in clause 2 of the Bill.

Amendment negatived on division.

My only comment is that I ask that my hon. friends on the other side withdraw their cheers.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I sincerely regret if I made a slip in regard to a division on that question. I remember the discussion, and I must apologise if I made a slip in regard to the matter.

Mr. ROWELL: Just to complete the record, as my hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe) has said it is desirable to have a complete statement on record, I have here Hansard of 1918, when the Bill granting the franchise to women was submitted to the House. That Bill contained a provision that all women who became British subjects by operation of law must, in order to exercise the franchise, establish their qualifications for naturalization and obtain a certificate.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What section?

[Mr. E. Lapointe.]

Mr. ROWELL: Subsection 2. My hon. friend will find this in Hansard of 1918, page 90, and on this occasion the Prime Minister in moving the second reading of the Bill, explained its purport.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Will the minister read the section?

Mr. ROWELL: (Reading):

If, being a married woman and previously an alien, she has become a British subject by marriage, or by the naturalization as a British subject of her father while she was a minor, and in either case has done nothing (other than in the second case by marriage) to forfeit or lose her status as a British subject, and obtain and present to the official in charge of the preparation or revision of the voters' lists of the said constituency a certificate, under the signature of a judge or any court of record or of any superior court, under the seal of the said court, certifying that such female person is of the full age of twenty-one years, has resided in Canada a sufficient length of time, and is possessed of all requirements necessary to entitle her, if unmarried, to become naturalized as a British subject, and that she has taken the oath of allegiance to His Majesty.

The Prime Minister in explaining the effect of the clause stated:

The meaning of that is practically this: to be entitled to vote, a woman who has become a British subject by marriage, or through the naturalization, while she was a minor, of her father, who was previously an alien, must have lived in this country the necessary length of time and must in every way fulfil the qualifications which would be necessary in case she were applying as an unmarried woman for naturalization.

Sir Robert Borden said further, as reported on page 91:

She must fulfil the qualifications required by paragraph (c) of subsection (2). Subsection (2) makes it necessary that she shall have resided in Canada a sufficient length of time and be possessed of all requirements necessary to entitle her, if unmarried, to become naturalized as a British subject. She must reside in Canada for at least a year, and must reside within the Empire for at least five years.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Did my hon. friend read the whole section?

Mr. ROWELL: No.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Was this part in it: "Provided however that this subsection shall not apply to any person born on the continent of North America"?

Mr. ROWELL: That was not in the Act of 1918. My hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) has repeatedly said that it was inserted in the Act of 1919, the By-Elections Act.

Mr. BUREAU: That Act was passed during the war.

Mr. ROWELL: The ground of protest urged by the leader of the Opposition and other hon. members on the other side against this clause is that a woman, naturalized by operation of law, must apply for and obtain a certificate before she can vote. That is the ground of protest; that is the ground upon which it is said we are disfranchising thousands of women; that is the ground upon which the motion is made to strike out the clause. Now, what is the basis of this clause? It is: that a woman, if of alien birth, shall not be entitled to exercise the franchise unless she possesses the same qualifications as a man must possess in order that he may have the right to vote. Before a man of alien birth can exercise the franchise he must secure his certificate of naturalization, and to obtain that certificate he must show that he has resided in the country for the necessary period; that he has a knowledge of English or French and that he possesses the other necessary qualifications for naturalization; and when he establishes his qualification for naturalization, then, under the Act, he becomes entitled to vote. The Act extending the franchise to women provided that we should require of them exactly the same qualifications as we require for men, and no more. They must show that they have resided in the country for five years; they must show that they possess a knowledge of English or French; and they must show that they possess the other necessary qualifications. That Act was before the House in 1918.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: During the war.

Mr. ROWELL: This question had nothing to do with the war. No hon. member on the other side questioned it because of the war. This clause was not challenged on the other side of the House, the only criticism on the part of the Opposition was of the principle of extending the franchise to women at all. That was the only criticism. My hon. friend says that the franchise is an inherent right of British citizenship. If so, why have one-half of the British citizens of this country, the women, been denied the franchise up to this time? The truth is, the franchise has never necessarily followed citizenship. It is a conferred right, and the only opposition in 1918 was directed against extending the franchise to women. As the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) has referred to the statements made by the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) I desire to turn to the report of his address as it appears in Hansard in connection with this Bill in 1918. My hon. friend, if he looks it up, will see that he supported the Bill.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In 1918?

Mr. ROWELL: While he had some doubts about the wisdom of extending the franchise to women, on the whole he was prepared to support the measure. He gave his reasons for supporting the Bill, and he is reported as having said:

> The second reason I have for supporting the Bill is that it may prevent the recurrence of what took place at the last election—

when the franchise was given to a certain class of women.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. BUREAU: Give it to all.

Mr. ROWELL. My hon. friend and other hon. members of the House in 1918 when the clause was discussed at length, and with a full knowledge of the terms of the Bill, did not dissent from it so far as my recollection goes and so far as I have been able to briefly review Hansard to-night. It was not dissented from except as regards the principle of extending the franchise to women, and an appeal was made that we should leave it to the different provinces to deal with the matter. Certain hon. gentlemen argued in favour of that proposition, and it was said that we should not extend the franchise to women in Quebec if they did not wish it. But this particular section was not criticised, and certainly there was no division in regard to it in the year 1918. Is it conceivable, then, that if every hon. member thought it was all right in the year 1918 it should become such an outrage in 1920? I have before me the new Bill introduced into the Ontario legislature by the present Farmer-Labour Government.

Mr. CAHILL: Is it passed?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not know whether it has been passed yet, but it is a Government Bill, and if it is not passed it undoubtedly shows the view of the Government as to what the legislation should be.

Mr. CANNON: Does the minister wish to quote the Drury Government as an authority?

Mr. ROWELL: I think that on the whole the Drury Government has done very well in a great many matters, and I believe they have done perfectly right in reference to the franchise. I think therefore I may quote them, at least where I agree with

them. The second section of the Ontario Election Act provides the conditions upon which a woman shall be deemed a British subject and entitled to vote. Subsection (c) of section 2 reads:

> If she has become a British subject by marriage, or by the naturalization as a British subject of her parent while she was a minor, and in either case has done nothing to forfeit or lose her status as a British subject, and has obtained a certificate (Form 13) under signature of a judge of the Supreme Court, or of a county or district court under the seal of the court, certifying that she has personally appeared and has satisfied him that she is of the full age of twenty-one years, has resided in Canada a sufficient length of time, and is possessed of all requirements as would be necessary to entitle her, if unmarried, to become naturalized as a British subject, and that she has taken the oath of allegiance to His Majesty, and no woman shall be entitled to be entered on the list of voters or to vote unless so qualified.

Mr. ROSS: What section is that?

Mr. ROWELL: Subsection (2) of section (2) of the new Ontario Act introduced into the House.

Mr. ROSS: What is the number of the Bill?

Mr. ROWELL: I am in error as to the Bill. It was brought to me as the Ontario Act of 1920, but it is the Act of 1919. However this provision is in the new Bill.

Mr. ROSS: I cannot find it.

Mr. ROWELL: I had a copy of the new Bill.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The hon. member is not quoting from the new Bill.

Mr. ROWELL: This was brought to me and I was under the impression that it was the Bill of 1920, but I find that it is the Bill of 1919. I did have a copy of the new Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ROWELL: I asked for a copy of the Bill of 1920 to be sent to me.

Mr. CAHILL: Where is it?

Mr. ROWELL: This provision is in the Bill of 1920.

Mr. ROSS: I cannot find it.

Mr. ROWELL: I was under the impression, when this Bill was handed to me, that it was the Bill of 1920. A request was sent to the Library for it. But it is in the Ontario law and was in the Act as introduced in the House in 1920. It was in the copy

of the Bill as received by me from the Attorney General's office of Ontario.

Mr. ROSS: It was not section 2 in the Bill of 1920.

Mr. ROWELL: It was in the copy sent to me. If it is not in the Bill the hon. member now has the Bill has been amended. I will be glad if my hon. friend will send the Bill across to me so that I may have an opportunity of looking at it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. ROWELL: Again I ask my hon. friend if he will let me look over his copy of the Bill of 1920?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Why did you say you had it?

Mr. ROWELL: Because I had it and I loaned it to an hon. member of this House. I understood that it was the 1920 Bill that was handed to me to-night.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You are going from bad to worse.

Mr. ROWELL: Well, I will produce a copy of the Bill which had it in, but I believe if my hon. friend (Mr. D. C. Ross) would send it across I could still find it, although it may have been changed. I cannot force my hon. friend to send it over, but, certainly, if I had a copy of a Bill, I would pass it over to an hon. gentleman and give him an opportunity of seeing it.

Mr. McKENZIE: Was the Bill of which the hon. member read the draft introduced by the Hearst Government?

Mr. ROWELL: The 1919 Bill was introduced by the Hearst Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ROWELL: It was passed in 1919, and therefore it must have been introduced by the Hearst Government. If my hon. friend (Mr. D. C. Ross) will pass over the Bill—

Mr. BUREAU: I thought you were supporting the Drury Government.

Mr. ROWELL: The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) has the Drury Government Bill, so he says.

Mr. BELAND: How do you know?

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend said he had it.

Mr. ROSS: My hon. friend (Mr. Rowell) said he was quoting from it.

Mr. ROWELL: Does my hon. friend say that there is no such clause in the Bill?

Mr. ROSS: Would my hon. friend say what the clause was? If he will read the clause—

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I would like to ask you, Sir, if an hon. member is in order in discussing a Bill of the Drury Government in relation to a clause before the Federal House. If that is in order, I would like to move that we adjourn until the Government get reasonably posted on the question before the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried, carried.

Mr. ROWELL: I just want to answer my hon. friend's question.

The CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). I would certainly agree with the hon. member that the House of Commons would not be in order in discussing a Bill introduced into the Ontario Legislature by any Government, but I think it is in order for the hon. minister (Mr. Rowell) to refer to one of these Bills by way of comparison.

Mr. ROWELL: In answer to my hon. friend, the clause which I understood was in the Bill was one which provided that a woman who was naturalized by operation of law was required to apply for and obtain a certificate that she possessed the qualifications necessary for naturalization before she became entitled to vote.

Mr. ROSS: That is not what my hon. friend said at all. My hon. friend quoted a section of the Bill, which he said was section 2, and which he also said was contained in the Drury Bill of 1920. The Drury Bill of 1920 does not contain any such section as section 2, so that my hon. friend is absolutely wrong in quoting that as section 2 of the Drury Bill?

Mr. ROWELL: Will my hon. friend tell me if there is such a clause in the Drury Bill?

Mr. ROSS: As what?

Mr. ROWELL: Which requires that a woman, naturalized by operation of law, must apply for and obtain a certificate to show that she is possessed of the qualifications necessary for naturalization before she becomes entitled to vote.

Mr. ROSS: I cannot say it is in this Bill at all. It may be there—I want to be fair to this discussion. My hon. friend quoted a section which he said was a section of the Drury Bill but which was not a section of the Drury Bill. I do not deny that a section in these terms is there.

Mr. ARTHURS: Read the Bill.

Mr. D. C. ROSS: There are sections within the Bill referring to former sections and former Acts and I do not know positively if they contain the restrictions which my hon. friend says they do, but I know certainly that the sections which he calls the sections of the Bill of 1920 are not the sections of the Drury Act of 1920.

Mr. CRERAR: I would like to ask the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) a question. He has referred to the Franchise Act that the Drury Government has introduced into the Ontario Legislature. Can he tell the committee if that Act contains a clause of the discriminatory character of this subsection 2 of section 29?

Mr. ROWELL: I am very glad to answer my hon. friend's question. It does not contain the provision relating to North American women, and the reason why that clause was put in, as my hon. friend will know, was to meet the case of the wives of American settlers in Western Canada, whereby women from the United States brought up under similar institutions, many of them having exercised the franchise and being accustomed to vote, and who are naturalized by operation of law, are not required to obtain a certificate. It was put in to meet the condition of the wives of American settlers in Western Canada. I am sure my hon. friend would not like to strike it out upon that ground.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to take exception to the rather sarcastic way in which the Acting Solicitor General treated the committee this evening as regards declarations made by members in the debates which took place during the two sessions on this question while the franchise was discussed. My hon. friend said that it was an absurdity to discuss this question as we are discussing it this evening when as a matter of fact it was never challenged by a vote in the House. Now it has been fairly established, much to the discomfiture of my hon. friend the Acting Solicitor General, that the provision was challenged upon two occasions. On the first occasion a vote, not a division, was taken in the House.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is a very nice distinction there.

Mr. LEMIEUX: On the third reading of the Bill a division was taken and recorded in the journals of the House. But my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) went a little further. He said that the member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) supported the principle of this clause in former debates. Now it is very easy to take up Hansard and to show that most of the members of His Majesty's loyal Opposition protested against that very principle on two different occasions, and notably my hon. friend from Quebec East and my hon. friend from Red Deer. My hon. friend from Quebec East has always been consistent with himself on this question whenever it has been debated in the House, and this is not his first protest, but in order to be just to him let me state his exact words. By reference to Volume 5 of Hansard 1919, page 4626, it will be seen that my hon. friend from Quebec East far from supporting this principle placed himself in opposition to it. He said:

I wish also to criticize that part of the Bill which discriminates against certain naturalized British women. It is a discrimination absolutely contrary to the ordinary law.

I find on the same page a protest by my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) who sits on my right. I will quote his words:

With these observations, and with the distinct understanding that we on this side of the House are not committing ourselves to any principle that may be involved in this Bill, or favouring any change in the system of franchise which was in vogue in Canada from the early days of Confederation down to 1885, and from 1908 to 1917, which we believe affords the simplest, fairest, and the greatest possible opportunity for the people of this country to express their opinion freely at the polls, I have no objection to agreeing to the second reading of this Bill. I do not think there will be any division upon it, but it is to be distinctly understood that we on this side of the House hold ourselves absolutely free to deal with any franchise measure that may be introduced at another session of Parliament.

Mr. Chairman, there is more than this. On this very principle of the alien woman marrying a British subject and being entitled to the franchise, my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) has committed himself very clearly. During the session of 1919, on the Amendment of the Dominion Elections' Act debated on June 30th 1919, as reported at page 4399, my hon. friend was being taken to task by my good friend from Quebec East, and here is the little dialogue exchanged across the floor between these honourable gentlemen. You will see, Mr. Chairman, that consistency is indeed a jewel—when there is consistency:

Mr. E. Lapointe: It has already been suggested that to exercise the franchise a woman must be personally naturalized, and not only be a British subject by reason of the fact that she is the wife of a naturalized citizen.

Mr. Guthrie: Under this Act it is most clear that the wife of a British subject, whenever she came from, shall be deemed to be a British subject, and that the wife of an alien shall be an alien. The declaration is quite plain. Even if a woman is Canadian-born, she is an alien if she is the wife of an alien.

Mr. E. Lapointe: According to my hon. friend the wife of a naturalized British subject shall be entitled to vote as well as her husband under any franchise law?

That is putting the question very plainly. (reading):

Mr. Guthrie: There is no doubt about that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And that was an actual statement of the law as it stood on the day that statement was made.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We are discussing the same principle.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I was asked the law as it stood, and I answered the question.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I must say to my hon. friend that was in 1919—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAPOINTE: —one year after the law of 1918. So that when my hon. friend says it was an accurate statement of the law as it was he gives away the whole case.

Amendment to the amendment of Mr. Euler negatived: yeas, 59; nays, 79.

On the amendment (Mr. Guthrie):

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Chairman, I informed the House, and particularly my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), to set at rest any doubt which he or others might have in regard to the form of the certificate that I was willing to add the language suggested by Mr. Mulvey, Under-Secretary of State. I therefore, propose the following amendment:

That the form set out in clause 29 be amended by inserting after the word "naturalization" in line twenty-eight, of page twelve, the following words: "or for any disability contained in "The Naturalization Act."

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment, already before the committee will have to be disposed of before this new amendment can be proposed.—Shall the amendment carry?

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I now move the amendment I have just read.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. PARDEE: I desire that the amendment shall not carry, Mr. Chairman, because I have another amendment to move as an amendment to the Acting Solicitor General's.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendments have already been agreed to. The amendment of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee) will now be in order.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Guthrie's) amendment has not been put.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been declared carried.

Mr. BUREAU: Mr. Chairman, the acoustics of this House must be very bad, indeed, because I am not deaf yet, old as I may be, and I did not hear the question put.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out to the committee that although the amendments have been agreed to the clause itself has not been carried. Any amendment to the original clause, or to the clause as it now stands in amended form is perfectly in order.

Mr. PARDEE: Mr. Chairman, continuing the discussion regarding clause 29, I can add but very little to what I said the other night regarding my idea of who should and who should not vote, and I do not propose to weary the House by again going over it. My idea is simply this, in short, that it will be far better for this country to drop the war and the war spirit and get back to normal just as quickly as possible. For that reason, therefore, I think it is not good legislation that we are endeavouring to enact by this clause. And I am somewhat fortified in that opinion by these reasons. The other night, if I mistake not, whether he said it or whether I read it, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell)—and if I am wrong I am willing to stand corrected—brought to my mind that one or two things had slipped into this Bill along the line of the Naturalization Act and the right to vote that had not been intended to appear. I am further fortified by the language of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) himself, who the other night practically admitted that negotiations were going on now with the Home Government whereby just such a clause as this might be amended so as to get back to the old Naturalization law, and apparently it was thought best by this Government and by the Home Government that we should get back to that position. Therefore, with those two expressions of opinion it would appear to me that all those who think about this matter seriously, and are not taking it in a purely political sense, have come to the conclusion that the best thing Parliament can do to-day is to legislate in such a way that we can heal the wounds that have been created and get back to what was our Naturalization Law prior to the passing of the 1919 Act and of the Elections Act. I submit to this House, as I said before, very sincerely that that is the basis that we should get back to.

The hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. G. R. Nicholson) was very much disturbed the other night by reason of the fact that he did not want people of all nationalities rushing in to secure the right to vote. No such idea has ever been contemplated by us on this side of the House. The Acting Solicitor General asked to-night, "Why should women from Europe vote one year after arrival?" That is beside the question so far as my amendment is concerned. Shortly it amounts to this. In 1919 we passed a Franchise Act,—and we were all somewhat sub-normal at that time; everyone was going a little bit further than perhaps he would have gone had conditions been normal, and we passed that 1919 Franchise Act, which said that no person of alien birth residing in the Dominion should vote until ten years had expired from the declaration of peace.

Now, it is patent to every hon. member that there are many people in the Dominion who have resided here for many years who, even although they have not become naturalized, have voted, they have taken upon themselves as British subjects to exercise the franchise, they have done their share in upbuilding the country, they have paid their taxes, and in every way both they and we have considered that they had an absolute right to exercise the franchise. I am not going to repeat it again, but if there is one thing that is most sacred to the people of this country, if there is one thing that is most sacred to hon. members, it is the fact that each shall have the right to exercise the franchise. It is practically being in No-Man's-Land to say that although you live in a country, although you exercise the functions of citizenship, although you pay your taxes, and although you are liable to the laws of the country,—laws which are made by representatives elected from the great mass of the people,—yet you shall not have a voice in the government of the country or in the selection of your representatives. It is not an en-

viable position; it is a position that ought to be done away with, in my humble opinion, just as soon as possible.

Now, I grant this to the Acting Solicitor General so far as the Franchise Act is concerned; in order that no ultra-loyal members may be heard complaining here or to his constituents that I moved an amendment which is going to let these people in, that the floodgates are to be opened for their admission, I am content, so far as this amendment is concerned, as are hon. members on this side of the House, that the ten-year clause should be lived up to. But I and my colleagues are desirous that those who have been here for ten years should at least have the right to go before a judge and obtain a certificate to secure naturalization for the purposes of this Act, so that under that Canadian naturalization they may be granted the right to the franchise.

Therefore, I beg to move an amendment to clause 29 by adding at the end thereof the following words:

> And it is provided that no disability imposed by the said paragraph (B) shall prevent any person, possessed of the qualifications which would have entitled such person to naturalization prior to the year 1914, applying to a judge for a certificate that he was so qualified,—which certificate the judge shall grant upon proper proof,—and on production of said certificate the said person shall be deemed a British subject for the purposes of this Act and shall be entitled to be entered on the list of voters and to vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: As the discussion has proceeded on clause 29 I think the committee has been incidentally entertained with a general discussion of the amendment now moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Pardee) in concrete form. I think that the amendment is objectionable; first, because it is really an amendment to the Naturalization Act, or ought to be, rather than an attempt to amend the Franchise Act. What is sought by the amendment now before the committee is a change in our present naturalization law which will permit of a dual system of naturalization in the country, first, in part, the Naturalization Act, which has special requirements enacted by this House in 1919, and, second, a naturalization law limited in its operation to the Dominion of Canada, practically putting back the law so far as the franchise is concerned to the law as we found it in Canada prior to 1914.

Mr. PARDEE: Are you not, in this Bill, changing the Naturalization Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, I do not think we are changing it.

[Mr. Pardee.]

Mr. PARDEE: Certainly.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What we are doing is recognizing its full force and application.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Not by the amendment which the minister (Mr. Guthrie) moved.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, for this reason; the people with whom subsection 2 would deal were British subjects by operation of law, and were people who were not affected by the Naturalization Act. But the object of the present amendment is to void the plain enactment which this House made in 1919, and on that ground it is objectionable. If my hon. friend deems that our Naturalization Act is improper or that it should be amended, he should bring forward a Bill to amend the Naturalization Act—and I doubt very much whether after its solemn pronouncement on the question one year ago, the House would feel inclined to amend the Naturalization Act.

Now, the amendment is objectionable in form and would likewise be objectionable in its operation and in its result. I am free to speak for myself on this subject, and I say that my experience of people I know in Ontario of German nationality who have lived in this country thirty, forty or fifty years has not been such as to lead me to believe that these people are entitled to the franchise, particularly at the present time. I would not be in favour of the proposal on that ground. I state the result of my own personal experience in regard to the matter. I am satisfied that the Imperial Naturalization Act was passed with a ten-year limitation against persons of alien enemy countries and adopted in Canada, Australia and the other dominions only after the fullest consideration and for the express purpose of seeing to it that people of enemy nationality should not, for a period of at least ten years succeeding the war, be treated as other subjects. I do not believe that the amendment moved by my hon. friend meets the situation in Canada. I grant that there may be many worthy people who have resided in this country for many years and who under normal conditions might be entitled to the franchise or to have exceptions made of their cases. But this also must be remembered; these people have been pretty careless in the past; they have been negligent of their rights. If citizenship is the great boon which we believe it to be—and British citizenship is certainly a great boon—these people have been hopelessly careless in that they did not see to it that they became

British citizens during these thirty, forty or fifty years. They have waited a long time. They have enjoyed all the protection given to British subjects upon the assumption that they had become such. If they have waited twenty, thirty or forty years in that condition, I think no great injustice will be done to them if they are allowed to remain ten years longer in order that they may comply with the law which this Parliament and the Parliaments of the other dominions saw fit so recently to pass. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman—and these are broad, general principles I am stating —and for the reasons which I stated on another occasion during the course of the discussion on this Bill, on behalf of the Government I ask the committee to reject this amendment.

Mr. EULER: It had not been my intention to make any remarks on this amendment, but I do so now, in order to take issue with one or two statements made by the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie). But before I do that, I think it would be fair, although the question has been discussed before by myself and others, to review the situation exactly as it exists so that members of the committee may vote with at least a fair measure of information on the question.

There are, as has been stated, in my constituency as well as in many others, a great many people of what may now be known as former enemy alien birth, who have lived in Canada for many years—many more years than the ten years now spoken of in the Naturalization Act—men who have lived here for twenty, thirty, fifty, sixty and in one case that I know of, seventy years, who are not to-day in a position to prove that they are British subjects and who may perhaps, technically not be British subjects. I want to make this perfectly plain: you are in this particular case not only dealing with people who are not British subjects; you are dealing with some people who are British subjects but have no means of proving that they are such. We have men in my riding who were in this country before Confederation and who took the oath of allegiance. They came from Germany. They are to-day, in my opinion, British subjects, perhaps even in law, but they have absolutely nothing to show that they are British subjects. They have no naturalization papers, and unfortunately there appears to be no record anywhere of the fact that they did take the oath of allegiance.

Mr. ARTHURS: Does the taking of the oath of allegiance make a man a British subject?

Mr. EULER: It does not now, but I think it did before Confederation.

Mr. ARTHURS: Did it ever make a man a British subject?

Mr. EULER: I am not certain, but I believe it did before Confederation.

Mr. BUREAU: What makes him a British subject, then?

Mr. EULER: Now, we have those who thought themselves British subjects; we have those who, I believe, are British subjects but who are unable to show that they are such, and we have others who, whether you call it negligence or something else, never did become naturalized. I do not want to dwell on this, but I do want to say in reply to what the Acting Solicitor General has just said, that his experience has been unfortunate; he does not believe that these people should be allowed to become naturalized until the lapse of another ten years. In that statement my hon. friend is in direct issue with his leader, the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). I have not the words of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) before me, but I can give them in effect. He stated at the Peace Conference, and he stated in this House, that there were a great many people in this country who were born in enemy alien countries who were worthy of naturalization, and he, together with the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) placed himself on record at the Peace Conference as declining to support a suggestion made by representatives of other parts of the Empire that people of enemy alien birth should not be allowed naturalization for another ten years after the conclusion of the war. Those were the sentiments of the Prime Minister of Canada, and in order to prove that those were his sentiments, we need simply go to his acts in 1917. I have said this before, but I will say it again, because I think it ought to be said, that it is fair to consider the fact that in the year 1917, when, perhaps, we may say that the war was at its worst phase, the Government of this country passed, under powers given by Parliament, Orders in Council under which it was possible to make Canadian citizens of those people who are now under discussion under the amendment of the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Pardee).

Mr. ARTHURS: In what way?

Mr. EULER: If the hon. member will have patience, I will come to that now. This was the method that was to be followed: These men could go to a judge in the ordinary way; they could prove to his satisfaction, or not, as the case might be, that they were worthy of being naturalized. In my particular constituency, in the city of Kitchener, some 93 of them went to the judge, were approved as being worthy of naturalization, and then their applications were forwarded to the Secretary of State in order that the process of naturalization might be completed. There certainly was no object in passing those Orders in Council if it was never intended that any use should be made of them. I cannot for the life of me, see why those Orders in Council were passed before the elections of 1917 if it was not the intention that the powers under those Orders in Council should be exercised. Yet, when the applications of those 93 people were sent to the Secretary of State, for some reason or other, although the machinery was there to make them Canadian citizens, British subjects, they were not given that naturalization. I say that to prove that, in the opinion of the Prime Minister, provision should be made for the naturalization of such people, and such provision was made which was afterwards nullified by the Act which was passed by the British Government and which was followed by the Naturalization Act of 1919 which was passed with the "ten-year" clause in order to meet the wishes of the British people, but not the wishes of the Prime Minister of Canada.

The Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) said that if those people did not obtain naturalization in the long period of time during which they were in Canada, they were guilty of negligence, and he assumed from that, that because those people were negligent, they did not deserve to obtain naturalization now. I do not see much force in that argument, for this reason amongst others. The minister will know, because he has some of these people in his riding, that in former years, matters of naturalization were not considered of as much importance as they are now, and it was perfectly natural that such should be the case. Those people had lived there for many years; they had had their names on the voters' lists from year to year; they had served on municipal councils; some of them, so far as I know, may have stood for Parliament; I do not know that for certain, but it would not have been thought out of place if they had done so, because it was felt amongst all classes of people, including those born in England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland, that those people were just the same as any other people in the county of Waterloo. They discharged their duties as citizens just the same as anybody else; there was no difference; and to show that such was the case, there was an understanding between the two parties, the Liberal and the Conservative parties, that when election time came, no man was ever to be challenged on the score of his nationality. It was taken for granted that if a man's name was on the voters' list, he was a citizen properly qualified to vote. So the matter went on. Under those conditions, it was surely not to be wondered at, especially when many of those men had taken the oath of allegiance, that they did not know the law so fully as to know that they must complete the operation by obtaining their papers. It was not be wondered at that they did not do anything further when they were enjoying all the rights of citizenship and when nobody was making any objection of any kind. It is those people who are included under the amendment, and it is to those people that we feel naturalization should be given. You are now willing to give men naturalization who came from former alien enemy countries if they live here for another ten years. Why in the name of reason and ordinary common sense should it not be counted to the credit of those men that they have already lived here ten years, or three or four or even five times ten years? If it is going to be right to give naturalization ten years from now to men who, perhaps, came to this country in 1913 directly from Germany, are you going to make any exception against the man who has lived here thirty or forty years?

While I do not want to appeal to sentiment at all, it is a fact that amongst those men to whom you now refuse the franchise for another ten years, although they have lived in this country so many years already, were men who had sons in this war. The Acting Solicitor General has made some rather strong statements that I resent; he has practically said that he would trust very few of those men who came here from Germany many years ago. I take issue with him on that, and while this is not altogether pertinent to the discussion, I want to say this on behalf of many of the people whom I consider I represent, although today they are not technically British subjects. We had in the riding of North Water-

loo a very difficult situation which some hon. members may realize. There were men there who, if they did not enlist, were criticised as slackers or worse than that, and some hon. members who served in the war probably know this to be the case, that if a man who bore a German name went overseas, he was under a certain degree of suspicion until he proved undeniably that he was all right. Those men were, if I may use the expression, in many cases between the devil and the deep sea. If they did not enlist, they were slackers or worse than that, and if they enlisted they were spies. This Parliament could now take a step that would restore, at least to some extent, a feeling of confidence that has disappeared in some parts of this country because of unjust suspicion and Acts by previous Parliaments. I am not going to make recriminations with regard to the War-time Elections Act. I have done that before, I think very moderately. That Act was wrong; it deprived honest British subjects of the franchise; but I want to say this to the Government, that the war is over, and surely you could do
11 p.m. no better service to this country than to try to heal the wounds of war and to unite together into one people all Canadian citizens, no matter whether they come from England, Ireland, Scotland, or even from Germany, as long as they show they are worthy of being Canadian citizens.

Mr. ROWELL: It is not my intention to undertake to reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Euler). I have only two observations to make. The first is that up to date, neither this Parliament nor, do I believe, any legislative assembly has in a general Franchise Act conferred the franchise upon others than British subjects. This Act deals only with the franchise, and if my hon. friend's amendment is germane to this Act, it would mean in effect that we were conferring the franchise upon those who were not British subjects; that is a proposal we cannot accept. If the effect of the amendment is to naturalize these men then it must pertain to the Naturalization law, and that is a question which should be dealt with under the Naturalization Act.

I rose to say that I have now a copy of the Drury Bill of 1920 which I did not have before me when I last spoke, and my hon. friend would not accommodate me with a copy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who?

Mr. ROWELL: The hon. member for Middlesex West (Mr. Ross). I had a copy of the Bill; I received it from the office of the Attorney General of the province; I knew what it contained. I loaned it to an hon. member of the House, and when the discussion came up to-night, I asked that the Bill should be returned to me. It turns out that the Bills of 1919 and 1920 are identical so far as this provision is concerned. There was a Bill in 1919, and the hon. member in handing it to me assumed that he was handing me the Bill of 1920. I have now a copy of the Bill of 1920, and the particular clause in question is the same as the clause in the Bill of 1919. I must say therefore that it was at least regrettable that my hon. friend opposite, when he had the right Bill before him, had not the courtesy to send it across the floor.

Mr. GUTHRIE: He denied that it contained the clause.

Mr. ROSS: No, I did not.

Mr. ROWELL: What this House wishes or should wish to get at is the facts, and if the clause was in the Bill which the hon. member had in his possession the committee was entitled to have that information. The hon. member might very well, therefore, have extended the courtesy of sending his copy across the floor of the House when the copy from which I was quoting proved to be the wrong one. The clause which I quoted appears in the new "Act Respecting Elections and the Preparation of Provincial Voters' Lists," introduced into the Ontario legislature on the 22nd of March, 1920, by Hon. Mr. Drury, the Prime Minister. For the information of the committee I shall read it. It is in section 9 of this Bill, subsection (2), clause (c). It so happens that it was also clause (c) in the other Bill.

If she has become a British subject by marriage or by the naturalization as a British subject of her parent while she was a minor and in either case has done nothing to forfeit or lose her status as a British subject, and has obtained a certificate (form 3) under the signature of a judge of the Supreme Court or of a county or district court, and the seal of the court certifying that she has personally appeared and has satisfied him that she is of the full age of twenty-one years, has resided in Canada a sufficient length of time and possesses all such requirements as would be necessary to entitle her, if unmarried, to become naturalized as a British subject, and that she has taken the oath of allegiance to His Majesty, and no woman shall be entitled to be entered on the list of voters or to vote unless so qualified.

Mr PARDEE: Would the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) say that the Naturalization Act of 1919 covers the provision in regard to a woman's voting under that Act?

Mr. ROWELL: The Naturalization Act would, I believe, cover the provisions under this Bill, and unless this Bill is amended it is much more drastic than our Bill in the sense in which my hon. friend is objecting to it. Now, so as to be technically accurate I may say that the form is Form 3 in the Act of 1919 and Form 13 in the Act of 1920; or rather, it is Form 3 in the Act of 1920.

Mr. ROSS: That is not right either.

An hon. MEMBER: Be careful.

Mr. ROWELL: It is Form 3 in the 1920 Act. My hon. friend has the section before him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He has had it all evening.

Mr. ROSS: I said I had it.

Mr. ROWELL: I want to draw the attention of the House to a change in the Act as actually adopted in 1919 and the Act as introduced in 1920. As introduced in 1920 it contained these words:

—and that she has personally appeared and satisfied me—

making it clear beyond question that before any woman naturalized by operation of law can cast a vote she must personally appear before the judge and satisfy him of her qualifications to become naturalized and to obtain the necessary certificate and take the oath of allegiance.

Mr. ROSS: What is the section?

Mr. ROWELL: Subsection (c) requires that she should personally appear and satisfy the judge. These words are stronger than in the clause of the Act of 1919 as actually adopted. I want to go a step further and point out Form 3, the certificate which the female voter must obtain under the Ontario Act. Form 3 will be found on page 44, and is as follows:

ELECTION LAWS AMENDMENT ACT, 1920.

(Referred to in section 9, subs. 2.)

Form of certificate for women of Foreign Birth.

I, a Judge of the Court, hereby certify that of the of in the county of not being a British subject by virtue of her birth in Canada or some other part of the British Empire, or by reason of her marriage to a British subject, has personally appeared before me and has satisfied me that she,—

1. Is of the full age of twenty-one years;

2. Has resided in Canada a sufficient length of time;

3. Is possessed of all the qualifications necessary to enable her, if unmarried, to become naturalized as a British subject; and

That she has taken the oath of Allegiance to His Majesty.

She must obtain that certificate before she is enabled to vote. Now, my hon. friend would have expedited the business of the House if he had sent the Bill across the floor so that I might have stated the situation precisely, instead of denying, as I understood him to do, that there was such a provision in the Bill. The clause is in the new Bill practically word for word in the form in which I read it from the Bill of 1919, except that it is contained in section 9 of the Bill of 1920 whereas in the Bill of 1919 it was in section 2.

Mr. ROSS: I do not know that my hon. friend has expedited the business of the House very much by this long harangue in regard to the point at issue. I had made it clear to the hon. gentleman and to the House as to what was the question at issue, and my hon. friend got up and said that he was quoting from the Drury Bill of 1920. He quoted section 2 of what he said was the Drury Bill of 1920, whereas as a matter of fact he was quoting from the Bill of 1919; and all that I denied was that he was quoting from the 1920 Bill. That was the whole of my denial, and I repeat it now.

I went on further and said that he did not have the Drury Bill before him although he said he was quoting from it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: You had it.

Mr. ROSS: Certainly I had it, and I said there were sections in the Drury Bill —does my hon. friend deny it?

Mr. EDWARDS: Will my hon. friend allow me?

Mr. ROSS: Just wait. My hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) takes up more of the time of the House than I do.

Mr. EDWARDS: And he takes it up to much better purpose than the hon. gentleman does.

Mr. ROSS: I said that the clauses in the Drury Bill referred to former Acts under the Hearst Government, and I did not know—

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why did you not send it across?

Mr. ROSS: You are awfully wise, but you are not as wise in regard to this Bill as you thought you were.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, I am.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must remind hon. gentlemen who desire to be heard that they should do the committee the honour of rising in their places and addressing the Chair. I must also remind the hon. member (Mr. Ross), who is addressing the committee, that his remarks should be addressed to the Chairman and not to hon. members on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. ROSS: I must apologize for referring to the hon. the Acting Solicitor General as I have done, and I shall, in deference to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, address the Chair. The hon. gentleman said that if I had sent the Bill across he would have told me what it meant. He introduced section 29 and he did not know what it meant. It was admitted by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) that it did not express the intention, and they had to ask for an amendment. I am not disputing what the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) said in regard to the points he raised in reference to the two Bills, but if he will go back and refer to the Bills of 1918 and 1919 he may find that what he said is practically correct. In the draft Bill of the Drury Government it will be found that former sections have been enacted in an obscure way and you would have to refer to the laws of 1918 and 1919 to see what the effect of some of these sections was. I did not have those laws before me. What the hon. gentleman said was, that he was quoting from a definite Bill when in fact he was not quoting from it and that was what I rose to point out.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. D. C. Ross) has told us that he was discussing this matter frankly. The hon. member neglected to refer to the fact that he repeatedly said that he had the Drury Bill of 1920 before him and that he could not see the clause in question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must ask hon. members to refrain from any further discussion of the Drury Bill. The amendment which was under discussion when this subject was introduced has been adopted. We are now considering another amendment and I would request hon. members to bring their remarks to bear on the amendment before the committee.

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I shall certainly bow to your ruling. A comparison was made between a bill introduced in the Ontario Legislature and a certain portion of the clause under discussion and I presume that was why the reference to that Bill was regarded as pertinent. However, I shall bow to your ruling and not discuss that any further. I will merely say that I hope that the eyesight of my hon. friend from West Middlesex has improved in the last half or three-quarters of an hour and that he is now able to see what he was before unable to see.

Mr. ROSS: I thank you.

Mr. ARTHURS: I have every sympathy with the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) along certain lines. I have a great many German-born people in my riding who were misled by friends of the hon. member and who for many years, and perhaps up to the present time, or certainly until the beginning of the war, thought they were British subjects. In my riding these men were led as lambs to the slaughter, and were sworn by the ordinary oath of allegiance by magistrates appointed by the province of Ontario under the old regime. They were told they were British subjects and they in many cases believed it and continued to believe it up to the present time. But that does not make them British subjects in any sense of the word, and that is the only class of men to whom the hon. member's remarks would have any reference to at all. I have them in my riding as well as he has, and I have every sympathy with the men who were misled. The great majority of these people many years ago learned that this did not constitute the ordinary form of naturalization. They knew what the hon. member for North Waterloo knew, that every man who was naturalized under the Act before the beginning of the war could have obtained, as he can obtain to-day, a certificate that he was properly naturalized. My hon. friend can apply to the Secretary of State and obtain for the county of Waterloo the name of every German, Turk, or native of any country who has been naturalized within that county. He knows that as well as I do.

Mr. EULER: Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Arthurs) trying to give the impression that I said anything to the contrary?

Mr. ARTHURS: Yes, the hon. gentleman did give me that impression. He said that many men could not find out whether or not they were naturalized.

Mr. EULER: I said they had no proof.

Mr. ARTHURS: The hon. gentleman said that many men in his county could not find out whether they were or were not

naturalized. Now he takes the apposite side and says that he did not intend to give the impression to this House that they could not find out whether they were properly naturalized or not. I make the assertion now that any German or foreigner in Canada can very easily find out whether he has or has not been naturalized. It is open to any member of this House or to any person in Canada to find out whether he has been naturalized or not.

Mr. EULER: Will the hon. gentleman say that they could do that if they were naturalized before Confederation?

Mr. ARTHURS: There was no naturalization before Confederation.

Mr. EULER: Will tney be recognized as British subjects if they were here before Confederation, or will they have any difficulty in proving it in order that they may vote?

Mr. ARTHURS: My hon. friend was not referring to men who are long since dead. He was referring to men who were in Canada and whose naturalization should or could have been conferred upon them since Confederation. The number of people who were here before Confederation would be so small as to be absolutely negligible in the argument. As I said before, as far as these men were concerned, I have a great deal of sympathy with them. Not long ago one of these men wrote to me saying that he had the naturalization papers issued by the province of Ontario and this man believed until the beginning of the war that he was a British citizen. But the amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee)—and hon. members on this side had no means of knowing what it was excepting by hearing it read by the hon. member—would have conferred upon the wives of all men who believe themselves to be citizens of Canada before or since the war the privilege of voting. It would not only have conferred that right upon the wives but would have conferred it upon the men themselves. In other words the amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Pardee) if adopted would allow these men—who before the war made no serious attempt to become British subjects—to have the privilege of voting. I do not think that is my hon. friend's intention, but that is the practical effect of the amendment he has moved.

Mr. EULER: I would like to correct what the hon. member for Parry Sound says by quoting from the Order in Council itself:

[Mr. Arthurs.]

The minister observes further that many persons of alien enemy origin who came to Canada many years ago, during infancy, and have grown up believing themselves to be British subjects, now that questions of nationality are being carefully scrutinized, find it impossible to show that they have become British subjects, although they have voted and held municipal positions for many years. Many others believe that they became British subjects through the naturalization of their parents, but they are unable to prove it because the records are not available.

That is from the Order in Council itself.

Mr. ARTHURS: In reply to that I would repeat what I said before, that the records are available to any member of this House.

Mr. PARDEE: The Government do not know that.

Mr. ARTHURS: The Government does know it.

Mr. PARDEE: Why did they make that statement in the Order in Council, if such is the case??

Mr. ARTHURS: These records are available to members of Parliament. I know that in my riding I asked for the returns showing the number of alien persons who have been naturalized in the district of Parry Sound, and the records as far back as the year 1867, which I believe to be complete, were produced. I believe that on any similar question any hon. gentleman could obtain exactly the same records. So far as the children are concerned, it is a very minor matter; the trouble is with these cases with which I sympathize myself. I have a great deal of sympathy with the class of men who have been unwittingly misled; but the adoption of the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Lambton will include a lot of men who never had any desire at all to become British citizens.

Mr. CANNON: To read clause 29 intelligently we must bear in mind that up to now the discussion has been carried on in connection with two different classes of electors. The first class are the women and children who have become naturalized British subjects by operation of law; and the second class are the men who have received the privileges of British subjects in Canada for a certain period of years, but who, owing to certain particular or special reasons, have not in hand to-day certificates of naturalization and therefore are not to be considered as British subjects. These men—according to the naturalization law as it stands and reads to-day—would not be in

a position to be naturalized for a period of ten years to come. The first class of people —that is the women and children—were disposed of by the amendment proposed by the member for North Waterloo which was voted down by the committee.

We are now dealing with the second class of people. The member for West Lambton proposed an amendment whereby any citizen of this country who has been living in Canada for at least ten years, and would be entitled to naturalization, would have the power, when an election takes place, to go before a judge and secure from that judge a certificate and, having done so, be entitled to cast his ballot. The amendment is to cover the case of the men to whom I referred at the beginning of my remarks. The Acting Solicitor General very briefly answered the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pardee) by saying that it was absolutely impossible for the Government to accept that amendment because it meant an amendment to the Naturalization Act itself. We have heard, since the discussion of clause 29 began in this House several ministers telling us that it was absolutely impossible to touch the Naturalization Act because that Act was a piece of legislation passed by the Imperial Parliament, and adopted by the various Dominions giving the right to every British subject within the Empire the privileges of British citizenship throughout that Empire. The Acting Solicitor General says that what the hon. member (Mr. Pardee) proposes is absolutely unacceptable because it means laying our hands on this Naturalization law, and when the Minister refers to the Naturalization law he has in mind, if I understand him correctly, the law of 1919. The argument of the minister is either good or bad. If that argument is good it ought to cover all cases; if it is bad it ought to be rejected by the committee. I claim, Mr. Chairman that that argument is unsound, because this committe, led by him as adopted the second paragraph of clause 29 and that is a direct amendment to, and an express alteration of, the Naturalization Law of our country. According to the Naturalization Act of 1919 the wives of British subjects in this country are British subjects. Furthermore the minor children were naturalized by the fact that their father was naturalized, and when they become of age are British subjects possessing all the rights of British subjects. I say that if the naturalization law of our country remains as it reads to-day, and if no other law was introduced into this Parliament, these women and these children would be entitled to vote. This is not only my personnel interpretation but it is, I think, that of the highest authority in this House as far as Parliamentary procedure and Parliamentary precedents are concerned, I mean the Minister of Justice. (Mr. Doherty). The Minister of Justice has discussed this question before the committee, and if you refer to unrevised Hansard, page 2136, you will find that, speaking on this subject, in answer to a question he spoke, he said:

> Mr. Doherty: There are a class of people from whom the vote to which they would otherwise be entitled is taken by this Act.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

> Mr. Cannon: And from the wives and the children?
>
> Mr. Doherty: If this Act had not stepped in, these women having become British subjects by marriage, or the children having become British subjects by the naturalization of their fathers would have had a vote.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. CANNON: This is the declaration of the Minister of Justice who is the highest legal official in this House, a colleague of the Minister of Militia, (Mr. Guthrie) and that declaration is a contradiction as flagrant as possible of the declaration just made by the Minister of Militia. On the one side here is a minister who said: If there was no Franchise Act these women and these children would have a right to vote. On the other hand, when the hon. member for Lambton wishes to give at least some portion of justice to a class of our population the Minister of Militia replies: I refuse to accept that amendment, because by accepting it I would alter the Naturalization Act. This House is entitled to better treatment from the Government. The Minister of Militia has no right to amend the Naturalization Act to suit his own purposes and the purposes of the Government on the one hand, and, on the other hand, to refuse the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Lambton because it does not suit his or their purposes any further. We have already amended the Naturalization Act, and in saying that I base myself on the declaration made in this House by the Minister of Justice; and he cannot deny it.

Mr. DOHERTY: Will my hon. friend allow me? There is nothing in what he quoted as having been said by me which involves that there is any amendment to the Naturalization Act in the fact that these women and children were refused the vote. I did say that if that provision had not withdrawn their right to vote they would have had it. Why? Because if that right had not been withdrawn from them, this present Act would simply have said that

every British subject had such a right. But the class that he is now discussing is a class of people who are not British subjects. The distinction seems to me to be perfectly clear.

Mr. CANNON: The Minister of Justice says that the distinction is perfectly clear. Well, he may be very grateful that his sight is as good as that; mine is not. I say that the Minister of Justice declared in this House that if paragraph 2 of clause 29 had not been introduced these women and children would have had the right to vote; and to take away that right to vote that they had as British subjects—and they were British subjects according to our Naturalization law as it existed—the Government had to change the existing law.

Mr. DOHERTY: I never said that.

Mr. CANNON: That inference, I can logically draw from the remarks made by him.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman can draw that inference, but whether he can do so logically is another question.

Mr. CANNON: Therefore I say that the Minister of Militia has no right to bring before this committee as a sound argument the fact that if the amendment brought in by the hon. member for Lambton was adopted it would in a way alter the provisions of the Naturalization Act. That Act, when it did not suit their purpose has been put aside already by the Government. I think this matter is very clear and there cannot be any discussion on it. The Minister of Justice gets up and says: I did not express any opinion that these opinion were given the vote by the Naturalization Act. I know they are not. The Naturalization Act does not give the vote; but it does give British citizenship. And the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) as a Minister of the Crown gave his pledge before this House and before the country that the qualifications to be an elector under this new Franchise Act would be British citizenship within certain limitations as to residence and age.

Since last Thursday when we discussed this clause I have studied clause 29, I have read several books and I have tried to find parallel legislation—legislation which would mean that in this country side by side we will have British subjects entitled to vote, and also British subjects who will be denied the right to vote. Nowhere can I find such legislation. Although, Mr. Chairman, I am sure you have read a good deal of history I do not think that you have ever encountered an instance of such legislation in any history of the world. The only instance which comes anywhere near this piece of legislation is the laws passed under the Roman Empire, when the people were distributed into three classes: The Roman citizens, the slaves, and the foreigners. The foreigners, if you refer to that legislation, you will find included not only people but also animals not indigenous to Italy. When, for instance, elephants were introduced during the first battles against Pyrrhus they were immediately designated by the legislature of the Roman Empire as foreigners, when strange birds from Asia were introduced into Italy they were classed as foreigners; when wild beasts from Africa were brought back to Rome by pro-consuls they also were classified as foreigners. Is this Government going to carry us back to the time of the Roman Empire? Are we in the country, which is supposed to have a progressive and democratic policy, going back to the policy which has been rejected by every other country in the world? I do not believe that our people will endorse such a policy.

Now, one word and I will conclude. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) made a very strong appeal to this committee to-night, and he based it on legislation introduced by the Hearst Government. I have only this to say in reply. The Hearst Government after introducing that legislation went to the people—and the President of the Privy Council knows what happend to that government. If he takes his precedent from the Hearst Government, he may at the next election meet the same fate as the ministers of that government did when they appealed to the people of the province. We do not want as a precedent for legislation in this House legislation passed by defunct governments; we want live legislation; we want legislation that secures the rights of the people. And I think the amendment brought in by the hon. member from Lambton is an amendment that ought to be adopted by the majority of this committee.

Mr. FIELDING: Subject to the insertion of a few words, to which I shall refer in a moment, I desire to endorse the amendment of the hon. member for West Lambton, and I think that strong reasons can be given in support of it. The Minister of Militia in opposing the amendment based his case upon, shall I say the sacred character of the Naturalization Act? He said that this amendment was an attempt virtually to amend the Naturaliza-

tion Act; thereupon he proceeded in the very warmest manner to defend the ten-year clause in that Act. He said that ten years was not too long; it was a perfectly good clause; it was all right. But he forgot something. He forgot that his two colleagues, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) said that it was all wrong. The other evening these hon. gentlemen told us that they were instituting negotiations with the British Government with a view to trying to get that provision changed. I put the question directly to the Minister of Justice when he was speaking of the negotiations in general terms. I said: tell us what was the object of these negotiations; what was it you wanted? Well, he said, the ten-year clause is capable of alteration. I said: then you want to reduce that period? Yes, that was it. So they are negotiating—and the Minister of Militia is a party to it—to get a change in the Naturalization Act as respects the ten-year clause. Yet the Minister of Militia bases his whole objection to the amendment on the ground that the ten-year clause is absolutely correct and proper. Now, that clause has caused a grievance. The Minister of Justice admitted that it was a grievance; the President of the Council admitted that it was a grievance. If it was not a grievance, why were these hon. gentlemen trying to get the clause changed? There is, then, according to their statement, not mine, a grievance existing under that ten-year clause. The Minister of Militia does not see it. He says it is a splendid clause; ten years is not too long; he almost talked as if he would like to make it twenty. But while he says ten years is not too long, the Minister of Justice and the President of the Council say that it is too long, and that they are doing their best to have it changed. Well now, the Minister of Justice, the President of the Council and myself had a little friendly conversation as to the possibilities of getting that provision changed by negotiation. The Minister of Justice and the President of the Council, admitting the grievance, thought we should endeavour by negotiation with the British Government to obtain a reduction of the ten-year term which my hon. friend, the Minister of Militia says is admirable. Well, I did not think that the prospect of getting it changed was a bright one. It is important to bear in mind that both the Minister of Justice and the President of the Council considered that there was a grievance in the present condition of affairs; the Minister of Militia took the opposite view; and I have to make up my mind as to which of these views is correct. If they are entering upon negotiation with the British Government in order to remove this grievance, I am bound to believe that the Minister of Militia has been away for a while and is not informed of what is going on in the Government of which he is a member.

I do not see any prospect of remedying this grievance in the way that the Minister of Justice and the President of the Council have suggested. I know the delay that takes place in connection with such negotiations. It is hard to get decisions from a Government; then after you get your decision you have to introduce an Act of Parliament. As I said in the previous discussion, the Naturalization Act is virtually a treaty between the Imperial Government and the Governments of the overseas dominions, and it is not likely that you can bring about any change until negotiations have been had between the parties. We all know how slow things of that kind are in coming to a finality; months, probably years, will pass before you can get a remedy for the grievance which the Minister of Justice and the President of the Council say exists. Then my hon. friend (Mr. Pardee) comes in and says: since we are not likely to get the remedy for that grievance in the way these Ministers suggest, why can we not remedy it ourselves? We do not need to amend the Naturalization Act. We cannot by any Act of our own create an Imperial citizenship. but we can create a Canadian citizenship for the purposes of this Act. If there are honest people in this country who ought to have a vote but who are disqualified from voting by reason of that ten-year provision, thent I say that while we cannot alter the Act as respects Imperial citizenship we can by our own Act declare the terms and conditions upon which we will apply a remedy of our own. And the remedy is this; that for the purposes of this Act, that is, for the purpose of voting and for no other purpose, these persons shall be qualified to be naturalized upon the terms and conditions which existed in Canada before the passing of this Imperial Naturalization Act. What is wrong about that? That is not an amendment to the Naturalization Act. An amendment to the Naturalization Act would affect the question of Imperial citizenship.

Mr. ARTHURS: Will the hon. member say that a man who was in Canada for

twenty or thirty years prior to 1914 but made no attempt to become a British citizen should be placed on the same footing with regard to the franchise as the man who became a British citizen during that period?

Mr. FIELDING: Well, I am afraid that my hon. friend is luring me into a broader discussion than I desire to undertake.

Mr. ARTHURS: The amendment proposed by the member for West Lambton is that any man who has been in Canada and who has the qualifications, whether or not he ever applied for British citizenship, should be a voter under this Act.

Mr. FIELDING: Well, I do not think that the question whether one has applied or not makes very much difference. If my hon. friend wants a general declaration of my views on the franchise, while I do not want to go into such a broad question, let me say this: there is a troublesome and embarrassing question out in British Columbia regarding Asiatics. I confess that it is an embarrassing situation, and I do not wish at the moment to express any opinion about it. But subject to that, and expressing no opinion about that, I say I believe that every person who is prepared to take the oath of allegiance, who has lived in Canada the necessary time, who has acted the part of a good citizen, and who wants to become naturalized, to become a citizen of Canada, by all means should be allowed to do so. As for disfranchising those who have been British subjects, that is another feature of the Act; the terms that have been used by various speakers in condemnation of it are not too strong. But that is getting away from the amedment, to which I wish to confine myself.

First, I say, there is a grievance. We will put aside what the Minister of Militia said. He was away; he did not know what was going on; he did not know these negotiation about which the Minister of Justice ad the President of the Privy Council have told us. These hon. gentleme say that there is undoubtedly a grievance; that many worthy people in this country are going to be deprived of the opportunity to vote because of the misfortune of the Naturalization Act, and they propose to take up negotiations which may occupy some considerable time. Now, my proposal is, not that we shall attempt by any Act of our own to give to these people an Imperial naturalization; that we cannot do. But what I propose and what the member for West Lambton proposes is that for all the purposes of this Act, that is for the purpose of voting, those persons who have a grievance shall, upon going to a judge and taking the oath of allegiance—that is not in the amendment, but these are the words I would like to see inserted; I take it that the member for West Lambton means that —these people, I say, who are disqualified by the operation of the Naturalization Act, shall have the right, upon proving that they are qualified by residence and otherwise to vote as citizens of Canada. That is what the amendment means and that is what I support.

Mr. TWEEDIE: The argument which has been advanced by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) involves the question of our enabling all people of alien enemy origin who resided in Canada the necessary length of time prior to 1914 to be enfranchised under the present law.

It seems to me that the gist of the whole argument was suggested by the hon. gentleman who asked the question in regard to those people who had resided in this country thirty and forty years. I know of many instances of that throughout Western Canada. The period may not be so long, but there are men there who have lived in the Dominion ten, twelve, twenty-five years, who have never become naturalized. British citizenship, I think, is one of the greatest blessings which any person can enjoy, and if there has been any fault in our country in the past, it has been the fault that all Governments in this country have held the question of citizenship at too slight a value. If those people who have lived in this country refused to make application for their naturalization papers when the required time had elapsed, are we going to set aside the principle of our citizenship simply in order to place those people on the voters' list? If they did not in that period appreciate their citizenship, there is no just ground upon which they can complain of the attitude of the Government if we do not pass some speedy, hasty legislation in order that they may enjoy the franchise at the next election. If they themselves were so inconsiderate of their rights during that long period, why should we now worry over the rights and privileges which they seek to enjoy?

Various matters in connection with the right to exercise the franchise in this country have been discussed, and as was pointed out by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Butts) in connection with the administration of the affairs of the province of Nova Scotia, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) who stands here to-night and asks us to extend

the franchise to the Germans, Austrians, Bulgarians and Turks who have resided in this country three years or more, is the very same hon. gentleman who deprived some twenty-five or thirty or forty thousand good British subjects of the franchise in Nova Scotia while he was premier of that province. Did he manifest any interest in those who were good, true British subjects? I cannot for my part understand the change of heart to which he gives expressions to-night when he deliberately took the franchise from British subjects when they were enjoying it, because they were working for a Government which was of a different political faith from his own.

As regards the amendment of the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Pardee), any man who has any pride in British citizenship and in his country should vote down that amendment, and let those people abide their time subject to the laws of this country.

Mr. FIELDING: I am going to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Tweedie) a question. Supposing that all he has said regarding my action in the matter of a franchise in Nova Scotia were as true as it is untrue, what bearing would it have on the discussion? What reason does it give for anything that is said here to-night?

Mr. TWEEDIE: The bearing which it has is what I pointed out, namely, that I cannot understand the attitude of any hon. gentleman who will deprive any British subject of the franchise, and who will at this time manifest such great distress on account of Germans, Austrians, Bulgarians, Turks or any other alien enemy who resides in this country. The point which I wish to make is, that he wishes to set at naught or treat lightly the great benefits of British citizenship in this country, and on that point I take issue with the hon. gentleman. I have no doubt that he is sincere in the views which he sets forth. I am equally sincere in the views I set forth; and I believe the great mass of the people of this country who enjoy the franchise do not want alien enemies rushed in so that they may enjoy those privileges simply because they have resided in this country for a period of three years.

Mr. FIELDING: Much of the discussion to-night has not been about alien enemies; it has been about the disfranchisement by this legislation of British subjects, persons declared by the law of the Empire, by the law of Canada, to be British subjects.

Mr. TWEEDIE: The hon. member (Mr. Fielding) knows perfectly well that the Minister of Militia, who is in charge of this Bill, pointed out, clearly and in a manner which is beyond contradiction, that this is not a Bill for the disfranchisement of any person who enjoys the franchise of this country; it simply does not include a certain class of people to whom he referred. But the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) now endeavours to divert the issue from this amendment, and the point of this amendment is that it intends to naturalize Austrians and Germans and others, who have lived in this country for a period of three years before the year 1914, some of whom perhaps have lived in this country for thirty or forty years. I am not entering into the general discussion as regards the clause, but I say that I am absolutely opposed to giving those people the right to exercise the franchise at the next election in this country simply because they lived in this country three years.

Mr. FIELDING: I have only one other question. I am assuming now that my hon. friend is a rational being.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I am.

Mr. FIELDING: I am speaking courteously. Will he tell me why he supposes that these people who for forty years have been in Canada with no desire to have the vote, are suddenly going to be seized with a desire to vote?

Mr. TWEEDIE: I do not know. It was the hon. gentleman who was asked before distinctly if he divided them into two classes, those who had resided here for a period of three years and those who had resided here for ten, twelve, twenty-five or forty years. As to the first, if they came to this country from Germany, or Austria, or Bulgaria, or Turkey, or any other alien enemy country, he must know just as well as I do that after such a short period of separation from their mother country, when the war broke out, they must have had an attachment for their mother country, and that during the period of the war, if they ever had any slight attachment for Great Britain or the Dominion of Canada, that must have been wiped out by the stand of Germany or their native country in the war. As regards the other class, if they did not respect and value their citizenship in this country enough to apply for and secure naturalization and enjoy the franchise, they are not worthy of consideration at the pre-

sent time under the circumstances, and in view of the struggle through which this country has passed.

Mr. PARDEE: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tweedie) has become very vehement over this matter. Perhaps he might say what his Government did not very many years ago. May I refer to Orders in Council which have been passed regarding the very subject upon which this amendment is founded? If the hon. member will take the trouble to look up Orders in Council Nos. 2552 and 2948, a portion of which have been quoted here to-night, he will find that the Government, when they passed one of those Orders in Council, had exactly this class of citizens in mind, and they said to themselves: It is not a fair proposition to disfranchise these men who have been many years in this country and believe themselves to be British subjects, but who cannot prove that they have their full naturalization, and we will give them the vote. There is no doubt about that. The letter was quoted here to-night; it has been sent for now, and if I get it will read it. Surely the hon. gentleman cannot deny that if they have resided in Canada for three years prior to 1914 and from 1914 to 1920, they have been here for ten years, which is as much as the Naturalization Act itself calls for. Surely that is sufficient to entitle them to vote under the Act. Order in Council No. 2552 reads in part as follows:

> The minister observes further that many persons of alien enemy origin who came to Canada many years ago, during infancy, and have grown up believing themselves to be British subjects, now that questions of nationality are being carefully scrutinized, find it impossible to show that they have become British subjects, although they have voted and held municipal positions for many years.

That is, they are merely naturalized by reason of the great number of years that they have resided in this country.

> Many others believe that they became British subjects through the naturalization of their parents, but they are unable to prove it because the records are not available.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does the Order in Council do?

Mr. PARDEE: It simply gives them the right to vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, it gives them naturalization.

Mr. PARDEE: It gives them naturalization, and therefore, they have the right to vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is very different.

Mr. PARDEE: Now you take it away from them. It is given with one hand and pulled back with the other. It is given by the hand that wants to be fair; it is taken back by the hand that wants to act unfairly politically. It is all very well for people to discant on these people in this House. The people who are condemned are some of the best citizens in this Dominion, although I do not say that that is true of all of them. This is being done for a political purpose, and it will have one effect and one only, and that is to keep open a wound that should be healed and that will not make the country united.

12 m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If this amendment has done nothing else, it has exposed the pretensions of hon. gentlemen opposite as regards the principle that governs them in matters of the franchise. I have sat in this House for many years and, particularly in recent years, I have heard it urged times without number from across the floor that naturalization and the franchise go hand in hand, and that it is a crime to take away the franchise from any person who enjoys naturalization. They have argued that the franchise is founded upon naturalization, rests there, is part and parcel of naturalization, and cannot be divorced therefrom. It is true they carried it too far. There was no truth in the doctrine at all. It is true that while they argued in favour of that doctrine they themselves were parties to the disfranchisement of half the citizens of this country and resisted the enfranchisement of that half. It is true they had no sincerity when they so argued, but at least that was the rock they believed they stood on; and on that they made their fight. Where do they stand now? They look over this country and find a class of our population whom they would like to see given the vote. Why they would like to have those people vote it is for them to say and for us only to conjecture; and I would conjecture that they believe they would get the support of those people. Do they say it is because they are naturalized citizens? Is it because the franchise is necessary, appurtenant to, and cannot be separated from, naturalization? Oh no! They are on other ground altogether. They have forgotten all of their preachings of the last four or five years and now tell us that even though these people are not naturalized it is the duty of the Government to give them the vote. And the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Pardee) reads an Order in Council which he says is being repealed by this Bill and which had the effect of enabling the naturalization of certain people in this country who had

lived for many years and who possibly through a technicality were not in a position to comply with the requirements. Any person who came in under that Order in Council had to assume all the obligations of citizenship in this country before he could be naturalized or enjoy any of the benefits of naturalization. Is that the case with this amendment?

Mr. PARDEE: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is? Would any man or woman who came and sought the vote under that amendment be bound by any of the obligations of citizenship?

Mr. PARDEE: I admit that I should have added, "on their taking the oath of allegiance." With the consent of the committee I now desire to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What obligations of citizenship would that bind them to?

Mr. PARDEE: Do you not believe in it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No man but a naturalized citizen of Canada is bound by any of the obligations of citizenship. Would the hon. member support the compulsory military service of a man who was not naturalized? If so, would he give him the vote?

Mr. PARDEE: It is a different thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know it is a different thing. Now let me ask the hon. member again. Would he support a Military Service Act which compelled a non-naturalized citizen to fight in the armies of Canada?

Mr. PARDEE: That is a different proposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know it is, but I am asking you the question.

Mr. PARDEE: Draw your own conclusions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why does not the hon. member answer?

Mr. PARDEE: Never mind, the two things are different.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know why the hon. member will not answer; he is perfectly aware that his answer would convict him. Would he answer, Yes? If he did, he knows he would put himself in a position that would make him ridiculous before the world.

Mr. PARDEE: In your opinion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why does the hon. member not answer?

Mr. PARDEE: Go on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He is like the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross).

Mr. PARDEE: No, he is not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I commend the hon. member's discretion in repudiating the comparison.

Mr. PARDEE: Not in the way you imply.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly no country in the world ever called upon any but its own citizens to defend it, and no country in the world ever gave the franchise to any one who was not a citizen; and in no Parliament that I ever heard of, was it ever suggested that the franchise should be given to any but citizens.

Mr. POWER: Does my hon. friend not know that we allowed American citizens in the Canadian army to vote in the last election?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not a man.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Do you remember the election at St. Johns, Quebec?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do, and I remember the investigation which the hon. member called for and which completely exploded the charges made.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Does the hon. gentleman believe in the decisions of Judge Maclennan?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly I believe in Judge Maclennan?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I knew the answer I would get.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I trust that hon. members will not enter into a discussion of the election at St. Johns, Quebec.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly not, Mr. Chairman. You know as well as I do, Sir, that as soon as hon. gentlemen call for an investigation and it turns out against them they at once malign the judge.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: However, what I am discussing is the Act itself. I say that under the War-time Elections Act no citizen of any country but Canada had the right to vote.

Mr. POWER: But they did vote.

Mr. DUFF: They voted in Amherst.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not discussing whether they did vote or not.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER: Back water.

Mr. DUFF: American citizens voted in Amherst.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If hon. members desire to raise any question regarding the way in which the Act was carried out they may do so, as they did before, and again they will be beaten. But if they are capable of turning their minds to the point at issue I shall address them. The War-time Elections Act gave the franchise to British subjects and to no man or woman who was not a British subject. Citizens of the United States came to Canada and enlisted here; the War-time Elections Act was passed, and not one of these men was given the vote.

An hon. MEMBER: They did vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not an hon. member on the other side—and they are sitting in this House tonight—rose in his place and suggested that any American citizen or the citizen of any other country should have the vote by that Act, even though they were at the time fighting in the defence of this country. Now, Sir, let me ask you: Does it not occur to you as rather curious than hon. gentlemen opposite should see an Act passed, at a time when the citizens of another country had enlisted to serve this country in its defence in Europe, and never suggest that those men should have the vote? They never suggested that those men should be enfranchised, because they were not our citizens; but now they look abroad and see Germans Austrians, Bulgars and others who are not our citizens, and they are most solicitous in their behalf, being exceedingly anxious that they should be given the vote. Surely, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CANNON: That is Toryism.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I put my Toryism against the Liberalism of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You will have to come to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I address this particularly to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), because none needs it more. Surely if there ever was a time when the doors of the franchise could be opened to the citizens of a country other than our own it was the time when this country in its peril was being defended by citizens of other countries who had sworn allegiance for that purpose. Surely they might have been admitted to the franchise. That was never asked for, that was never included in our law. But now hon. gentlemen rise in the House and ask that men who have never sought citizenship in Canada, who, for all we know do not want citizenship in the British Empire and who have not been burdened with a single obligation of citizenship, be granted the rights of citizenship—that the doors be thrown wide open and that these people may be given the ballot the same as citizens of this country. In what position are hon. gentlemen placed? For years they have sought to malign the election laws of Canada on the ground that you never could divorce citizenship from the ballot. If this amendment has done nothing more it has shown that there has been no principle inspiring the Opposition in their antagonism to former election laws any more than there has been in their antagonism to this; and if this discussion has done nothing more it at least has served a purpose in one respect: it has shown that the only rule which governs hon. gentlemen opposite in matters of franchise is a pretty shrewd conjecture as to what class of people in this country is likely to support themselves.

Mr. EULER: If the Government is really sincere in desiring to implement the promise made by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) it would be quite possible for them to ensure that the people under discussion to-night should be given the vote and proper naturalization. I am one of those who argued, and argued very sincerely, that the vote ought to go with citizenship. I believe that yet. I am going to support the amendment of my hon. friend from West Lambton, and I shall do it for this reason: If it is logical for this Government to take the vote away from British subjects in one case, it is just as logical to give it to people who are not technically British subjects. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) states that there is a grievance. That there is a grievance is, I think, admitted by responsible members of the Government. That is amply proven. The Prime Minister himself has said that he considers these people have a grievance. That is proven in different ways. It was proven by making provision in 1917 by means of Orders in Council which were designed to provide for the naturalization of these people in a proper way. It was proven by the Prime Minister's speeches at the Peace Conference and it was proven by the attitude of the President of the

Privy Council when he backed up the Prime Minister in that matter. It was proven the other night by the Minister of Justice when he admitted there was a grievance. It was even proven by the Acting Solicitor General although he takes a different attitude to-night. To-night he is willing to withdraw what he said in the debate in 1919. To-night he thinks that these people who have been here longer than ten years should not be given the vote; and yet in the debate of 1919 after I had made an argument to the effect that we should have made it possible for these people to become technically Canadians by giving them naturalization the Acting Solicitor General made some observations. I should add that I had moved an amendment to the effect that the clause should be amended as follows:

> That such person is the subject of a country which at the passing of this Act was at war with His Majesty, provided that such subject was permanently resident in Canada on the 4th day of August in the year one thousand nine hundred and nine.

The effect of that was that a person who had lived in Canada for ten years should be given the right of securing naturalization. I thought that amendment was reasonable and it was reasonable at that time to the Acting Solicitor General, because he said:

> I confess that the amendment does not appear to be unreasonable but I would like to have an opportunity of considering whether or not it would be deemed a radical change from the provisions of the Imperial Act, and as there are several other elements in the proposal which I shall have to consider, I would ask that the matter stand over until some future occasion in order that I might look into it.

He based his objection not upon the same ground as he has to-night but merely upon the fact that the amendment might conflict with the Imperial Naturalization Act. We have this expression of opinion from the Prime Minister, the President of the Privy Council and the Minister of Justice, that there is a grievance here to be remedied. If this amendment cannot be accepted, and if the Government is sincere in all it has said, I would like to make the suggestion that I made the other night and that is that this House re-enact the old Canadian Naturalization law and that it have force until such time as the Imperial Naturalization law may be altered. That is surely a fair suggestion. It conforms entirely to the views of the Government if they desire to give these people the franchise and naturalization. The answer made to that the other night was that they did not wish to have a dual naturalization law. But you have that in effect now. You had it for some time in the past and you actually have it to-day. As a matter of fact, while you speak of giving these people of enemy alien origin the Imperial naturalization, after you have successfully completed your negotiations with the British Government, they will not get Imperial naturalization any way. Take men who came from Germany, Bulgaria, Austria or Turkey; if they have Canadian naturalization to-day that is all they can get. The members of the Government know that to be the fact because we know that some of these men have made application for an Imperial naturalization certificate and they have been refused. If they are refused that now, what chance have others of getting the Imperial Naturalization certificate?

I say, none at all. Then, under the circumstances, if it is conceded that these men are worthy of naturalization—and I am not asking on behalf of anybody else—they still have to come before the judge. If you enact the old Canadian naturalization law it is not a matter of throwing the doors wide open to everybody in the country; it means that they still have to go before the judge and prove that they are worthy of naturalization. If they prove that they should be given Canadian naturalization—and as I said the other night that would serve the purpose in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand—give them Canadian naturalization. That is what they want; they are Canadians first, last, and all the time; and it is no reflection upon their patriotism to say that Canadian citizenship probably appeals much more to them than Imperial citizenship—I should think it would to everybody in this country. As far as I am concerned I would like to make that suggestion in all sincerity and good faith to the Government. Why could it not be possible, at this very session of the House—because it need not be debated at length—to re-enact that Canadian naturalization law. Under that Act these men can become naturalized and the vote will necessarily flow from such naturalization. I should like to know from the Government what possible objection there can be to that? I think that would be the preferable and the better way, because then they would be British subjects and the franchise will flow out of that fact. I ask again what objection can there be to it? That is the best way, but if that way cannot be followed I assuredly will vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Lambton in order to do justice to these people.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question, question.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment (Mr. Pardee) carry?

Mr. EULER: I would like to get a reply if possible from the Government or from the minister. That is only fair.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The rule is that when the committee has declared itself ready to vote upon a question, no hon. member has a right to speak. The hon. member can, however, speak again, after the amendment has been disposed of, and before the clause is adopted.

Mr. EULER: I was merely desirous of obtaining an answer to my question from the Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon member is certainly out of order in repeating his question. The question is now on the amendment. All those in favour please say aye.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Aye.

The CHAIRMAN: All those opposed please say nay.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Nay.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. BUREAU: Yeas and nays.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out to hon. gentlemen on both sides that the time for members to rise in order to exercise their right to demand a vote is when the Speaker, or the Chairman, states that in his opinion the ayes or the nays have it. After the presiding officer has declared the amendment carried or lost it is too late to rise for the purpose of demanding a vote. Owing to the fact that this rule has heretofore been misunderstood I would suggest that by unanimous consent a vote be taken.

Amendment negatived: Yeas 44, nays 76.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that the amendment submitted by the hon. Acting Solicitor General has been carried?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Now the clause stands as amended?

The CHAIRMAN: As amended by the Acting Solicitor General. The following words have been added to the clause:

[Mr. Euler.]

Provided that no disability provided by paragraph B of subsection 4 of section 8 of the Naturalization Act, chapter 38 of the statutes of 1919 (second session), shall disentitle a person on that ground alone to the said certificate.

Shall the clause as amended carry?

Mr. CAHILL: I want to enter my protest against the clause passing as it stands at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No doubt that will help the clause.

Mr. CAHILL: Has some hon. gentleman anything he wishes to draw my attention to? If so, I will take my seat and listen to him.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is all they can say.

Mr. BUREAU: Those who cannot speak cannot hear. That is why they are shouting "louder."

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the clause carry?

Mr. CAHILL: No.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out to the hon. member (Mr. Cahill) that it is not sufficient for him to rise and remain standing. If he desires to prevent or delay the putting of the question, he must continue the debate.

Mr. CAHILL: I thought it was customary for the chair to ask for order, and I was waiting for order to be restored. It may be the rule that you must do more than stand on your feet and wait for order to be restored.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. CAHILL: I doubt very much, Mr. Chairman, if there is any rule defining how fast a man shall speak or how much time he shall occupy in debate. If hon. members opposite are not anxious to get away from here in a great hurry, they can very well continue as they are doing now and they will get all the entertainment they are looking for.

Before the clause carries I want to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that this country at the present time is in worse need of people than of anything else. I think the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) will agree with me on that. And yet this clause will work directly against immigration. When people come to a country they come to make new homes, to better their condition, and to be-

come citizens. But after men and women have been in this contry for forty, fifty and in some cases sixty years enjoying the rights of citizenship, and find that by an Act of this Government they are precluded from exercising the franchise, I submit that the Government of the day could do nothing better calculated to work a great hardship on our taxpayers than by passing this Act, which will exclude for the future not only Germans, Bulgarians, and Turks, but American and British subjects—the very people that we want; because if the Government juggle with them as they did last year by passing legislation under which they can send British subjects out of the country—a piece of legislation that was rushed through this House without any consideration—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CAHILL: There seem to be several chairmen calling for order, Mr. Chairman. I do not know whether they are assuming to undertake the duties of the Chair or not. This very measure juggling with the franchise will be the means of keeping good prospective citizens out of this country. There is no question about that. When my hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) says that a man who has been in this country for twenty-five or thirty years without asking for naturalization should not have it, the reflection is not on the alien, it is on the Canadian people. There must be something radically wrong with Canadianism when men and women will live in this country for thirty years and fail to ask for citizenship. When my hon. friends the other day introduced the question of education and urged that we do something for our foreign immigrants, I thought they were taking the right course, and I think so still. But it is the business of the Government and of every citizen not to attempt to juggle with the votes of these immigrants as has been done in the past.

When it is said that this Act cannot be changed, I would ask my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) what course are the Ontario Government adopting in this matter? Are they being guided by the Naturalization Act? Not at all. Every province makes its own franchise; and surely the Dominion Government, has no less power than the governments of the provinces. We have a much greater responsibility than the provinces—a responsibility to every immigrant, and it is a responsibility that we should not treat as lightly as it is being treated here tonight by hon. Ministers of the Crown in trying to pass this legislation. One minister stated that the franchise had been passed last year without opposition. In 1918, my first session, the first measure I spoke on was the Franchise Bill. I was in favour of woman suffrage, but I was opposed to having it tied up to the War Time Elections Act. It was explained that it could not be done in any other way, and I accepted it for that reason because I wanted women to have the vote. Hon. members get up and say that everyone on this side of the House was opposed to woman suffrage. One minister says there was no opposition. Well, he has apologized for telling an untruth. Another minister says he was reading from an Act submitted to the legislature of Ontario; and he must admit that he is stating an untruth. They treat this matter in that way, they pay no attention to it any further than to get this Act in such shape that they can carry off another election. They have no more regard for the country, they have no more regard for citizenship, they have no more regard for what is decent and honest than to simply say: Give us this Franchise Act, we will force it through anyway, so that we may have a chance to get back again to the Treasury benches. The attention seems to be so good that I think I will desist; otherwise if my hon. friends want to prolong the discussion I am quite willing that they should do so. However, I just rose to go on record as protesting against this Act going through in this manner. So perhaps in future my hon. friends will have a little more patience.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Before the clause carries I wish to emphasize again the situation created by the answer given to me tonight by the Acting solicitor General regarding the case I brought before the House. It was the case of a gentleman who came to this country from France thirty years ago, with his wife and his son who was seven years old. After a while he got his naturalization papers, and, of course, by the operation of the law his wife and son became British subjects. When the war broke out in August, 1914, the son took the first boat for France, he fought for five years, and he was decorated with the Military Medal and the Legion of Honour. His mother, who resided in Montreal, took part in all the war charities; that is she was practically the head of the charity organizations in that city, and she did such good work that she also was decorated by the Government of France. The mother and the son had both voted in the election of

1917; they had the right to vote. Now, according to the interpretation given by the Acting Solicitor General, this woman, who during five years cared for the relatives of those who went to the front, and her son who during five years risked his life and was wounded for the cause of civilization, will be deprived of their votes unless they will submit to the humiliation—I insist on this word—the humiliation of going before a judge and submitting to an inquiry regarding their loyalty and probably being cross-examined by one of the government officials; and yet if the husband of this woman and the father of this boy had come from the slums of Chicago or had been a Mexican desperado they would not be obliged to submit to this humiliation. I appeal to the fairness of members of the committee. Is it fair that this woman and this boy who did more than their duty during the war should not be entitled to vote without going through this procedure, while the son of a man from Mexico or of a man from the slums of Chicago, who probably did nothing during the war, is entitled to vote without going through it. I submit that any member who does not realize the unfairness of this situation is either blinded by political eagerness, or, non compos mentis.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I wish to protest against this clause being carried in its present form. On Thursday last I put the following question to the minister in charge of the Bill:

> Will the minister be kind enough to tell me what good reason there is and what good purpose will be served by compelling these British subjects to travel miles from their homes to obtain certificates?

The minister answered, if answer it can be termed:

> Under this Bill as drawn it is provided that a person who has become a British subject by operation of law, in order to vote, shall obtain a certificate from a judge. That certificate is not for the purpose of identity, as my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier suggested a few moments ago; it is for the purpose of satisfying the judge that the woman has such qualifications that in any event, though she may be a British subject by operation of law, she would be entitled to naturalization.

He admits that these people who are compelled to make applications are British subjects. Clause 29 says, in respect of the qualification of a voter:

> A voter is one who
> (a) is a British subject by birth or naturalization; and,
> (b) is of the full age of twenty-one years; and,
> (c) has ordinarily resided in Canada for at least twelve months and in the electoral district wherein such person seeks to vote for at least two months immediately preceding the issue of the writ of election.

Under this clause it is not claimed that these people who are compelled to travel many miles at inconvenience to themselves and their families to appear before a judge and obtain this certificate are not British subjects. The law says that to have a vote you must be a British subject. Why, then, are these people compelled to go to this unnecessary trouble to obtain a certificate? If the reason is good, why did the minister not tell the committee what that reason was? Later, the minister said:

> The amendment I have submitted meets with the approval of the Government and it is the desire that it be passed.

It seems to me that the Government should be in a position to tell the committee and the country what reason they have for insisting that these people who are British subjects should be compelled to obtain these certificates. It has been suggested that the reason is political; that the motive is not what it should be. If that is the case, I will make my remarks very brief. I am sorry that the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) is not in his seat, because he knows the conditions in Saskatchewan even better than I do. He must know that if this provision is carried into the law thousands of people in the western provinces will, in effect, at any rate, be disfranchised. If that is the intention of the Government, then this proposed legislation is worse than the War-time Elections Act. Under the War-time Elections Act the Government went out and disfranchised people by what I would term front-door methods, but in this case, they give the franchise with one hand and take it away with the other; instead of using front door methods they are going in the back door and depriving these people of the right to the franchise.

I have nothing to say on behalf of the newcomers to this country or against the ten-year residence clause as contained in the Naturalization Act. Taking into consideration the promise made by the Prime Minister, I have, however, something to say on behalf of the people who are already in this country, who came here at our invitation. We went so far as to send our immigration officers into their country to invite them to come here and it seems to me that if we want to build up in this country a united citizenship, that is a mighty poor way to go about it. I think that every hon. member looked upon the resolution intro-

duced a few days ago by the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) in respect to the education of the foreign-born in this country as a good resolution. You can say all you like along the lines suggested in that resolution, but if you treat newcomers to this country as we propose to treat them under the terms of this Bill, you will undo everything you do in every other way. I dissociate myself from anything that may have been said on behalf of foreigners in this country. No one from this group has been making a plea for foreigners. These people are Canadian citizens, British subjects in this country, but for some reason this Government has seen fit to bring down a Bill that will in effect disfranchise subjects who are entitled to the vote.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, if I wanted any confirmation of the view which I hold that we have held the franchise too cheaply in the past, I have had that confirmation in the discussion which has taken place here to-night. The hon. member (Mr. Johnston) has spoken of the inconvenience to which certain people will be put in obtaining the right to vote. Well, the man who does not see fit to put himself out to the extent of travelling a few miles in order to get the necesary papers to entitle him to vote cannot be regarded as a man who values his citizenship very highly. I do not think that we need waste any sympathy on persons of that kind. The Bill makes provision for certain safeguards to enable certain people-in this country to vote. Hon. gentlemen complain that they will be put to inconvenience because of their having to travel several miles to get the necessary papers. The hon. member for Chambley and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) recited what he wishes us to regard as the very pathetic case of a young man who had gone to the war and had done distinguished service, being decorated for his services. The hon. gentleman, it seems to me, is making a great mistake in concluding that the mother of that boy would regard the provisions of this Bill as a hardship. I do not think that person would look upon it in that light at all. Any woman whose son was of the calibre to get on board the first ship and go over to France, any woman whose son could come back and tell her of the terrible war in which the country was engaged and in which he bore such a part, will be impressed with the necessity of placing certain safeguards around our franchise and will appreciate those safeguards as something in the interest of the country as a protection for people who have done their duty.

I am struck, as most hon. members must be, with the great concern of certain hon. gentlemen opposite that certain people in this country should have the franchise. I have a recollection, when the War-time Elections Act was going through, that certain hon. gentlemen opposite objected very strongly to certain British subjects resident in the United States who came over here and joined the forces, being willing to risk their lives for this country, having a vote, and stated that these men did not have a dollar's worth of interest in this country. Yet these hon. gentlemen are very solicitous of certain others upon whom we think it necessary to place certain restrictions. It is all very well for the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Pardee) to say that the war is over and that we should forget all about it; that we should get down to a cordial feeling. Certain hon. gentlemen opposite have no intention of allowing the people of this country to forget the war. I will venture to prophesy that when the next election comes around, these same hon. gentlemen will make it their chief stock-in-trade in certain parts of Canada not to permit the people to forget there was a war; that they will use conscription in certain parts of the country to influence certain electors to vote against the Government which enforced conscription in this country; that they will use the War-time Elections Act and the fact that certain people were allowed the franchise and certain others were not, to influence certain votes. Yet these hon. gentlemen are very quick in getting up now and asking the Government to forget all that took place during the four or five years the war was on. They would have the people forget anything the Government has done that might redound to its credit, but for the political reasons they will not allow certain people in this country to forget certain things the Government did which certain classes of the people did not like, as for instance, not granting the franchise to certain women and granting it to other women. That calls to mind the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite, especially from Quebec, who, when the matter of giving the franchise to women was before the House—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: It had to come out.

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, I hope it does not make my hon. friend sick; it has not had that effect on me. When the question of

extending the franchise to women was before the House, my friend will admit, certain hon. gentlemen opposite from Quebec objected to the extension of the franchise to women, and that, I believe is the attitude generally of that province. I am not going to quarrel with the people of Quebec for taking that attitude if they choose to take it. A great deal can be said both for and against the extension of the franchise to women, but I think I am stating what is correct when I say that a strong feeling was manifested in this House by certain members from Quebec against extending the franchise to women, which feeling was not manifested, at least to the same extent, by members from any other province. It was their privilege to express that disapproval if they wished to do so, but it seems slightly inconsistent on the part of those hon. gentlemen who objected generally to the extension of the franchise to women to show now such solicitude on behalf of women of alien enemy origin who happen to reside in this country. Those who give this bill careful study and consideration will see in this clause certain safeguards which we should have in this legislation in order to protect those people who are entitled to the franchise. We have been entirely too slack in that regard in times past; we have held our franchise entirely too cheaply, and the safeguards which are inserted are no more than are right under existing circumstances. True, the war is over, but the people of this country have not yet forgotten and will not forget for many years to come that there was a war. They are still suffering from the losses which many of them have sustained in that war, and it is in the interest of all concerned that there should be a period of probation, so to speak, before certain people are taken into full citizenship.

Section 29, as amended, agreed to on division.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Right Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. (Tuesday.)

Tuesday, May 11, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House I move:

That the name of Mr. Rinfret be placed on the following Select Standing Committees of this House: Debates and Mines and Minerals; that the name of Mr. Stein be placed on Forests, Waterways and Water Powers and Private Bills; that the name of Mr. McDonald be placed on Mines and Minerals, Forests, Waterways and Water Powers and Agriculture, and that the name of Mr. McKenzie be substituted for that of Mr. Duff on the Public Accounts Committee.

[Mr. Edwards.]

Motion agreed to.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Acting Solicitor General) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 126 to amend the Bankruptcy Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Explain.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Bankruptcy Act that was passed last session will come into force on the first of July next under a proclamation in that behalf which was issued, I think, in the month of January. It is now intended to amend the Act. I think there are about twenty amendments proposed. They are not very radical in their nature but it is thought that they will simplify the Act and make it more workable. I will take the opportunity when the Bill comes to its second reading or is in the committee stage to more fully explain the nature of these amendments.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

SENATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 113, for the relief of Jessie Elizabeth Hudgin.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 115, for the relief of Caroline Ewing Gudewill.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 116, to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the Western Assurance Company.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 117, for the relief of Charles Lindsay Keys.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 122, to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the British American Assurance Company.—Mr.——

Bill No. 125, for the relief of Irene Martin Chapman.—Mr. Hocken.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Mewburn, Bill No. 23 respecting the Hamilton, Provident and Loan Society, to increase the amount that it is authorized to receive by way of deposit, and to change its name to the Hamilton Provident and Loan Corporation, was withdrawn.

THE BUDGET SPEECH TO BE DELIVERED MONDAY NEXT.

On the Orders of the Day:,

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): May I ask the right hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) if the rumour is correct that we are to be disappointed in our expectation that the Budget will come down to-morrow. If it is not coming down to-morrow, can he inform us when we may expect it?

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): I do not know whether my hon. friend is disappointed or not but circumstances have intervened which make it undesirable that the Budget Speech should be delivered to-morrow as was anticipated. One of the considerations in the matter is the pleasurable circumstance that the Prime Minister of the Dominion (Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden) is expected to take his place in the House to-morrow, and on account of his return just previous to the time that the Budget was to have been delivered it was not considered advisable to go on with the Budget without giving the Prime Minister an opportunity of looking over it. Secondly, we shall not sit on Thursday but shall sit on Friday. The Budget might have been delivered on Thursday if we had sat on that day, and it does not seem advisable to start the debate on Friday. The Budget will, however, be delivered on Monday next which must not be, for that week, considered as a dies non, as it very frequently is. It being Budget day I hope all the members will make it a point to be in their places.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING: Monday is not usually Budget day. While I must not say that there has been no such case I have no recollection of a Budget ever having been delivered on Monday. It is usually considered desirable that the Budget should be delivered on a day when there is a pretty good attendance. Of course my right hon. friend will say that there should be a good attendance every day. Perhaps Monday is being chosen for some special reason that my right hon. friend has not given. He informs us that we are to have the pleasure of the presence of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and he immediately proceeds to say that is the reason why we should not have the Budget on Wednesday, implying that it will not be a pleasant thing and that he does not want to mix a pleasant and an unpleasant thing. I think my hon. friend might take into consideration the fact that Monday is not a Budget day, and it would be a wise thing to say Tuesday. If, however, the Government insists on Monday, we will have to agree to it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know upon what grounds my hon. friend says that Monday is not a Budget day.

Mr. BUREAU: Custom.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Monday has as many hours in it as any other day, and after the rest of Sunday it ought to be a good day for the Budget.

Mr. BUREAU: The shock would be too great.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is the duty, and I think the pleasure, of members to be present on that day, but the main object is this: We do not want to lose any more time in getting the Budget down and proceeding with the important business of the House.

Mr. FIELDING: No time would be lost if the Budget were brought down on Friday next.

Mr. BELAND: The session might come to an end before it is delivered.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think so.

EXPLOSIVE WORKS AT BELOEIL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): I wish to call the attention of the House to a very important matter. In my constituency there is a placed called McMasterville—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: —where the Canadian Explosives Company have a very large plant.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BUREAU: That is awful.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The plant is situated on the river Richelieu, about a mile from the village of Beloeil, where, in addition to quite a considerable population, there are some very beautiful summer residences. Now—

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will come to the point of his question.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I will, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to remember the nature of the questions which may be asked on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: In the last fifteen days four explosions occurred at that point which resulted in considerable damage to property and even loss of life. I have already drawn the attention of the Government to the danger which exists from the presence of this plant and the necessity that an inspection should be made. The answer I received was that the Government had no jurisdiction and could not name an inspector or make an inquiry. I wish to inform the Government that chapter 31 of 4 and 5 George V—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is making an argument upon the Orders of the Day and, under no circumstances, can he do that. If he desires to ask a question perhaps the matter is of sufficient importance to permit him to do so, but he should not, under the guise of a question, submit what is in effect an argument.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to make an argument but simply to point out to the Government that according to sections 15 and 17 of the Act referred to—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must ask the hon. member to submit his question.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I am coming to that, Mr. Speaker. I hope the Government will order an inquiry and name an inspector under the terms of sections 15 and 17 of this Act, because it is most important. Otherwise there may be a catastrophe impending.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: To-morrow I will give my hon. friend an answer. In the meantime if he would direct a note to me detailing briefly what the trouble is which he has been trying to expose this afternoon it will help in coming to a decision.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I had the same answer from my right hon. friend two years ago.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Two years is so long a period that I have forgotten.

Mr. SPEAKER: The very circumstance that this matter originated two years ago is sufficient evidence that the question is one that ought not to be submitted on the Orders of the Day.

[Mr. Archambault.]

REPORTED MIGRATION OF MENNONITES FROM CANADA.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) a day or so ago made inquiry as to whether or not the Government had any official information respecting the migration of a large number of Mennonites from Manitoba and Alberta to the United States, and if so, if the Government was taking any steps to induce the people to remain in Canada?

In reply I beg to state that the Government has no official information of any such movement. During the course of the past two or three years the press has on several occasions contained announcements of the possibility of the emigration from Canada of a large number of Mennonites because the Governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta,—under the administration of their school laws, were insisting that the children of these people should be required to acquire a proper and efficient common school education.

If the contemplated movement referred to by the hon. gentleman is due to the fact that there are large numbers of Mennonites who will not observe the school laws of these provinces the Government considers that it would be most unwise to interfere in the matter in any way.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT, 1907. AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved the third reading of Bill No. 57 to amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: I was not aware from the order of business given to the House last night that the third reading of this measure was to be moved this afternoon. However, I think it would be inadvisable to allow the Bill to pass its third reading without once again referring to features of the measure which seem to afford reasons why it should not pass in its present form. There has been a great deal of discussion on this Bill in committee and it is therefore unnecessary again to review in detail the different points that have already been mentioned. It will be sufficient to draw the attention of the House to significant features of these amendments.

The first amendment changes the method of making application for boards of conciliation and investigation. As I pointed out in committee the change in this regard

has not, so far as the Government has shown, been requested in any general way. The minister has intimated that members of the executive of the Trades and Labour Congress have asked for the change, but he has brought before the House no evidence in corroboration of his statement. He has not presented to the House any communications from the Trades and Labour Congress, and if he has them in his possession I would ask him to read them to the House before the Bill is passed. In the absence of any request for a change in the method of proceeding under the existing Act, I think it is obviously desirable that a method which has stood without criticism for thirteen or more years should be permitted to stand, and that the effectiveness of the Act should not be jeopardized by an amendment of the kind suggested which can do no good and may lead to a great deal of harm.

Then another amendment changes the allowance to witnesses from what in the Act at the present time makes it accord with the allowance to witnesses in the courts of the different provinces and establishes instead a minimum of $4 a day. The effect of that amendment, as was pointed out in committee, will simply be to encourage large numbers of witnesses to be called before these boards, and will greatly increase the cost of administration. When this objection was pointed out to the minister, he made the somewhat popular reply that the Minister of Labour was anxious that workingmen should not be taken away from their work as witnesses and paid meagre witness fees. I might point out that many of these boards hold their proceedings after the day's work is over, and that the attendance of witnesses may be for only ten or fifteen minutes. If the law is not left as it is, it is certainly going vastly to increase the number of witnesses called and correspondingly increase the expenses of administration.

In considering the amount to be paid witnesses under the proposed amendment, we must also consider the effect of the previous amendment, which the Government has introduced, and which permits any two individuals connected with an industry to which the Act applies to go around with a memorial and upon securing signatures of a majority of the employees to become entitled to have a board of investigation granted. I believe that the two amendments taken together are going to have the effect of leading to a considerable interference with many of these large industries which are among the most important to the country, and that they will prove prejudicial to capital and labour alike.

A further amendment gives to the Minister of Labour the power, before a strike or lockout has taken place, of his own initiative, and without request from any of the parties, to appoint a board of investigation under the Act. That, I believe, is going to work prejudicially to the Government, and to the parties whose interest it was intended to serve. The Act is intended as a means of investigating existing disputes, and provision is made whereby any of the parties interested may make application to the Government in a regular way for the appointment of a board. In the past that provision has worked very well. Interested parties have been able to get a board when it was needed. More than that, where a dispute in any case has assumed the proportions of a strike without a board having investigated its merits, the law, as amended two years ago, gives the right to the minister to step in at that stage and appoint a board on his own initiative. But here is an entirely new departure in the nature of interference by the Government of its own will with private business, and that I think is a principle which the House should not endorse.

These are the essential features of the outstanding amendments made by this Bill to the existing legislation. All of them are doubtful, some of them are thoroughly bad. Other amendments were asked for by labour and by the public for the protection of public interests, namely, that public services and industries in the nature of public utilities operated by municipalities or provincial governments should be brought under this law. The minister says that the Department of Justice has given some ruling in regard to the application of the Act to municipal enterprises, and in virtue of that ruling he does not propose to alter the measure one way or the other; he proposes to leave these important matters in a condition of doubt. My view is that if instead of bringing in amendments altogether doubtful in their effect, the Minister of Labour had introduced amendments that are desired and have been requested for the protection of communities and of employees in these large public utilities, he would be rendering a service that would be worth while. There are these objections, it seems to me, to the amendments proposed to the Act, and, as already pointed

out, they cover pretty much all that the amendments pertain to.

Let me say that I think the discussion on these amendments has shown the necessity of having the Minister of Labour in this House. I wish to pass no reflection whatever on my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) who has been piloting the Bill through the House. He has handled the measure with that skill which all are prepared to concede he possesses in very large measure. But I am sure he will be the first to admit that he has repeatedly felt the difficulty of appreciating the amendments which he was asking the House to accept. These industrial matters affect all classes, and if there is one place above another where a Minister of Labour should be it is in the House of Commons, where from day to day he can answer urgent questions on existing industrial situations.

It is a serious reflection upon the Government's appreciation of what is owing the public that as regards the two departments of government which have the most to do with questions of greatest concern to-day, namely, matters pertaining to labour and capital, and matters affecting returned soldiers, the ministers of those departments should be in the Senate where it is not possible for members of this House of Commons to ask them questions or to get the benefit of their views.

May I point out in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that the action of the Government in keeping the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment in the Senate amounts really to a form of closure so far as concerns the securing of information on vital questions or the discussion of them. We are by the rules of Parliament precluded from making any reference to what has taken place in the Senate. When those amendments to the Industrial Disputes Act were introduced in the Senate the Minister of Labour made certain representations concerning them. I have read the debate in the Senate. May I say that my hon. friend who has been piloting the Bill through this House gave us, in regard to this particular matter of witnesses' fees reasons for adopting the amendment, entirely different from those given by the Minister of Labour in the Senate. There the proposal originally was that the minimum should be $2 a day. In the discussion yesterday my hon. friend who sits to my right (Mr. Lemieux), an ex-Minister of Labour and the member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) also an ex-Minister of Labour, and the immediate predecessor of the present minister and myself—three of us who have had to do with the administration of this Act, were all united as to the folly of making the suggested change, and yet there was no opportunity for the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Robertson) to give his views to the House, and under the rules we were precluded from referring to the debate in the Senate.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): I want to ask the leader of the Opposition in view of what he has said, if, after all, he does not think it is desirable when a person or persons has or have a complaint to make that he or they should be in the position of an ordinary litigant, who upon issuing a writ is able to cite the defendant to appear before the court and have the whole case dealt with on its merits. In that way not only private interests but public interests are protected. Does the hon. gentleman not think that some such course as that should be taken?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to answer my hon. friend's question, but I am sorry to say that I do not quite see the point of it; I do not see that it has any bearing upon what I have just been saying with regard to the importance of having the Minister of Labour in this House. I should be glad to have my hon. friend repeat his question if he cares to do so.

Mr. BURNHAM: The hon. gentleman has just said that he thinks it is unfair.

Mr. McMASTER: What? Louder.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) is referring to remarks which I made some little time ago, whereas I have in mind what I have just been saying.

Mr. BURNHAM: Two minutes ago.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps a little later I can go over the ground again, if my hon. friend wishes it. In the meantime, perhaps he will permit me to finish my remarks on this point of having the Minister of Labour in the House of Commons.

It is very opportune, Mr. Speaker, that reference should be made to this matter on this particular measure, because there is no doubt that the House has been detained longer in dealing with this measure than it would have been had the Minister of Labour been here to explain the features of his own Bill. We had to have two or three adjournments in order to find

out what the minister really meant. Lest it might be said by my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) that these adjournments were unnecessary, I should like to direct the attention of the House to the circumstance that I pointed out to the minister (Mr. Meighen) that one of the amendments which he brought in did away altogether with a very important amendment to this law which was passed in 1910. I asked him if he were aware that that was the effect of his amendment, and he replied that he was not, and he adjourned the House to ask the Minister of Labour about it. Yesterday he came and frankly admitted that the amendment as brought in had that effect; that it was never intended as it dropped a very important amendment to the Act made in 1910 at the instance of the railway employees and railway companies. That, I think, is quite sufficient to show the unwisdom of having legislation promoted in this House by ministers who know nothing whatever in a detailed way about the legislation which they are promoting. But I come back to what is fundamental under the British system as respects a ministry and that is that it should be where at all times and on all occasions it can be questioned upon important matters of public concern. As I have said, the matters of greatest concern to the future prosperity and present contentment of our country, are those which relate to industry and to the well-being of returned soldiers.

The course of this legislation helps us to appreciate, I think, just why this session has lasted so long and why so little has been accomplished during the time we have been here. If any one looks over the legislation which the Government have introduced, he will find that almost the whole of it amounts to bringing into this House Bills which have previously been brought in and passed, brought in again and amended, and then brought in once more for further amendment. I have not at the moment a list of the Bills which have been before the House; if I had I could show that with the exception of half a dozen measures, they are mostly in the nature simply either of a consolidation of former legislation or of a chopping up of existing laws into different Acts and the assignment of parts to one minister and parts to another, and the bringing in of little amendments, some of which may be necessary, but many of which, like the amendments to which I have directed attention, are mischievous and bad. Now, that is the reason why we have been taking up so much time during this session to so little account. There has been very little legislation of what one could call an original or constructive nature. The Government have brought forward practically nothing of that kind; if they think they have, I should like the minister to cite instances. Take the Grand Trunk Bill. At the last session that measure was introduced. We complained that it was being rushed through; that errors would creep in; that it would have to be amended on a subsequent occasion. This session the Government brings down a measure to correct errors in the hasty legislation put through last session, and two or three days are occupied in the consideration of that measure. Take the Opium and Drug Bill. What was that measure but a measure that the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Rowell) had amended a year or two ago and which he brought back this session for further amendments—amendments so extensive that the whole Bill had to be reprinted? I might mention other legislation, but the facts are familiar to every hon. member. I submit that instead of tinkering and tampering with existing legislation to no effect, the time of this Parliament should be taken up, at this time of all times in the country's history, with constructive legislation along lines that are in accordance with the country's needs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out that the minister, in moving the motion for the third reading, has exhausted his right to speak.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Except in reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no reply on the third reading

Mr. BUREAU: Stung.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion for the third reading of the Bill?

Motion agreed to, on division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT—SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS.

On the motion of Hon. N. W. Rowell (Minister of Health), the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Canada Shipping Act, chapter one hundred and thirteen of the Revised Statutes, 1906, and to provide:—

1. That Part V of the said Act, relating to Sick and Distressed Mariners, be repealed, and in lieu thereof it be enacted,—

(a) That the Minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may rent and equip and maintain premises for hospitals for the care and treatment of sick mariners, and may, with the consent of the person having the control and management of any hospital, designate such hospital to be, during his pleasure, a hospital for the care and treatment of sick mariners, and contract with such persons for the care and treatment of sick mariners, and may discontinue the use of any such hospital for the purposes aforesaid; and that the minister may make regulations for the government of any such hospital, and prescribe the duties and powers of the medical and other officers and employees of such hospitals, and of the port physician and of all other officers required to perform any services in carrying out the provisions of this legislation or of any regulation made hereunder; and all hospitals devoted exclusively to the treatment of sick mariners shall be under the exclusive control and management of the minister; and that any shipwrecked, destitute or otherwise distressed seamen may, by authority from the minister, be temporarily boarded and lodged and taken care of at any marine or seamen's hospital devoted exclusively to the reception, care and treatment of sick mariners;

(b) That there shall be levied and collected on every ship arriving in any port in Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island or British Columbia, hereinafter called "the provinces," a duty of two cents for every ton which such ship measures, registered tonnage, but in no case shall the duty payable by any ship be less than two dollars in any year; that such duty shall be payable on each ship three times during each calendar year by the master or person in command of such ship, or by some person on his behalf, to the collector or other chief customs officer at the port at which such ship is entered, at the time of making such entry, and such entry shall contain on its face the tonnage of such ship, and no entry shall be made and no clearance shall be granted unless such duty is paid;

(c) That no ship otherwise liable to pay the duty shall be exempt from the payment of the said duty by reason of her voyage being one not requiring entry or clearance at the custom house. If the ship does not require entry, the duty shall be paid immediately on her arrival

(d) That no ship engaged in the coasting trade of Canada and arriving at any port in any of the said provinces from any other port in the same province, or arriving at any port in the province of Quebec from any port in the province of Ontario, shall be subject to the payment of the duty; Provided that no ship arriving at any port in Canada from any place out of Canada, and afterwards continuing her voyage to another port in Canada, shall be exempt from the payment of the duty at the last mentioned port, unless she has paid it at the first mentioned or some other port on the same voyage;

(e) That as regards fishing vessels, the duty shall not be payable on ships employed exclusively in fishing or arriving at a port in the provinces when on a fishing voyage, but the master or person in command of a ship registered in Canada used exclusively in fishing or to be employed on a fishing voyage, may, if he so desires, pay the said duty of two cents for each registered ton before the said ship makes its first fishing voyage in any year, at the first port at which the ship receives any part of her outfit for the said voyage, and thereafter before each subsequent voyage during the year, but not exceeding three payments in all in any calendar year;

(f) That every collector or other chief officer of the customs shall account for the sums received by him under these provisions in such manner as the minister may from time to time direct;

(g) That sick mariners on ships paying duty shall be received and treated in any hospital for sick mariners as heretofore, and receive the care of a collector or other chief officer of customs where there is no marine hospital; but no sick mariner taken ill or injured outside of Canada, and arriving in any of the said provinces otherwise than in a ship to which he belongs, shall be entitled to the benefits conferred by these provisions, nor for a period longer than one year without written authority from the minister nor shall he be entitled to treatment or care thereunder when suffering from permanent insanity, and no sick mariners belonging to ships exempted from or not paying the duty levied under these provisions shall be entitled to the rights or benefits of sick mariners hereunder;

(h) That all expenditures made under these provisions shall be paid out of such moneys as Parliament may appropriate for the purpose; and be accounted for, with attested vouchers, as the minister may direct; and an annual report thereof, with a statement of receipts and expenditures shall be laid before Parliament.

2. That section two hundred and seven of the said Act be repealed, and in lieu thereof it be enacted that the minister may whenever he deems it necessary pay out of any moneys applicable to the relief of distressed seamen and appropriated by the Parliament of Canada for that purpose, such sums as he deems requisite for the temporary relief in such manner as he deems advisable, of shipwrecked, destitute or otherwise distressed seamen not entitled to relief under any of the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894; and may also on the production of the bills of the disbursements with the proper vouchers and such other evidence as the minister requires, pay out of such moneys any reasonable expenses incurred by the Board of Trade of the United Kingdom or by any officers of His Majesty in any British possession other than Canada or in any foreign country, on account of subsistence or transport back to Canada of any seamen or apprentices who have been domiciled in Canada for twelve months and who have been found in distress either on account of shipwreck or otherwise in any place out of Canada; and persons serving in ships registered in Canada shall for this purpose be deemed to be domiciled in Canada while so serving.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister please explain how this changes the existing law as regards sick mariners?

Mr. ROWELL: This does not change the existing law as regards provision for the care and treatment of sick mariners; it rather changes in some aspects the administration of the law, as I shall explain in a

moment, and it increases slightly the charges upon the vessels. Under the law as it stood up to the year 1908-09, the charge on vessels that came under the provisions of the Act was two cents per ton, in order to provide the money necessary for the care and treatment of sick mariners. In the year 1908-09, the charge was reduced to one and one-half cents per ton, and the amount thus realized was sufficient during the years between 1908 and the present year to provide all moneys necessary for carrying on this branch of the Government service. But owing to the very substantial increase in the cost of hospital care, the revenue under the existing Act will not be sufficient to cover that cost. It is estimated, that the revenue this year will be approximately $75,000, and the expenditure this year will be something over $90,000. The change proposed by this resolution, viz.: to increase the charge from one and one-half cents to two cents per ton will it is estimated bring our revenue up to $90,000, or a little over which will be sufficient to provide the moneys necessary for the care and treatment of these sick mariners. The change in the amount of the fee is the most important change involved.

Then there is a change in administration. At the last session of Parliament, the administration of marine hospitals was transferred to the Department of Health. We had at one time ten marine hospitals; of these, four have been disposed of; two are not now in use; and at present only four are in operation. A change of policy has taken place in recent years in the administration of this branch of the service. In view of the limited number of patients to be treated at any given port, it has been found more economical to make arrangements with the local hospital authorities for their care and treatment on a certain per diem basis. The result has been that in a number of places the maintenance of these marine hospitals has been discontinued and satisfactory arrangements have been made with the local hospital authorities for the treatment of the patients. The bulk of the work, therefore, is now covered by arrangement with the local hospital authorities, and in dealing with the matter, it was the view of the two departments that it was more convenient, expeditious and satisfactory to administer the Government hospitals in association with the work which is carried on in hospitals with which the Government have agreements for treatment of patients. Therefore, it was decided that the whole work should be carried on under the Department of Health, and the necessary changes to make that administration effective are provided for in the proposed legislation. The result is a revision of the clauses of Part V of the Act, which simplifies the procedure for carrying on the work and puts under the Health Department, not only the management of the marine hospitals, but the care of the sailors who come into our ports and who are provided for in hospitals in Canada under agreement with the department at so much per diem.

Mr. STEVENS: I think the minister should give careful consideration to this phase of the proposed change, namely, that we are increasing rather than decreasing, as it appears to me, the cost of administration. By subclause (a) the minister is given authority, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to rent and equip and maintain premises for hospitals for the care and treatment of sick mariners. While I do not object for a moment to any provision for giving proper care to sick mariners, I submit to the minister and the House that this is rather a wide provision. I think it would be exceedingly unwise to provide a method whereby at any chosen point hospitals could be opened up and maintained by the Government, when we know that in nearly every port affected by this legislation there already exists one or more properly equipped hospitals. I think the most effective and most economical way would be for the Government to make an arrangement with the hospital authorities to take care of sick mariners at these hospitals. We should avoid as far as we can, increasing the cost of administration of this particular branch of the public service.

There is another point I wish to bring to the attention of the minister. Subclause (b) provides that there shall be levied and collected on every ship arriving in any port in Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, or British Columbia, a duty of 2 cents per ton. Why exempt Ontario? I am not offering this in any way as a criticism of Ontario, but the point I am making is that there must surely be occasions when there are sick mariners in Ontario, and if the country is to assume the responsibility of looking after sick mariners, I think the cost should be distributed as widely as possible. Why should vessels arriving at a port in Quebec, Nova Scotia or British Columbia be taxed, and ships arriving at ports on the Great Lakes in Ontario not taxed at all? I submit in support of that argument that there is in existence to-day

a very large unexpended sum from the fees which have been collected over many years. In other words, the cost of maintaining and caring for the sick mariners approximates less than one-half of the fees collected. I am not sure whether the fee is being increased by this measure.

I think this should be the course the Government should pursue. First of all, the fees should be reduced against shipping. I think that is of importance because after years of experience in caring for sick mariners we now have in hand a very large sum unexpended.

Another point I would bring to the attention of the minister is this. It is alleged —I am not sure whether the statement is accurate, and I would ask the minister to inform the House— that a large portion of the funds collected against shipping for the maintainence and care of sick mariners has been spent in other ways and for other purposes, purposes of relief and so forth, having no relation whatever to sick mariners. That is not fair. We must remember that this is a direct tax against shipping and in so far as it is a tax against shipping, it is handicapping the shipping of this country.

Another important point is this: The sick mariners' dues imposed in Canada have in the past been seized upon by the American Government as a ground for imposing a retaliatory tax against Canadian shipping entering their ports. In British Columbia, for instance, and I presume the same thing applies to the Maritime Provinces as against the ports of Maine and other states, our ships going to Seattle are now taxed very much more heavily than we tax American ships. The Americans imposed that tax because we imposed a tax on American ships entering our ports under this provision for sick mariner's dues. In my opinion it would be better if, instead of imposing a tax against all shipping, thereby inviting these retaliatory taxes against our shipping, we provided that where seamen are taken from a ship ill, the shipowner or company should maintain and care for that seaman. I do not think the shipping concerns of Canada are opposed to caring for sick mariners under Government control and direction, but to have a large fund created that is not used in anything like its entirety, and then under this legislation to increase the tax, is in my estimation bad policy for Canada, because this is a time above all others when we should encourage the development of Canadian shipping.

[Mr. Stevens.]

There is another point. Subclause (a) provides for the establishment of hospitals devoted exclusively to the treatment of sick mariners under the exclusive control and management of the minister. Supplementing what I said at the outset, I am afraid the minister will find, as the new Department of Health becomes established, that it is going to get far beyond anything that was anticipated by this House when it created that department. The care of sick mariners has been most admirably looked after by the Marine Department. The sick mariners have been well cared for in the past, as is proven by the fact that a large sum, amounting, I think, to several hundred thousand dollars for the

4 p.m.

care of sick mariners remains unexpended. Now we cannot create new paraphernalia and new officials, and as this legislation suggests, possibly the establishment of Government hospitals in different parts of the country, without enormously increasing the expense. I assume that the minister has considered this but I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that in the brief time I have had to peruse the resolution it appears to me that we are establishing a very dangerous precedent which if extended and perpetuated will result in a tremendously increased cost to the country with no vital advantage to the sick mariner. After all it is merely the care of the sick mariner that we are interested in and not the establishment of an expensive institution in the country. I want the minister to understand that I am not approaching this question with the idea of embarrassing him at all but there is a very widespread feeling amongst the shipping people that the cost to shipping should not be increased. One thing above all others that we should avoid is increasing taxes in any way unless we are going to get a very decided and advantageous return from the same. I bring these matters to the attention of the minister and I request not only an answer but if possible a careful reconsideration of his own views as expressed in the resolution.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: This is largely a question of administration. The Marine Department have been collecting large sums of money from the ships of this country but they have not been using that money for the treatment of sick sailors. They have been placing the money in the consolidated revenue fund and using it for other purposes. I went through the blue book a few days ago and discovered that they have between $150,000 and $200,000 still to the good.

They have collected over $150,000 from the shipping interests of this country for the purpose of treating sick sailors but they have not spent the money and they have not treated the sick sailors in very many cases. They have not undertaken the responsibility of looking after the sailors. There are places along the coast of Nova Scotia where the department have not made the necessary provision for attending to sick sailors. I drew the attention of the minister to one very urgent case in my own constituency. I do not know whether it is wise to transfer the treatment of sailors from the Marine Department to the Health Department. It would seem at first blush that it was the proper thing to do. If we are to have an efficient Health Department it should look after the health of the people in all respects, but at the same time I fear that the Health Department, being situated at Ottawa and knowing so little about our sailors a thousand miles away, the sailors may not receive any better treatment than they have been receiving in the past. I agree with the policy of the Government, wherever it is possible to carry it out, that sailors should be treated at existing hospitals. Wherever there is an efficient hospital in the place where the sick sailor happens to be, it is the proper policy to make arrangement with the hospital to treat that sick sailor but I think that the department must also take the responsibility at places where there are no hospitals and that is the main difficulty along the Eastern coast of Canada. There are places so far distant from hospitals that it is very difficult to deal with cases of this kind. Take, for example, the town of Canso, which is situated some ninety miles away from the hospital at Louisburg which is the nearest hospital that is sufficiently equipped to treat a sick man. The hospital at Louisburg is one of the four hospitals that the Department has been maintaining. We have about five thousand miles of coast line on the Eastern coast of Canada and you can understand that with only four marine hospitals these must be distant from any points where sailors may become ill. The policy of sending sailors to existing hospitals where there is sufficient equipment is the proper one.

I would like to see something done which will enable the minister to use the money that has been collected from these ships to equip hospitals or to assist in equipping hospitals at points like Canso where no hospital exists. Canso is the headquarters of the fishing fleet of Eastern Canada. It is the nearest point to the Banks and hundreds of vessels come in there every year and there are many cases of hardship arising from the fact that there is no place there in which to treat sick sailors. The French Government have provided a hospital ship to look after the fishermen who have their headquarters at St. Pierre and it frequently happens, I understand, that the Canadian sailors are treated in the hospital ship belonging to France and treated free. Not having taken the same interest in our sailors, we have not made any provision of that kind at sea, and we have also failed to make provision on shore for those who come in. The minister should go a little further than he proposes. He has collected a very large sum of money from the shipping industry for the purpose of defraying expenses connected with this service. I think that he should make provision that in places like Canso—and there must be other places of the same kind—where no hospital exists some capital expenditure should be provided to assist in building and equipping a hospital. I understand from the citizens of Canso that they are willing to do their best to maintain an efficient hospital at that place and in addition to treating their own sick they will be pleased to treat the sailors who ought to be treated by the department. They are not able to do that under present conditions. They have no hospital and in order to procure the money to build and equip a hospital it will be necessary to give them some assistance. I would like to ask the minister if he would agree to some policy whereby capital assistance could be given, or a yearly amount could be provided for a sufficient number of years, to enable a small town like Canso to build and maintain an efficient hospital.

Mr. CURRIE: I observe in the resolution that there is an exception made in the case of the province of Ontario. Am I right in believing that the province of Ontario is exempt from this resolution? I understand that the Government has been collecting fees for sick sailors for many years. In the province of Ontario we have as many sick sailors proportionately as there are on the sea coast. If there is a sick sailor in Ontario he is taken off the ship and sent to a local hospital where he is attended to. The expense is not charged against the ship; it is charged against the municipality. In the largest town in my riding, Collingwood, they have a marine and general hospital where they treat sailors who come from various places to that port. They are

sent to the port and treated in the hospital, and the municipality invariably has to pay all the charges as these sailors have very little money. In many instances they are suffering from contagious diseases, such as smallpox, and they are sent to the hospital and quarantined and some are treated for five or six months. In typhoid fever cases they are taken care of for two or three months. Whilst the Dominion Government assesses shipping and receives a large mount annually from that source for the purpose of attending sick sailors, not one dollar have I ever been able to get out of the Marine Department for a hospital. The minister might take notice of that. Not only is that the case in Collingwood but it is equally true in respect to Midland, Fort William, Port Arthur, Goderich, Kincardine, St. Catharines, Toronto and all those points on the Great Lakes. There are over four thousand sailors under ordinary circumstances on Canadian ships on the Great Lakes who need this attention. Not only do we have to attend to the Canadian sailors but a great deal of the traffic goes by American ships and we have to attend to the crews of those vessels as well. The American vessels come to our great lake ports with corn, iron ore, and other products. Many of them are allowed to engage in the coasting trade in Canada and they come to Fort William, Midland, St. Catharines, Port Colborne, and other places with grain. Their sick men have to be attended to and why should Canadian municipalities have to meet the expense? That is something I cannot understand and I would like to know from the minister when he makes his reply whether it is a fact that this money tax has been collected from the shipowners on the Great Lakes in recent years and if so why it has not been paid over to these hospitals for the work they have done. I think that in the case of the hospital in Collingwood it will be found that there has been some seven or eight thousand dollars of charges against sailors who entered that hospital in the last four or five years. The money was handed over by the ships for the maintenance of these hospitals but the municipality has been unable to collect a cent of it and the reason assigned is that the municipalities are attending to the matter. For the reasons I have given I cannot understand what induced the minister to insert a clause in the Act exempting Ontario from the operation of this law. The Department of Marine for years has known that we have been making a claim for this money. The hon. member (Mr. Duff) shakes his head.

Mr. DUFF: The shipowners in Ontario have not paid these dues before.

Mr. CURRIE: I would like to know why they have not been made to pay the dues the same as the ships in the other provinces?

Mr. CHISHOLM: They claim the charges are too high.

Mr. CURRIE: The charges are not too high for other purposes. A charge is made by the Federal Department, for example, for inspection. Shipowners have to pay a fee for inspection to the province as well and they even have to pay an inspection fee to some foreign association; they pay to that association $35 or $40 for certificates of that character. There is no reason in the world why the shipowners on the Great Lakes—and they are not all Canadians, some are Americans, because there are foreign vessels trading on the Great Lakes—should not be charged the necessary fees to maintain hospitals for sick sailors. Those sailors are very subject, for instance, to typhoid fever. They are more subject to that disease than are the sailors on the ocean; and most of these cases in the Lake hospitals will be found to be typhoid fever cases. Up to a few years ago—I do not know whether there is any stringent rule against it now—these ships used to pump the water for drinking purposes on board from the slips at Toronto and various other ports which they entered, and by reason of the fact that sewage was discharged there instead of being carried a long distance out, that drinking water very often was contaminated. The same difficulty does not exist on ocean vessels because they either get pure water from the land before they start on their voyages, or else use salt water which has been condensed. As a result of these outbreaks of typhoid, the Department of Marine was compelled to order the installation of systems whereby the drinking water was disinfected before it was supplied to the sailors. The outbreaks of disease became so bad at one time that about 15 or 20 per cent of sailors on board the ships were suffering from typhoid fever because of the conditions which I have mentioned. I have every sympathy with the shipowner, but I have more sympathy with the poor sailor who never gets much of a deal from anybody, even from the Government. He is asked to pass examinations but the Government does

not provide any education for him. Take the man who has to undergo an examination for the position of marine engineer. He is required to take a very high standing in mathematics and thermodynamics but no government in this country is giving men an education along such lines or conducting schools where these men might receive a training for their calling. It is like pulling hen's teeth to get a dollar out of the Government for assistance towards any of these purposes. Now this legislation gives the last blow—this is the blow that killed father. None of this money is to go to the province of Ontario but it is to be left to the farmers in the rural districts and the artisans in the towns to bear the expense of ministering to our Lake sailors whenever they fall sick. I hope the minister will see that the clause is amended so that the cities of Toronto, Hamilton, St. Catharines, Kingston, and others along the Great Lakes that have been maintaining hospitals for sick sailors and saying very little about it are properly compensated for the services they render. It should not be a case of charity at all to have to attend the sick sailors. The shipowners are very wealthy. Some of these shipping companies are paying as high as 80 per cent per annum since the beginning of the war. Talk about profiteering! Therefore to continue to exempt them from the payment of $35 or $40 per ship per year is to my mind a great mistake. I hope the minister will take that into consideration and will amend the clause so as to bring all the provinces under the same regulation and see that the sailors on the Great Lakes get just as good and fair a chance as the sailors on the ocean.

Mr. DUFF: I have listened carefully to the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Currie) and I cordially agree with a great many of them. But the trouble of which he complains is due to the fact that the sailors on the Great Lakes are not looked after by the Department of Marine or the Department of Health, because there is no provision for that purpose.

Mr. CURRIE: Under what?

Mr. DUFF: There is no provision under the existing law.

Mr. CURRIE: American sailors who are taken sick are looked after by the United States.

Mr. DUFF: I am not discussing what the United States Government are doing, I am referring to what we do in Canada. As I said a moment ago I am in perfect agreement with many of the hon. gentleman's remarks and am only trying to get this matter straightened out. If the hon. gentlemen will look at clause 384 of the Shipping Act he will see that it reads:

> There shall be levied and collected on every ship arriving in any port in the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island or British Columbia, a duty of two cents for every ton which such ship measures, registered tonnage.

It will be seen that the province of Ontario is omitted from the operation of the Act. As far as I am concerned I will be quite satisfied to have the Act made applicable to that province. I quite agree with what the hon. gentleman says: There is no reason why sick sailors in the province of Ontario should not be treated in exactly the same manner as are the sailors on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and on the gulf of St. Lawrence. I feel quite confident that ship owners on the great lakes will not object to paying the small amount of dues which the Government asks in connection with the Sick Mariners Fund. Two cents per ton on a ship of 10,000 tons means $200. That has to be paid three times a year so that in the case of a vessel of that tonnage the ship owner would only have to pay $600 to ensure that sick sailors shall be properly looked after in the hospital. If the province of Ontario comes under this Act the department will arrange either that the local hospitals shall care for the sick sailors on the Great Lakes, or else will maintain hospitals of their own where the men can be treated.

Looking over this resolution and comparing it with the old Act, part V, chapter 113 of the Shipping Act, I really cannot see that there is very much difference between them except that the wording of the resolution is much longer than the part V referred to. If the Government finds it necessary to put the care of sick mariners under the Department of Health instead of under the Department of Marine, the wording of the Act will require to be changed and "Minister of Health" substituted for "Minister of Marine" in clause 5. Personally I am opposed to the care of sick sailors going under the Health Department; I am firmly convinced that it is purely a marine matter and should be left in the hands of the Marine Department. In the last fifty years the department has built up a good branch in connection with this work, and the officials appointed to look after the marine

hospitals are well qualified and capable men, and give satisfaction not only to the general public and the shipowners but to the sailors themselves. It seems to me therefore that to transfer the care of the marine hospitals to the Department of Health would be a mistake. The Department of Health will, in a few years, have sufficient work to do without bothering in any way with the sailors who come under this Act.

I also notice that in subsection (e) it is provided:

> That as regards fishing vessels, the duty shall not be payable on ships employed exclusively in fishing or arriving at a port in the provinces when on a fishing voyage, but the master or person in command of a ship registered in Canada used exclusively in fishing or to be employed on a fishing voyage, may, if he so desires, pay the said duty of two cents for each registered ton before the said ship makes its first fishing voyage in any year, at the first port at which the ship receives any part of her outfit for the said voyage, and thereafter before each subsequent voyage during the year, but not exceeding three payments in all in any calendar year.

In my opinion this clause ought to be changed so that there would be no discrimination against fishing vessels as compared with coasting or foreign-going vessels. Of course under the clause the fees may be paid if the captain or owner so desires; but it seems to me better to have the fishing vessel treated in the same manner as the coasting or foreign-going vessel, and there is no reason why this should not be done. As I said a moment ago the owners of fishing vessels have paid these fees willingly because they realized the benefits which the Marine Department have been able to give sick mariners. I suggest that the clause be changed so that fishing vessels be treated in exactly the same manner as other vessels.

I was very much interested in what the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) said as to what is going on on the Nova Scotia coast. I do not wish to say anything about the county of Guysborough, but I do say there is pressing necessity for a marine hospital at the Port of Canso—not so much perhaps for the fishermen of Guysborough county as for the fishermen and sailors on the Atlantic coast. As the hon. member for Guysborough well said, Canso is the half-way house for fishing and coasting vessels going from the different parts of Nova Scotia to Newfoundland or the gulf of St. Lawrence. There is hardly a day in the shipping season when there are not from ten to twenty-five vessels either anchored in the Port of Canso or passing up the strait of Canso, and those vesels sometimes have to land sick men at this port. It has been a great inconvenience to those sick men to have to be sent all the way to the Hospital at Halifax or to their homes. Some one has said that the Government has on hand $150,000 collected from ship-owners of this country which has been paid into this fund. It seems to me that Parliament should immediately take steps to erect a marine hospital at Canso for the treatment of sick mariners. Therefore I would strongly urge on my hon. friend who is in charge of this Bill (Mr. Rowell) that immediate steps be taken to that end. If there is one port in Canada where something should be done for sick mariners it is at the port of Canso.

The department should also arrange to have a hospital ship. If I may be allowed to refer to what I said some time ago on a resolution before the House. I then suggested that one of the things the Government should do to encourage our fishing industry was to have hospital ships stationed at different ports on the Nova Scotia coast or on the Banks to look after sick mariners. It seems to me that the Government might very well arrange to have a hospital ship placed at the disposal of sick mariners on the Atlantic coast, and also, if necessary, on the Pacific coast, where there is also a great fishing industry.

Suggestions have been made to close the present hospitals and arrange with local hospitals to look after sick mariners. While there may be some advantages in such an arrangement, I am not very strongly in favour of it. In my opinion it will very greatly increase the expenditure of the department, and I feel that sick mariners require rather different treatment, perhaps, than other sick people. Usually they are landed from their ship, and they will very likely be—

Mr. CURRIE: What would the hon. member do in case of contagious disease? Supposing two or three men are taken off a ship suffering from plague or small-pox, should not the department have power to equip a place in which to take care of those men? Some one has to do that.

Mr. DUFF: Men suffering from a contagious disease are not taken off their ship.

Mr. ROWELL: I am advised that His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency will attend at four-thirty to assent to Government Bills, and in order that we may receive the report from the Senate on some Bills

already sent it, I move that the committee rise and ask leave to sit again this day.

Progress reported.

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

Sitting suspended for Royal assent to Bills.

A mesage was delivered by Colonel Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Deputy of the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable Senate.

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate.

And having returned,

The Speaker informed the House that His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name the Royal assent to the following Bills:

Bills passed session 1920.

An Act to amend the Currency Act, 1910.

An Act to amend the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act and to transfer to the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police the powers heretofore vested in the Commissioner of Dominion Police.

An Act to amend The Government Annuities Act, 1908.

An Act to amend the Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act.

An Act to amend The Ottawa Mint Act.

An Act to amend the Customs Act.

An Act for carrying into effect the Treaty of Peace between His Majesty and Bulgaria.

An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act (Certificates of Service).

An Act to incorporate Scottish Canadian Assurance Corporation.

An Act respecting The Trust and Loan Company of Canada.

An Act to incorporate The T. Eaton General Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate The T. Eaton Life Assurance Company.

An Act to confirm an Agreement between His Majesty the King and the Corporation of the city of Ottawa.

An Act to amend The Dominion Lands.

An Act to amend The Technical Education Act.

An Act respecting The Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.

An Act respecting The Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.

An Act respecting The Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.

An Act respecting The Kettle Valley Railway Company.

An Act respecting Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company.

An Act respecting The Pacific Marine Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate Armour Life Assurance Company.

An Act for the relief of George Henry Shemilt.

An Act for the relief of John Bertram Hall.

An Act for the relief of Nell Louise Dennis.

An Act for the relief of Harry Ernest Wright.

An Act for the relief of Henry Delphe Parizeau.

An Act for the relief of Gele Karafel.

An Act for the relief of William George Uren.

An Act for the relief of Meryl Adams.

An Act for the relief of Herbert Walter Ecclestone.

An Act to incorporate International Loan Company.

An Act to amend The Trust Companies Act.

An Act to amend the Civil Service Insurance.

An Act to amend The Loan Companies Act, 1914.

An Act to confirm the Agreement dated the eighth day of March, 1920, between His Majesty the King and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada for the acquisition by His Majesty of the capital stock of the said Grand Trunk Railway Company, except the four per cent guaranteed stock.

An Act for the relief of Ignace Perugini.

An Act for the relief of William Murray Gray.

An Act for the relief of Gladys Stewart Addison.

An Act for the relief of Fedorin Cope.

An Act for the relief of Albert Harvey McBride.

An Act for the relief of Alexander Scougall.

An Act for the relief of Ada Mabel Sanderson.

An Act for the relief of John Albert Green.

An Act for the relief of Emily Cruickshank.

An Act for the relief of Cyril Graham Sinclair.

An Act for the relief of Richard Ernest Anderson.

An Act for the relief of Edith Gertrude Willis.

An Act for the relief of Thomas Edward Dowthwaite.

An Act for the relief of Thomas Ferby Gatenby.

An Act for the relief of Michael Joseph Courtney.

An Act for the relief of Thomas Patrick O'Neill.

An Act for the relief of Robert Ernest Beadie.

An Act to incorporate Canada Security Assurance Company.

An Act respecting The Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Company.

An Act respecting The Canadian Mining Institute, and to change its name to "The Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy."

An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act (Steamboat Inspection).

An Act to amend the Soldier Settlement Act, 1919.

An Act to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act.

An Act to amend the Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act.

An Act for granting to His Majesty a certain sum of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1921.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT—SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS.

The House resumed in committee on a certain resolution—Mr. Rowell—respecting sick and distressed mariners, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member (Mr. Currie) asked me what would happen in the case of sailors on an incoming ship who were suffering from some infectious disease. In cases of this kind the ship is quarantined for twenty-one days or longer and the sailors are treated on board ship or sometimes taken ashore and put in what is known as the pest house. They are not put in the ordinary marine hospital. That practice has worked out very well. The sailors are treated by doctors and are taken care of until they are cured.

Now, Sir, clause (d) of this resolution reads:

> That no ship engaged in the coasting trade of Canada and arriving at any port in any of the said provinces from any other port in the same province, or arriving at any port in the province of Quebec from any port in the province of Ontario, shall be subject to the payment of the duty.

In addition to what the member for North Simcoe has said there is another aspect of this clause which, I think, should be discussed with a view to the clause being amended.

Mr. ROWELL: All these clauses will appear in the Bill and can be separately discussed and dealt with. Quite apart from any discussion of a general principle, I suggest that we leave the details until we get into committee on the Bill.

Mr. DUFF: There is something in what my hon. friend says, but when members on this side make suggestions, the Government usually answer that they have to give them their most serious consideration. If I leave what I intend to say on this provision until we are in committee on the Bill, I may be given that answer, so that if the committee will bear with me for a moment, I shall bring the minister's attention to this matter so that he may consult his officials and propose a change in conformity with my views and the views of a number of ship owners in different parts of the country.

Under the present Act a vessel which is chartered to go to North Sydney or Sydney and load coal for St. Johns, Newfoundland, and then to proceed to Europe, the West Indies or South America, may not participate in the sick mariner's fund or the benefits of the marine hospital if a sailor on that ship gets sick, say, at North Sydney—that is to say, while the vessel is on a voyage from one port in Nova Scotia to another port in Nova Scotia. I respectfully suggest that a change be made in clause (d) with a view to providing that when a vessel is not on what is known as a local voyage but is chartered to go to a foreign port and calls at a local port for cargo, that vessel may participate in the benefits provided by the Act.

There is another clause which, I think, should not be in the Bill to be founded on the resolution, that is, section 2 of the resolution. Clause 2 repeals section 207 of the present Shipping Act, which section deals entirely with payment of expenses in connection with shipwrecked or distressed mariners who may find themselves in foreign ports and has nothing to do with sick mariners. The minister no doubt knows that, under the present Shipping Act, owners of vessels have to pay the expenses of shipwrecked or distressed steamers. For instance, supposing a vessel is wrecked off the Atlantic coast and the crew are taken to Portugal or Spain, immediately on their arrival at any port, the crew go to the British Consul who arranges to send them home. An account of all expenses incurred in sending them home is sent to the Marine Department at Ottawa, which collects the amount from the owners of the vessel that was wrecked. Therefore, this clause has nothing to do with sick mariners, and should not come under the Department of Health, but should be left as it was before under the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I suggest to the minister that he take that clause into consideration, drop it from the resolution, and arrange that the matter be left in the hands of the Marine Department, where it has been for many years.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not wish to delay the passage of the resolution, but I think it my duty, at the present stage of the proceedings, to call the attention of the minister to the very strong protest which he has received from the Shipping Federation. This protest is headed "Sick Mariners' Dues." Reference was made to this protest this afternoon by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), and as I am one of the representatives of the city of Montreal, I think it is only due to the Shipping Federation that I should bring their protest to the attention of the House and to the country. This imposition

of a tax upon vessels for the
5 p.m. Sick Mariner's Fund has caused a retaliatory measure to be passed by the United States, and it is very striking that whilst in Canada American vessels are taxed for that fund to the extent of only four and one-half cents per annum, our vessels, as a result of this tax, when they reach any of the United States ports, are taxed to the extent of 37 cents per ton per annum. Therefore, it is, I believe, in the interest of all, if we wish to help our merchant marine and to develop our Canadian trade abroad, that consideration be given to the protest of the Shipping Federation against that taxation. The minister received on May 7 a memorandum from the manager and secretary of the Shipping Federation, Mr. Thomas Robb, and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall read just the principal paragraphs which deal with this question. Mr. Robb says:

I am directed on behalf of the members of the Shipping Federation of Canada (Incorporated) who represent 900,882 tons of shipping trading to the St. Lawrence to respectfully protest against the proposed amendment you intend making to the Canada Shipping Act under Part V thereof covering sick and distressed mariners, particularly in reference to increasing the duty from 1½ cents to 2 cents per ton per voyage.

The Federation for years past have been striving to have this unjust tax removed which has proved a discrimination not only against the St. Lawrence route, but also against the trade and commerce of the Dominion, and as a result of these protests, the Government reduced the duty from 2 cents to 1½ cents per ton. From your notice of motion, the Federation presume it is the Government's intention to increase this tax to 2 cents per ton, and I have the honour of submitting herewith the views of the Federation why this tax should not be further increased, but also why it should be abolished in its entirety:

1. The tax now imposed is 1½ cents per ton registered restricted to three voyages in one year. The accumulated surplus of the fund from figures taken from Government returns amounts to $294,996.08, while the surplus for the year 1917 amounted to $12,011.81.

2. The tax is an unjust impost in itself and is unknown in other countries with the exception of Turkey and Peru, which in itself shows a sufficient reason for the Canadian Government abolishing the tax.

3. The levying of this tax on the Province of Quebec, Maritime Provinces and British Columbia, is the cause of a retaliatory tonnage tax being imposed against tonnage hauling from these provinces by the United States. Moreover, sick mariners' dues are not levied in the Province of Ontario. Tonnage from that province goes free both in home ports and in the United States which is an unfair discrimination against the other provinces.

4. Shipowners are liable for hospital or funeral expenses for seamen injured or killed in service, and for medical attendance, medicine and wages while incapacitated from duty by sickness during the voyage, and the Canadian Government is fully protected by sections 207 and 208 of the Merchants Shipping Act, which are to be found in the Statutes of Canada, 58 and 59 Victoria, volumes 1 and 2, pages 116 and 117, and being already provided for it is unfair and unjust that vessels trading to Canadian ports should be further taxed to supply funds for other purposes, and further, there is no just reason why one vessel should be taxed to support the sick of another.

The Federation understand that one of the difficulties the Government have had in dealing with this matter is in regard to sick seamen on transient vessels. This we respectfully point out to you can be easily overcome by you instructing the collectors of Customs that when any seamen may require to be cared for in Canadian hospitals, the master of any transient vessel shall be required to give a bond for an amount to cover any expenses that may be incurred in connection with the sick seamen who may be left in hospital. This can be required of the captain or the owners' responsible representatives before clearance is granted to the vessel by the customs authorities, and if this was carried out it would entail little or no extra duty to the collectors of Customs.

5. The moneys collected from this tax have not been applied for the purposes for which it was collected. A return made to Parliament in 1888 shows that since Confederation, the sum of $236,500 had been applied to other purposes, chiefly for the relief of the sick poor in the cities of Quebec, Kingston and St. Catharines.

6. The Federation do not wish to avoid or saddle the Government in any way with the cost of providing for the sick mariner, but say that each vessel should be required to pay and look after her own sick in the same manner as is done in other countries, thus relieving the Dominion Government of any legal or moral responsibility to care for the sick seamen any more than for other sick people.

The seventh paragraph deals with British Columbia, and as my hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) has explained the situation as regards that province, I shall not quote this paragraph.

The members of the Shipping Federation of Canada, being the largest payers of these dues, trust that this just grievance of theirs will receive full and fair consideration, and that the minister will introduce an Act during the present session of Parliament abolishing this unfair tax, which will be another step in the direction of freeing the Canadian tonnage from the retaliatory tonnage dues in the United States.

Such is the protest of the Shipping Federation, one of the largest corporations in Canada, and one whose interests are welded to the general trade of this Dominion.

There are two or three essential facts which, in my humble judgment, should not be lost sight of by my hon. friend when we consider the Bill. It should strike the members of the committee, on general principles, that the law as it stands to-day concerning the sick mariners' fund is an-

tiquated, and requires to be radically changed. It is not fair, for instance, that these dues should be collected from the ships in one province and not from the ships in another province. I always understood my hon. friend the Minister of Health and hon. gentlemen opposite to be in favour of uniformity in the laws of this Dominion. Now, if there is one law which should be uniform throughout this country, it is this law concerning the dues collected for the sick mariners' fund. There should not be one mode of taxation in one province, and another in another.

A second consideration which strikes me as very important indeed, is the fact that we are all willing that in the years to come great efforts should be made to develop our trade abroad and to seek wider markets for our products. Now it seems to me, as Mr. Robb states in this correspondence, that if we are charging 4½ per cent per ton on foreign ships, while we are met by a retaliatory tax of 30 cents per ton per annum by our greatest trade rival, the United States, we are defeating the end we have in view, because this will tend to restrict rather than to expand our trade. It is a restriction of trade, and I call my hon. friend's attention to the seriousness of the matter. I have no special brief for the Shipping Federation, but as my hon. friend the Minister of Marine knows, its members are all working hard to develop the trade of this Dominion. I know nearly all the members of the federation, and I know they do not wish to be debarred from the privilege of paying taxes. Far from it; they pay their full share of the taxes of this country. They are willing to help the Government in developing and expanding the trade of this Dominion, but they call the attention of the Government to the injustice of this particular tax, and it seems to me it is only wise on the part of the Government to do away with this antiquated legislation, and to establish a uniform system throughout all the provinces. It is not fair that ships in the Maritime Provinces, in the neighbouring province of Quebec, and in British Columbia should be taxed, while ships in Ontario are exempt. It gives the ships from Ontario an unfair advantage over the ships from other provinces when they reach American ports. I hope, therefore, when we consider the Bill the minister will take into serious consideration the protests which he has received. I am very anxious to know what are his views on this question.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. ROWELL: As I have already intimated, when the Bill is in committee there will be the fullest possible opportunity of discussing its provisions in detail. I shall not this afternoon therefore take up the time of the committee with going into the matter in detail, but shall only briefly refer to some of the observations and suggestions made by the hon. members of the House.

Dealing with them in order, with reference to the point made by my hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) as to the position of Ontario under the Bill, the explanation is that this has been the law ever since Confederation. I think the reason why Ontario is exempt is the distinction drawn in our Shipping Act, and in the American Shipping Act, between ships sailing on purely inland water and ocean-going vessels. As the ships sailing purely on inland lakes are carrying on a traffic on the inland lakes alone, they are not brought within the provisions of this part of the Shipping Act. They are neither taxed, nor are the sick mariners on these ships on the inland lakes of Ontario entitled to be provided for out of the fund. Neither the shippers nor the mariners come within the scope of the Act, and they have not done so since Confederation. The Act in that respect is just the same as it has been ever since we have had a Shipping Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend will understand that I do not begrudge Ontario her good fortune in not being taxed. I am simply asking that the province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces and British Columbia be put on a footing of equality with Ontario so far as this exemption is concerned. I want the system to be uniform throughout all the provinces.

Mr. ROWELL: All I have been doing is endeavouring to make clear to the House the reason why the provision is as it is. One further remark in reference to it. My hon. friend's suggestion that vessels going from Ontario to maritime ports or American ports on the sea coast will be exempt from these dues, is due to a misapprehension. That is not the case. It is only vessels plying on these inland waters, and not those that pass out of these inland waters to the ports of Quebec or to ocean ports that are exempt. I am quite prepared to say that when the Bill comes into committee this matter may receive further consideration.

It may be that the change could not be made without some consequential amend-

ments to the general Shipping Act. It is a matter that would have to be very carefully considered in all its bearings before an important departure of that kind could be made. I recognize that mariners sailing upon the inland lakes are entitled to the fullest protection and I am anxious to see that they get it. Then, in reference to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), and also contained in the memorandum from the Shipping Federation that there is a large accumulated surplus to the credit of the "Sick Mariners' Fund," I beg now to say that there is no such surplus standing to the credit of this fund. The monies collected have been paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, they have been expended from year to year and the way the figures which my hon. friend has read, or any figures showing a surplus, is arrived at is by taking the actual disbursements in connection with the marine hospitals and the payments to other hospitals on the one hand and subtracting those from the receipts on the other. But I would like to point out to my hon. friend that that method of computation does not take into consideration at all the cost of administering this fund by the staff which has existed in the Marine Department and which has now bee ntransferred to the Department of Health. If the actual cost of administration was charged up against the fund, my information is that there would be no surplus whatever to its credit. The fact is that at the present time there is no fund and that in order to discharge the obligations which accrue on account of these sick mariners at the different hospitals where they are being treated it is necessary that we should have more money than we are now receiving. That is the reason for asking for the increased grant.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it not true that for many years past the revenues of this fund have far exceeded the expenditure?

Mr. ROWELL: As I intimated to my hon. friend, if you leave out all cost of administration—yes. The figure which has been used has not taken into consideration the cost of administration and I am not sure that it takes into consideration the money spent on capital account. My information is that if you charged against this so-called fund—there is no fund in fact existing—it is a name rather than a fact—the amounts that might properly be charged against it, there would be no surplus. There is no surplus to-day. This year we will run behind some thousands of dollars by reason of the increased amounts we must pay the hospitals for the treatment of these patients and I am assured that the rates in the new schedule are simply equal to the cost of carrying on the work. My hon. friend suggested the possibility of increased expenses of administration. There is absolutely no change as far as that is concerned by way of additions to the staff. The staff which has been administering this branch of the service in the Department of Marine and Fisheries has been transferred to the Department of Health and this same staff is carrying on the work and there is no thought or intention of increasing it. As I have already intimated, the policy of the Government is not to construct new hospitals but rather to take advantage of existing hospitals and make a suitable arrangement for the treatment of patients. I am glad to say that the hospitals of the country have been reasonable and that we have been able to come to a reasonable arrangement with them for the treatment of these sick mariners.

The provision in the Bill in reference to maintaining hospitals but carries forward in substance the provisions of the old law which permits us to carry on the hospitals which we own. The details of that can be explained when we go into Committee on the Bill. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) referred to the situation in Ontario and the monies charged against the municipalities for the maintenance of these sick mariners. I shall be glad to inquire into that matter and ascertain what the position is. The situation in Ontario however differs in one respect from that with regard to seamen upon the high seas. I believe that these ships upon our inland lakes come under the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Act, that is a matter which I shall be glad to look into. I should think that they would come under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mr. CURRIE: No American ships come in, they have men hurt and they do not come under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mr. ROWELL: No. But our ships do, I understand, in British Columbia. However that is a matter that I will look into before the Bill goes into committee with a view to considering that aspect of it. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) has suggested that fishing vessels be brought under the operation of the Act and required to make the payment and become entitled to the benefits the same as the

merchant vessels. As far as the department is concerned, if that is the view of the House, we have not the least objection to it. When the matter goes into committee I shall be glad to know what the view of the House is in that respect.

In reference to the point raised by the hon. member for Vancouver and also referred to by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) in connection with the memorandum from the Shipping Federation, that the result of our imposing this tax upon ships is that there is a retaliatory charge against our ships in American ports, may I say that the first I knew of that fact, if it be a fact, was when I read the memorandum from the Secretary of the Shipping Federation. It is my intention to look into that matter and see upon what foundation the statement rests. It does not appear to be reasonable to suppose that because we impose this very limited tonnage tax for the purpose of looking after sick mariners there should be a retaliatory charge of some thirty cents per ton. That is a matter that I shall carefully look into with a view to ascertaining what the situation is and it can be considered when the Bill goes into committee.

Mr. STEVENS: For the benefit of the minister I might point out that if a ship leaves Vancouver and goes to Seattle and a sailor falls sick in Seattle the ship has to pay the cost of the sailor's treatment in Seattle although it paid the sick mariner's dues in Vancouver. The ship can get no return from the department. I think there might be some provision to meet a case of that kind.

Mr. CURRIE: There should be a reciprocal arrangement in a matter of that kind.

Mr. ROWELL: I am afraid the matter which my hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) has mentioned could not be dealt with by our legislation. If some reciprocal arrangement could be established, the situation might be relieved in that way. We would be glad to give the matter consideration. In reference to the observations of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), I would suggest that the question of how any particular amount should be expended is more properly a question for the Estimates rather than in connection with this proposed legislation. My hon. friend has brought the question to my attention and I am having a report made on the local situation. When we go into committee on the Estimates, the matter may be further discussed. I shall ask that the committee report the resolution and further discussion can take place upon the Estimates.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I desire to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that there is no provision in this Bill for any capital expenditure. There is a provision here for treating sick sailors and even for renting buildings for hospitals; but what is needed in the case of Canso is some provision for capital expenditure for an hospital. I would therefore suggest that the expenditure by the Government be made conditional—I see no reason why that should not be done. So that the town of Canso, or any other town similarly circumstanced that will give a certain amount per year might then be entitled to receive something from this fund. I know pretty well that if you assist hospitals indiscriminately from the fund you will have no end of trouble, and I do not want to put the department in that position. I would suggest that where there is a small town at some distant point on the coast that will contribute an amount say $500 per year, out of its own taxes for the purpose of maintaining and establishing a marine hospital for the treatment of their own sailors that we should give a similar sum. I would like to see the minister amend the resolution so as to make provision for capital expenditure in that way at a place where no hospital at present exists.

In regard to the situation at Washington, and the possibility of a retaliatory tax, has the minister heard anything from our Trade Commission on the question of retaliation? That is a matter that would properly come within the province of the commission, and if its members were alive to their duties I would think the minister would have some report from them on the subject, because a realiatory tax of thirty cents per ton on our shipping would be a very heavy tax.

I would again ask the minister to consider whether he will not amend his resolution in such a way as to enable something to be done towards establishing a hospital in places where there is no hospital at present. For many years the custom has been for the captain of a ship to put his sick sailors ashore at Canso but unfortunately there is no one to take the responsibility of providing a place in which those men may be cared for. Sometimes they are treated in a dwelling house where there is no suitable accommodation, and men have lost their lives because in that particular place there was no proper treatment available for them. I think the department ought to find a solution for that problem and that my

solution is a reasonable one. Let the Government make a proposal to the town of Canso, or any other town in the same situation, and say: "We will give you for ten years a capital expenditure of so much per year, if you will levy the same amount upon yourselves so as to build and maintain a hospital which will permit of the treatment of your own sick and also any sailors that may require to be treated there."

Mr. WIGMORE: What is the population of the town of Canso?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: About 2,000.

Mr. CURRIE: If the resolution passes in its present form there is no possible way in which, when the Bill founded upon it comes before the House, the minister can give consideration to the facts which I brought to the attention of the committee this afternoon with reference to the province of Ontario. Because it could be pointed out when the Bill came forward for consideration that there is a distinct clause in the resolution declaring that no money is to be spent on the provinces of Ontario and Quebec for this purpose. I would therefore suggest that clause (d) be struck out, and also that the word "Ontario" be inserted in clause (b) so as to make the Act apply in that province as well as the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia. The old law on this subject passed many years ago with respect to this matter did not apply to the province of Ontario because there was no ships of any size that were owned or operated in that province. I believe that three or four wooden vessels of a comparatively small total tonnage would cover all the shipping in operation in that province in the time to which I refer; but to-day ships of ten and eleven thousand tons are built and big fleets of large vessels employing a great number of men are plying on the Great Lakes. If the resolution is not amended in committee now, it will not be legally possible to do anything in the way of granting relief for the province of Ontario. I would therefore suggest to the minister that the resolution be amended in the way I have suggested. Then if his information is such as to warrant him in bringing the province of Ontario under the provisions of the Act it will not be necessary to come back and introduce another resolution. I would make that suggestion to the minister and I hope the committee will sustain him if he agrees to make the change, because I am satisfied the intention of Parliament is to help our sailors no matter in what province they may be employed.

Mr. ROWELL: If my hon. friend's objection is valid—that is that we could not amend the Bill in the way suggested—the same objection would apply to the resolution. We cannot amend a resolution if that amendment adds to the burden of taxation, it would be necessary to have a supplementary resolution to which His Excellency has assented. I therefore suggest that the resolution should go through in its present form. I am quite willing that this matter, which affects Ontario, should be further discusssed when the Bill is before the House, and if the conclusion is reached that it is proper to make the suggested change I will introduce whatever supplemental resolution may be necessary to carry it into effect. However, we will have to consider that carefully.

Mr. CURRIE: The minister must know that a resolution of this kind when it goes into committee is subject to change and there is no harm in making such a change. Parliament is supreme on a matter of this kind and all that I am asking is that this particular clause (d) be dropped. If we were making any addition to it possibly there might be some force in the suggestion that the resolution involved greater expenditure than was contemplated, and that it had not received the authority of the Governor General. I do not, however, see why the suggestion could not be carried out under the rule. There is nothing wrong with my proposition, it is customary for the House to do as proposed, and it is one of the prerogatives of the House to be able to change money bills. With the consent of the Government the House can at any time advance or reduce any expenditure contemplated in a money bill.

Mr. FIELDING: I think that the point taken by the President of the Privy Council is well taken. There could be no objection to the insertion of the word "Ontario," but that would undoubtedly broaden the taxation power of this resolution which, as proposed does not contemplate levying any taxation on the shipping of Ontario. If, however, you insert the word "Ontario" as the hon. gentleman suggests, you will be levying a tax on the shipping of that province, and I am inclined to think that is beyond our power at the moment. Parliament can make the change in a more roundabout way, but I think the point taken by the President of the Privy Council—that if you insert the word "Ontario" in the resolution you are running up against a

well understood usage requiring a recommendation from the Crown—is quite correct.

Leaving that point, however, I want to commend, if I may, to the careful consideration of the Government—if not at this time at a more convenient moment, but at all events for inquiry—the suggestion of my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) in respect to providing a hospital ship. I do not suggest that by any means as a substitute for the usual shore treatment of sailors but as a supplement to it. I think there is such a service established for British seamen in the North Sea; and in recent years we have seen the inauguration of a hospital ship along the Labrador coast by Dr. Grenfell, of whose splendid services we have all heard with very great pleasure,—

Mr. CURRIE: That is a voluntary service.

Mr. FIELDING:—and whose work amongst the fishermen on the Labrador shore has been beyond all praise. It will cost a little money but our fishing business is growing—the industry is bound to develop to a much greater extent than it has reached at the present time—and if the minister will make inquiry into the matter, that is all I urge at present. He will find it quite expedient to provide a hospital ship which could spend her time amongst our fishing fleet. At present when a man is taken ill on board a fishing vessel, that ship sacrifices time and money in making for port in order to land the sufferer for treatment. All these things cost money, and this is not the best moment to recommend the minister to expend larger sums, but I think that in this respect the suggestion of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) is a particularly good one, and I would ask the Government not to lose sight of it in the general consideration of this question.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would ask the minister whether the statement made by the Shipping Federation is true or not, namely, that in some of the other ports named, the Sick Mariners' Fund has been utilized for the sick poor?

Mr. ROWELL: My information from the officers of the department is that that statement is not correct, but I shall have it looked into carefully.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The suggestion I would make to the hon. minister to cover the case which I have been pressing on his attention would be to amend subsection (a) to make it read:

[Mr. Fielding.]

That the minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may subsidize, build, rent and equip and maintain premises for hospitals for the care and treatment of sick mariners,—

and so on. That would enable the minister to expend the money collected from ships for the purpose of providing a hospital where no hospital exists at the moment, and to my mind that is one of the prime needs in connection with this matter.

I do not sympathize very much with the proposal of the Shipping Federation. I think a tax ought to be paid by shipowners for looking after sick mariners, and I think the large ships ought to bear the largest share of the tax because they can better afford to do so. One and one-half cents a ton is a mere bagatelle on the tonnage of even a large ship, and it is so insignificant in the case of the smaller ships that it is hardly worth collecting. Why should not fishing vessels pay a tax; why should it be optional in their case? I think their owners should take the same responsibility with regard to their seamen as do the owners of other vessels, and I am quite sure that they are willing to bear their share. A fishing vessel of 100 tons—and that is the average size—would have to pay only $2 for one assessment, and if it paid that assessment three times a year the total sum represents very cheap insurance. A fishing vessel of that size has probably 15 to 18 sailors aboard, and by the payment of that small premium of $6 the owners have the assurance that their men will be treated in the ports where they happen to fall sick, and altogether it is a very favourable arrangement. I think the minister would be well-advised if he so amended the Bill that fishing vessels would have to pay this duty. Then of course it would be necessary to make reasonable provision for the sailors. I wish to assist the minister if I can, in making this Bill a good Bill and in improving the service; therefore I would ask him to take these suggestions under favourable consideration.

Mr. ROWELL: My present impression is that the Bill which will be introduced following the adoption of this resolution is broad enough to cover the matter which my hon. friend has mentioned. But the whole scope of the clause can be considered when we get in committee on the Bill.

Mr. McKENZIE: One matter was mentioned by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) which pertains to the Department of Health more particularly than anything else touched upon in connection

with this resolution, and that is the quality of the drinking water supplied to sailors. He has told us that epidemics of typhoid have occurred among our seamen when as many as 75 per cent were incapacitated, due entirely to drinking contaminated water. I would ask the minister to inquire into this matter and punish people for supplying such contaminated water.

Mr. ROWELL: We already have that power under the Health Act passed last session, and that particular matter is now engaging the attention of the officers of the department. There is no doubt as to the importance of insuring a supply of pure water to our sailors.

Resolution reported.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (Minister of Health) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 127 to amend the Canada Shipping Act (Sick and Distressed Mariners).

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT.

The House resumed from May 10 consideration in committee of Bill No. 12 (Hon. Mr. Guthrie) respecting the election of members of the House of Commons and the electoral franchise.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When progress was last reported upon this Bill, all of the clauses and schedules had been read and considered. Paragraph (k) of clause 2, clauses 32, 37, 44, 45, 63, 101 and the amendments proposed to clauses 37, 44 and 101 have been allowed to stand for further consideration. Clauses 19 and 76 which provide for the expenditure of money cannot be adopted until the House has concurred in the required resolution. The other clauses have been agreed to. We have now reached clause 32. Shall the clause carry?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have been requested to let clause 32 stand. I am still considering some amendments to it which have not yet been put in definite shape. I therefore move that the clause stand and that the committee proceed to the consideration of clause 37.

Mr. FIELDING: Is clause 32 to be taken up later in the day?

Mr. GUTHRIE: If we have time.

Motion agreed to.

On section 37—Proclamation by returning officer.

The CHAIRMAN: When this clause was last before the committee it had been considerably amended; several amendments had been adopted, and one amendment moved by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) was under consideration. He had moved to strike out in lines 26, 27 and 28 on page 26 of the Bill the following words: "In every electoral district in the province of Quebec and Manitoba and in the English language only in other electoral districts."

Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. LOGGIE: In view of the situation as presented when the matter was previously under discussion, it seems to me that it would be fair to provide that in electoral districts where a considerable proportion of the electors cannot read English the proclamation should be published both in English and the language which these people can read and understand.

Mr. PROULX: I am glad to hear the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Loggie). When this matter was last under consideration I suggested that the Chief Electoral Officer could instruct the returning officers in all districts where there is a considerable French population to have the proclamations and notices in those districts issued in both languages. I hope that the Acting Solicitor General has given consideration to this suggestion. In this respect the Chief Electoral Officer could be guided by this last decennial census.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Would my hon. friend (Mr. Turgeon) explain the purpose of his proposed amendment? There would seem to be some mistake in the drafting of it.

Mr. TURGEON: My intention in moving the amendment was to provide that the notices and proclamations issued under this Act may be printed in French and in English not only in the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba, but also in all the other provinces. When I made some remarks on this subject on a previous occasion I stated that the publication of these notices in French in districts where there was no French population would not be necessary. In British Columbia, where there is no group of French-speaking people that I know of, it would not be necessary to have these notices issued in the French language. The same applies to Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan; in any parts of

these provinces where there are no French people, the French language need not be used. In New Brunswick we have districts which are largely peopled by French Canadians. In the northern part of the province there are five large counties the majority of the people in which are French. According to the census of 1911, twenty-five per cent of the population of Northumberland county was made up of French-speaking people. The French population in that county is increasing more than the English population. In such districts as these I would require that both languages be employed. French people are sentimental; they appreciate anything that is done in their behalf, and nothing but good can result from a provision that these notices and proclamations may be printed in the French language. During the course of the discussion on this clause the member for Neepawa (Mr. Davis) expressed his approval of the request which I was making. I hope, for the reasons which I have given, that the minister will be inclined to favour my amendment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The effect of my hon. friend's amendment will be to strike out the words:

> In every electoral district in the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba and in the English language only in the other electoral districts.

If these words were struck out the clause would then read:

> Within two days after the receipt of the writ of election the returning officer shall, by a proclamation in form L, issue under his hand in the English and French languages, and shall mail one copy at least to the various postmasters of the post offices within his electoral district.

That would mean, of course, that that system would prevail throughout all the electoral districts in Canada. Now, if I understand aright the remarks of my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) he does not intend that his amendment shall have such a wide application. When this clause was before the House on a previous occasion I was very much impressed by arguments which were presented in favour of some relaxation, at all events in the law as respects the printing of proclamations in the French and English languages. But practically all the arguments that can be used in favour of the printing of proclamations in French are equally applicable to the question of other languages in other parts of Canada.

Mr. d'ANJOU: No.

[Mr. Turgeon.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend says no. But I am informed that in the northwestern portions of Canada we have large territories where no French is spoken but where many other European languages are spoken. I know that in the portion of Canada where I reside it would be a convenience to a large number of people if the proclamations were issued in Italian; very few people there would be accommodated if the proclamations were issued in French. Unfortunately, very few of the people in my constituency can either speak or read the French language. That is to be regretted, but it would be a convenience to a good many people if these proclamations were issued in Italian, and to a number if they were issued in German. Therefore, my hon. friend will see that we are opening up a pretty wide subject if we depart from the old established section which has been in the statute book for many years. The provision of our law for many years has been the provision which appears in the clause as drafted in the Bill, namely, that in the province of Quebec and in the province of Manitoba proclamations shall be issued in both languages. After having given this matter the very best consideration that I can bestow upon it, I think at the present time it would be unwise to extend the scope of this section. Personally, this is not a matter which appeals to me very strongly; I am in no way prejudiced against the extension of the proclamation in the French language, but I know other people are; I know there are people who look upon the matter as a matter of constitutional right. Consequently the law that has been efficient and satisfactory during the past thirty or forty years should not be interfered with unless for very grave reasons, unless some very serious injustice or inconvenience has resulted from it. If a case of that kind were made out, speaking for myself, I would not hesitate to make the change; but after considering the matter for several days and discussing it pretty generally, I think the committee would do well to allow the clause to remain as it is. There is a legal right; there is, I believe, a constitutional authority for the language of the present clause. I do not say that we have not constitutional authority to extend it, but I know we raise serious constitutional questions when we attempt to extend it. I see no great points to be gained by interfering with the present clause, and a good deal of difficulty may arise if we make the attempt. For these reasons I prefer to

stand by the section under which we have had many years of experience and which has not, so far as I know, resulted in any great inconvenience. I therefore think the amendment, while in form it is objectionable in any case and does not carry out the intention of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon), should be rejected by the committee.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 118 (from the Senate) for the relief of James Lewis Price.—Mr. MacNutt.

Bill No. 119 (from the Senate) for the relief of Frederick Tristram Clark.—Mr. Burnham.

DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT.

The House again resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. 12 (Hon. Mr. Guthrie) respecting the election of members of the House of Commons and the electoral franchise—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock we were considering clause 37, to which Mr. Turgeon had moved an amendment to strike out the following words in lines 26, 27 and 28 of page 26 of the Bill, "in every electoral district in the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba, and in the English language only in other electoral districts."

Mr. TURGEON: I took the floor before six, after the Acting Solicitor General had explained that it was impossible from his point of view to accept my amendment, with the intention of giving a further explanation as to my attitude in this matter. I admit that opinion may be divided as to the French language having equal rights with the English in Canada. I am not a lawyer—

Mr. McMASTER: The father of a lawyer.

Mr. TURGEON: I am the father of a lawyer, it is true. Though I am not a constitutional authority, I have my convictions on matters affecting the constitution. I was born into life, I might say, on the discussion of a constitutional point. I came into New Brunswick at the time of the school troubles and the assertion by a portion of the people of that province of what they believed to be their constitutional rights. After the Privy Council had declared that New Brunswick had no constitutional right to separate schools, I was the first to call on my people in the northern part of the province not to press the agitation further, but to accept any amendment which might be granted by the Provincial Government, rather than cause the least trouble. My admiration for the constitution has not decreased since then. I admire the constitution, because I have suffered for it. I would be the last man in Canada to ask for an amendment to the constitution, believing that one amendment might weaken the whole structure. The British North America Act is a tree, carrying in its growth the elements of the bounteous soil, and the tree has grown as the country has grown in population and developed. The Act itself carries an acknowledgment of what I am saying, because French was conceded in the province of Manitoba when at that time there was a certain French population as a result of an exodus from the province of Quebec. There were no French at all, however, at that time in Saskatchewan and Alberta. In New Brunswick the increase of population since Confederation is due to the French who have remained at home cherishing the soil of their forefathers.

I am asking by this amendment that the French language be recognized in every Federal record, as has been so eloquently and clearly demonstrated by hon. members on this side of the House particularly my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) and my hon. friend (Mr. Beland) who have spoken on the amendment. The Acting Solicitor General says that if he accepted the amendment, he would have to accede also to requests for the same privileges in regard to other languages spoken in this country. Personally I would not object to any group of people in this country speaking neither English or French, being given the privilege of having these documents printed in their own language, in order that they might better be able to comprehend them and make themselves acquainted with the principles upon which they are to pronounce themselves. In a mixed country like Canada we should be ready to grant concessions to accommodate our peoples. We know that there are languages in this country which have not the rights which the French language has in Canada, and I leave it to the Government or the minister who is in charge of this Bill to introduce such an amendment if he so desires.

As I said before six o'clock, I want to be practical. I am not moving my amendment as a matter of pride or jealousy. I want these documents to be published only in districts where there is a group of French people to read and ponder over them. I do not see why any hon. member on the other side of the House should not accede to this amendment. I am glad to see the Acting Prime Minister in his seat. He was not present when I spoke on this question a few days ago, and again this afternoon. I believe that if there is one Canadian who has given authority to my understanding of the rights of the French language in Canada, and has contributed to the harmonious feeling which such recognition may create, more particularly under present conditions, it is my right hon. friend, the Acting Prime Minister. At the opening of the session he delivered a most eloquent speech in French, delivered it more eloquently than could I. He spoke like a master of the language. He has given an example of admiration of the rights of the constitution, and his action tends effectively to create further harmony in the country. I believe that if I had not been prompted by the effect that speech of the right hon. gentleman created upon my mind I would not have brought in this amendment. The Confederation has grown in fifty years, it has developed, and its privileges have been extended to every territory it covers. Therefore, I believe that the House will be prepared to accept my amendment. But, I want to be practical in this matter. I would be willing that my amendment, as worded, should be altered in a certain way to meet all practical needs while at the same time maintaining the principle upon which it is based. In that case I might suggest a change in the phraseology to the Acting Solicitor General instead of insisting upon the wording as it is there. I do not withdraw my amendment, but I would be willing to change it so that it would read in this way:

> Within two days after the receipt of the writ of election the returning officer shall, by proclamation, in form L, issued under his hand in the English and French languages, in every electoral district in the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba and in such other electoral districts of other provinces as the Chief Electoral Officer will deem it advisable to so direct, and in the English language only in the other electoral districts, and mailed one copy of each to the various postmasters of the post offices within his electoral district.

And so on. I move my amendment with the explanation which I gave this afternoon. I believe that this House will have no good ground to refuse to accept the amendment which, under the circumstances, can only bring about good in the future.

The CHAIRMAN: Do I understand the hon. member to say that he withdraws his amendment and that he substitutes this amendment for it?

Mr. TURGEON: I do not intend to withdraw it yet, but I want to substitute these words. The effect will be that the proclamation will be issued in the French language in any district where the Electoral Officer himself considers that it would be warranted by the number of French people in that district. I do not say where these districts should be; I leave that to the judgment of the electoral officer.

Mr. LEGER: Mr. Chairman, I felt very sorry when I heard the hon. the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) before dinner state that it would be impossible for him to consent to this amendment to the Act. The reasons which he advanced were not acceptable to me and in reply to the hon. gentleman I will give a few reasons why this amendment should be accepted. The law has been such that during the last thirty or forty years there has been only two provinces in which regulations and proclamations have of necessity been printed in the English and French languages. The Fathers of Confederation agreed that both the English and French languages should be official languages in this country. The use of either language has been the right of any member in the House of Commons since Confederation. In the Senate Chamber to-day we witnessed the ceremony of assenting to Bills which had been passed by this House, and before the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General these Bills were assented to in both the French and English languages. The minister said that he could not see his way clear to the acceptance of this amendment, that it would open the door to lots of trouble, but I would say to him that I can foresee no trouble that would be caused by the use of these two official languages in carrying on elections in this country. I am not speaking about any other language; I am only speaking about the two official languages. Therefore, I cannot agree with him when he says that the adoption of this proposition will open the door to trouble in the future. Another argument that has been advanced is that this has never been done before. If it has never been done before it is no reason why it should not be done now. We are making a new Act and we are only asking for what is within our rights.

We are not asking for any favours, only our rights, and therefore I cannot see why the minister should not accept the amendment and allow the minority the right which was granted to them by the Fathers of Confederation. The fact is that the recognition of these two official languages was one of the foundation stones of Confederation. There must be some reason with which we have not been acquainted that prevents the acceptance of this proposition. We have no claim from any other nationality to have these proclamations published in their language. We have only two official languages and it is only these languages that are referred to in this amendment. I ask that the Maritime Provinces be placed on the same footing as any other province in Canada, that recognition be given to their rights, and in doing that I feel that I am only asking something which they should receive at the hands of this Government.

Mr. BURNHAM: Is the hon. member trying—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BURNHAM: Is the hon. gentleman claiming that the law should be changed?

Mr. VIEN: We are making the law now.

Mr. LEGER: We are not asking that the law be changed at all; we are only asking that the law enacted at the time of Confederation be continued. The question may be asked: "Why did you not ask this before?" Well, there are many things as to which the same question might be asked. The country is growing and the French population is growing in numbers also—the French population throughout the Maritime Provinces has been considerably augmented. There is nothing wrong about the request we are making; it is simply that the election proclamation and the various election documents be printed in French. I do not consider that we are making any extraordinary request in asking for that and I shall be pleased at any time to meet my constituents and justify the stand I am taking to-night. I believe they will endorse that stand because I know them and they know me. The majority in my province are generous and I am asking the majority in this House to be equally so. When the English people in my county ask for anything that is reasonable the French people cheerfully grant it. I am now making a reasonable request to hon. members who form the majority in this House and who represent the majority in the country at large. The request that I make is that the two official languages shall be on the same footing as they are in our schools and in other institutions in that part of the country from which I come. I ask the supporters of the Government to join with us in seeing that our application is acceded to. Why not permit the French people in my province to more accurately grasp what is going on at election time when they could do that better through the medium of their own language? The franchise has been granted to women, but some of the women of my nationality in New Brunswick have not had the advantage of an English education and unless these documents are printed in French they will be handicapped to a certain extent in following the course of the elections. Let the Government grant this right and they will receive every credit from the people who will benefit by it. I again appeal to the Government to give us that justice and fair play to which we are entitled.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If I understood my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) aright he asked that the French language be used throughout certain electoral districts in Canada to the extent of printing the proclamation and election papers in French rather as a privilege than as a right; but I gather from what the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Leger) has said that he made the claim as a right—

Mr. VIEN: No.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE:—as a right given to the people at Confederation under the British North America Act. I am not going to labour the point, but I think it just as well to have a clear statement of the law as far as I know it, because there are provisions in the Act which will clear up any misunderstanding which may exist. The only clause in the British North America Act, to my knowledge, that bears upon the question is section 133 which reads as follows:

> Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the Debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec,—

I think the committee will agree with me that that clause does not refer to these election documents or proclamations. The next clause is:

> —and both those languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses;

Now I sbumit that the election proclamations are neither "records" nor "journals"

"of these Houses". The third clause is worded thus:

—and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this Act and in or from all or any of the courts of Quebec.

That is the third clause and I think it is clear beyond doubt that it could have no application to the question under discussion. The next and last clause is:

The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those languages.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it is equally clear that the last clause has no application whatever to the subject under discussion, viz: The right that was granted to the people of the country under the British North America Act; and I merely point out to my hon. friend from Kent, N.B. (Mr. Leger) that in my humble opinion that does not include the election documents as set out in clause 37 of the Bill under discussion. There is another enactment, relating to the province of Manitoba, which I had better put on Hansard at the same time. That is to be found in the Manitoba Act, passed in the year 1870 when Manitoba entered Confederation. Paragraph 23 of that Act provides as follows:

Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the Debates of the Houses of the Legislature, and both those languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses.

That is the first clause of the section of the Manitoba Act bearing upon the question.

That paragraph can have no application to the section under discussion.

The next paragraph is:

And either of those languages may be used by any person, or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under the British North America Act, 1867, or in or from all or any of the courts of the province.

The second paragraph, you will see, Mr. Chairman, can have no application to the subject under discussion.

The last paragraph of the section is:

The Acts of the Legislature shall be printed and published in both of these languages.

Now, I submit that under a strict reading of the Manitoba Act it is very doubtful if there is any obligation upon this Parliament to print in the French language in the Province of Manitoba any documents relating to elections. That, however, has been established through long years of practice, and the Government has no intention of departing from what we look upon as an established practice—whether established strictly in accordance with law or for what other reason I cannot say at this time. I am pointing this out for the purpose of showing my hon. friend from Kent, N.B. (Mr. Leger) that so far as I am aware the request that he makes is not founded in right; it must be viewed as a matter of privilege. He is quite within his right in asking for it, and I am quite sure that this Parliament has full power and authority to grant it if it sees fit. But in the present Bill we do not go as far as that, we are merely leaving the law and practice where it has been for many years, and I have yet to hear that it has caused any great degree of inconvenience in any part of the country.

Mr. BELAND: May I ask my hon. friend a question before he proceeds further? What kind of a document in his opinion is the Canada Gazette? Is it a "Journal" of the House; is it a "record" of the House; is it an Act of Parliament? Still, it is published in both languages all over the Dominion.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think that when we come down to examine that question strictly, it may be found that the Canada Gazette is published in both languages as a matter of convenience. It is nearer an approach to a record of the House or to a statute, because it does contain all our Orders in Council, which have the same force and effect as statutes of this Parliament. In a word, in my humble opinion, it is a nearer approach to the records of the House than any election document.

Mr. BELAND: In what way may I ask?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Simply because it is a record of the legislative enactments of this House, whether carried out by statute or by Order in Council. It is a resume of the powers this Parliament has exercised, whether sitting as Parliament or whether sitting as the executive authority, as the Governor in Council. Therefore I say it more nearly approaches the language of the British North America Act than any election document could. I think that perhaps on a strict examination of the section it might fairly be held that the Canada Gazette need not be published in the French language. I would not advocate such a thing; I would advocate its continued publication in both languages. But when one interprets a statute one is bound to interpret it strictly, and I doubt very much

whether on a strict interpretation the Canada Gazette would be held to be a record or "journal" of this House, although it very nearly approaches it.

Mr. LEGER: The British North America Act as explained by the minister does not mention a word in reference to the proclamation for elections being printed in both languages either in Manitoba or in the Province of Quebec?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No.

Mr. LEGER: Now, is not the law of this House the law which was established after Confederation, and which law was made to meet the requirements of that day? The official languages were established by the British North America Act, and then this House has gone so far as to say: We are going to allow proclamations for elections in the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba to be printed in the two languages. If such be the case, and the two official languages were established by the Confederation Act, we are only asking now for an extension of the Act wherever it is needed, whether in the province of New Brunswick, of Nova Scotia, of Prince Edward Island or of Ontario. I never contended that the British North America Act went so far as to say that these proclamations should be printed in French and in English in Quebec and Manitoba; that is not what I meant. But I believe I am right in my contention that the law in regard to the use of the two official languages as laid down in the British North America Act may be extended when it is deemed desirable to do so. I would like to have an explanation from the hon. minister as to that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It may be that I misunderstood my hon. friend from Kent, N.B. (Mr. Leger) because I certainly heard him repeat on two or three occasions that the use of the French language as described by him was a matter of right established by the Constitution at the time of Confederation, and my only object in rising was to point out to him the exact terms of the section.

Mr. BELAND: Does the Bill provide for the text of the proclamation to be issued?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: It does. This Bill could not be read a second time before it was printed in both languages?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is the fact.

Mr. BELAND: Then why should not the proclamation be published all over Canada in both languages, if it is part of a Bill adopted by this House?

Mr. GUTHRIE: A Bill is published in both languages in accordance with the requirements of the Constitution and as an act of this House, and this Bill will be published in both languages. There our duty ceases. There is no requirement outside the province of Quebec that election documents shall be printed in French. Now, I may not know all the legislation dealing with this subject, and I want to guard myself to this extent, that there may be some other Act of which I am not aware with regard to the printing in French of the Canada Gazette or some other document. I am referring only to the law that was passed at the time of Confederation, because that was the point raised by my hon. friend from Kent, N.B. (Mr. Leger). I am not expressing my own opinion as to the propriety of using the French language more freely than we have used it in the past. What I say is, that, viewing the matter from all points, having regard to the records of the past, and having regard also to the fact that no great inconvenience has ever been suffered, I think our safest, wisest and fairest course is to adopt the clause as printed in the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not share the views of my friend from Kent, N.B. (Mr. Leger) and I take issue with the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie). I claim that the word "records" used in section 133 includes everything that is kept in the custody of any official of this House. I go further and say that when I ask for a return in this House, that return is a "record" of the House, and if I wanted to insist on the strict interpretation of clause 133 I would have a right to see that that record was deposited on the table of the House in both languages. Section 133 does not say "may," it says "shall;" it is not permissive, it is imperative.

Now, Sir, what is a "record?" A record, according to Murray's New English Dictionary, is:

> The fact or attribute of being so; having been committed by writing as authentic evidence of a matter having a legal importance;—

Now, where is the evidence that the election was held, that is, that the proclamation was issued therefor?

> —as evidence of the proceedings or verdict of a court of justice; evidence which is thus preserved and may be appealed to in case of dispute.

What are these election papers, and what does the Act say about them? These election papers are issued under the order of the highest court in this country, the Parliament of Canada; and for the purpose of making sure that they shall be issued Parliament appoints a Chief Electoral Officer. The Chief Electoral Officer is vested with quasi-judicial powers; he has to see that this law is carried out according to the terms which Parliament has enacted. The definition of "record" as given by Murray is this: "Evidence which is preserved and may be appealed to in case of dispute." Section 75 of this Bill provides:

The Chief Electoral Officer shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, retain in his possession the papers transmitted to him by any returning officer,—

These papers are the election papers, and they are defined in the Interpretation Act. The section continues:

—with the return, for at least one year—

Nobody will dispute that for that year these papers which are in the custody of the Chief Electoral Officer are "records" of this House. If they are not, I do not know what they are.

—if the election is not contested during that time, and, if the election is contested, then for one year after the termination of such contestation.

If the election is contested there is the evidence, which is kept to be used before the court in a determination of the case. The only evidence that the election has been held is the proclamation which says that on such a day, by order of the Governor in Council, an election shall be held. I submit, therefore, that all these papers become records of this House and ought to be kept as such. If you want evidence of the fact that those who first drafted this law had the same idea as I have, take the wording of this Bill. Section 37 reads:

Within two days after the receipt of the writ of election the returning officer shall, by a proclamation in form L, issued under his hand in the English and French languages in every electoral district in the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba, and in the English language only—

What is the word "only" there for? If the contention of my hon. friends is right that the only official language in which this proclamation should be issued is the English language, why use the word "only?" That word was put in because those who were drafting the clause were giving to section 133 of the British North America Act the same interpretation that I am giving to it to-night. If what my hon. friends contend was so clear in the minds of those who drafted the clause, all they had to say was that the proclamation should be issued in both the French and the English languages in the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba, and stop there. But, as I say, their interpretation of section 133 was the same as mine.

Now, my hon. friend says that "record" does not mean these election papers; that what is and what is not to be considered a record is a matter to be interpreted by the courts. I contend that all papers which come into the custody or under the care of any officer of this House become "records" of the House if they are kept for a purpose. When these election papers go into the custody of the Chief Electoral Officer they are records in the custody of an officer of this House. If the election is contested he has to keep these papers one year after the proceedings in the contestation are ended. Why? Because these documents are to be used as evidence before a court of justice. I refer again to Murray's definition of "record" as "evidence which is preserved and may be appealed to in case of dispute." If these papers are not to be "appealed to in case of dispute," why preserve them? The only use to which they can be put is to determine whether or not, when the election took place, everything was properly done. When there is a recount, from whom do you get the ballots and the papers? From the same officer. "Election papers" means all those documents which were used in an election. The strict interpretation of this clause, therefore, being that all documents used in a federal election become records of this House, it is imperative that they be printed in the official language of this country, which is a dual language, English and French, and they stand on a par. Statutes are not enacted for the purpose of throwing ink on a sheet of paper; they are supposed to mean something. If publication of these papers has been restricted in the other provinces to the English language, that restriction is an infringement of existing rights. According to the Interpretation Act, Revised Statutes, the word "shall" is used—it is not permissive; it is imperative. In section 37, therefore, there is a command to print these notices in both languages in the two provinces mentioned and in English only in the other provinces.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. gentleman says that the Chief Electoral Officer is bound under section 75 to keep the election papers in his possession for a year, and in case

of contested election for a further year from the termination of the contestation. Now, what does the Chief Electoral Officer do with them after that?

Mr. BUREAU: Does my hon. friend mean to say that the question whether a paper is a "record" depends upon whether it is preserved in perpetuity?

Mr. MORPHY: I simply ask the question.

Mr. BUREAU: He destroys them, I suppose. Does my hon. friend contend that a printed Bill used in this House is not a "record," even though it is of no further use when it is merged into a statute? I say that the question whether a paper is a "record" does not depend on how long it is preserved. If a paper comes into the possession of an officer of this House for a purpose, in order that it may be used as evidence in a court of justice or anywhere else, it becomes a "record" of this House, and under section 133 of the British North America Act it is imperative that it be printed in both languages. I make this point, not for the purpose of claiming anything, but for the purpose of showing my hon. friends opposite, who think they are always giving us privileges when under the constitution we have rights, that we are not here asking for privileges. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) has been moved in the best interest of the people of Canada. I understand my hon. friends to answer our argument by saying: Why not print the proclamation in Russian, in Polish? I have more respect for the constitution than that. When the constitution states that the official language of this country shall be dual, that does not mean a dozen or eighteen languages. It is no use trying to get out of the difficulty in that way. The language of Canada is dual; I do not say which language is "the" language. There is but one official language in this country, and it is English and French, or if you like to reverse the two, French and English,—because the French language was here before the English language was. I say this, because the other night the hon. member for Perth North (Mr. Morphy) said: When you give an inch to those fellows, they want an ell.

Mr. MORPHY: No, a mile.

Mr. BUREAU: Well, that is just like my hon. friend. That was beyond his vision, and he always looks beyond his vision when he makes rash statements like that. We are not asking for any privileges; we have always been giving in, giving in, and giving in. As I said just now, according to this section, there are many documents that come down to this House, and if we were to sit—

An hon. MEMBER: Tight.

Mr. BUREAU: No, but to sit still on our rights, we could delay the proceedings of this House. There is a rule in this House that says that before a Bill can be read the second time, it shall be printed in both French and English. Time and again, we have refrained from insisting on that, because every hon. member on this side understands English, and when it came to a matter of expediting business we all agreed not to insist on a Bill being printed in French. But I do not want the country to remain under the impression that the statement made in this House by my hon. friend (Mr. Morphy) is true. There is not a discussion in this House on which we do not hold different opinions because "tot capita, tot sensus." There may be a thousand different interpretations that can be given to that section of the statute. But if my hon. friends opposite are sincere, I will make a proposition to them, and we shall settle the question once and for all. If my hon. friends opposite think that they are right and that this means that the proclamations and other documents should be printed in the English language only, I will ask them to accept this amendment. Let the clause read as follows:

> Within two days after the receipt of the writ of election the returning officer shall, by a proclamation in form L, issued under his hand, and mailed one copy at least to the various postmasters of the post offices within his electoral district, indicate—

Drop out the words "in the English and French languages in every electoral district in the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba, and in the English language only in other electoral districts," and we shall go to the highest tribunal in the land and find out what section 133 of the constitution means. If my hon. friends opposite are willing to accept that amendment, I think the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) and the hon. member for Kent, N.B., (Mr. Leger) will be satisfied. There is the test.

Mr. GLASS: Does the hon. member take the ground that it is necessary, according to the constitution, that these proclamations shall—he laid great emphasis on the word "shall"—be published in the English and French languages in all parts of this country?

Mr. BUREAU: The section as it stands says in so many words that the proclamations shall be printed in English and French in two provinces, namely, in Quebec and Manitoba, and then it says "and in English only in the other provinces." No other interpretation can be given to that than that Quebec and Manitoba are the only two provinces under the Act as it stands in which the proclamations have to be printed in English and French, because we have a right to determine these things. We may legislate ourselves out of certain rights if we want to do so; that is the privilege of a Parliament. But what I say is this. Drop out the words "in English and French in Quebec and Manitoba and in English only in the other provinces," and let the clause go at that, and publish the proclamations in English only. Then the courts will determine the matter.

Mr. GLASS: I think my hon. friend misunderstood my question. I asked him if he takes the ground that, according to the British North America Act, it is absolutely necessary that these proclamations in all parts of the Dominion shall be published in both languages.

Mr. BUREAU: I say that the British North America Act uses the word "shall." These election papers are a "record" of this House when they are returned to the Chief Electoral Officer, and the word "shall," according to the Interpretation Act, is imperative and not permissive. In other words, I say that if a man wanted to insist, if this clause did not read as it does to-day—if the words "in English and French in Manitoba and Quebec and in English only in the other provinces" were left out—he could compel the Chief Electoral Officer to print in every part of Canada, these proclamations in both the English and the French languages.

Mr. GLASS: My hon. friend's position is entirely illogical.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, no.

Mr. GLASS: I say that it is, if he takes the ground that the proclamation must be published in both languages throughout the Dominion.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend does not understand me.

Mr. GLASS: Probably not.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not discussing the clause as it stands to-day before the House. Clause 37 is a re-enactment of the section as it existed before—so I am informed by the Acting Solicitor General. That clause determines in what provinces the proclamation shall be printed in both languages. There are two such provinces in the Dominion of Canada—Quebec and Manitoba. The clause goes further. I will read it to my hon. friend.

Mr. GLASS: I want what the British North America Act says.

Mr. BUREAU: I told my hon. friend that we could legislate ourselves out of certain rights and privileges if we wanted to. Parliament is free to say that those proclamations shall be printed in English or in French only in any part of Canada. But I say: If you are sincere, if you want to test the matter, drop out those words entirely from the clause, and then if anybody is dissatisfied, we shall go before the courts and have the matter determined and an interpretation given to this clause. My hon. friend need not laugh and shrug his shoulders. He knows very well, if we came to argue that point and have it determined by the court, what election papers constitute when they are in the hands of the Chief Electoral Officer. I could have the court determine that they become "records" when they are in the hands of the Chief Electoral Officer for a month or a year; and as long as they are "records" for any time at all they must follow the general rule to which records are submitted when they are records of this House. I said that I wanted to make myself clear on this point, because I do not want the hon. member for Perth North (Mr. Morphy) and some of his confreres to believe we are begging favours from them and to let

9 p.m.

the country believe they are unwilling to grant favours. This is a right, and there is a way of testing that. Leave those words out of the clause; then let the proclamation be published in the French language only, if you like, or in the English language only, if you like, and let the people who feel aggrieved on account of such proclamation go before the courts and have the matter determined once and for all.

Mr. FIELDING: I realize that the question under discussion is not only one of great importance but one of a very delicate character, which we should all approach with a most sincere desire to find a ground of agreement. It is a question upon which many of our people hold very strong convictions. It is a question upon which perhaps a great many of our people have very strong prejudices, and these convictions

and these prejudices do often come into conflict. Just how far the French language is an official language in Canada is unhappily the subject of debate. Up to a certain point there is no question whatever. My hon. friends who have spoken before have indicated the point up to which there is no debate. There is no question that the French language is the language of this Parliament on equal terms with the English language. It is so in the Senate, it is so in the House of Commons, it is so in the province of Quebec, it is so, as the Acts have indicated, in the province of Manitoba. Up to that point there is no dispute. We all agree that as respects this Parliament and the legislature of Quebec and the legislature of Manitoba, the French and English languages stand on equal terms. The moment you pass beyond that, you get into the field of debate, and when hon. gentlemen who feel strongly on what I might call the French side assert that the French language stands equal with the English throughout the Dominion, they run to a point which is immediately resisted by a great many people. I am not trying to determine the question myself, but I do want us to clearly understand that beyond that certain point, beyond the point of the legislatures of Quebec and Manitoba, and this Parliament, it is not a clear question. At all events, it is a question that always has been and I suppose always will be, in dispute. The records of this Parliament, we are told, are to be printed in French. The hon. member for Three Rivers has just put up what seems to me, as a layman, to be a pretty good interpretation of what the "records" should mean. It is a new view of the matter to me. I do not know whether it has been presented before. It is rather a curious fact that for fifty-odd years we have been viewing it in another way. If the question came before the Supreme Court, it is possible the view of my hon. friend would prevail, but that is a purely legal question on which I as a layman would not presume to express an opinion.

I prefer to consider the matter from the point of view of what I might call public convenience, mutual convenience, a desire to meet each other, if we can, on all these matters, to respect each other's convictions—aye, and sometimes to respect each other's prejudices when they are based upon convictions. If I look upon this matter entirely from the point of view of my constituents and my province, I want no change in the law as it now stands. So far as they are concerned, I am content with the clause as it stands in the Act. But if in another province some of my brother members find themselves embarrassed and in difficulty, I would like to be mindful of their troubles and not be so selfish as to think of only my own. Down in Nova Scotia we have a large French population, and I am glad to say that we have practically no language trouble whatever. We have adapted our school system, as far as possible, to the needs of our French-speaking people, and the result is that every Frenchman, I believe, in the whole province of Nova Scotia understands and speaks both languages. We rejoice that it is so, and on behalf of the French-speaking people of Nova Scotia I would not desire any change whatever.

But my hon. friend from New Brunswick (Mr. Turgeon) says that they have difficulties in his province and he would like to meet them. If the object of his amendment is simply to provide a proclamation in French for those who cannot read English, if it is a practical question, then I am heartily with him. I sympathize largely with his object, but I do not quite like the words in which he has drawn his amendment. He proposes to leave it to be determined by the Chief Electoral Officer sitting in Ottawa as to the cases, other than those specified in the Act, in which a proclamation in French shall be issued. I do not like that provision. I do not think the Chief Electoral Officer sitting here in Ottawa is the officer best qualified to know the conditions with regard to language in all parts of Canada. I do not think it is very practical. I am not going to move any amendment, because it is too delicate and serious a matter to plunge into amendments. I am simply going to offer a suggestion to the minister which is in line with that of the hon. member for Gloucester to a certain extent and in line with what I understood my hon. friend from Northumberland to suggest, although he made no motion. My point is that if there is any community in Canada where the people do not understand the English language, I do not care in what province it is, I am willing to give them a proclamation in French. I am not willing to give it to them in Italian, I am not willing to give it to them in German. I am not scared by this idea that if we do this for our French friends we must do it for all other nations; the French language does not stand in Canada on an equal footing with the Italian or the German, it has, within certain limits, a clear and distinct position, and within those limits I would like to stand by and support my hon. friends—when they go

beyond that and want something else, perhaps I cannot agree with them. I am not prepared to say that the Italian, or the German, or the Scandinavian, or any other man of foreign birth who comes to Canada has the same language rights in Canada as our French friends. The French language has a certain established right in Canada, and I am willing that that be recognized and given even beyond strictly what the law proposes.

I have said that in the province of Nova Scotia we have a large French population. In the western part of Nova Scotia, in Yarmouth county, and in the neighbouring county of Digby, there is a large French population. Coming east to Halifax county, in the eastern part, there is a considerable French population. Passing further east, in the county of Antigonish, in the county of Inverness, in the county of Richmond, and in fact in quite a number of the districts of Nova Scotia, there is a large French-speaking population. But inasmuch as they all understand and speak the English language, as they have never made any demand whatever to have these documents published in French, I do not want any proceedings to be taken to publish the proclamation in French with the view of obliging anybody down there. The French-speaking people of Nova Scotia do not need it, they do not want it, they have never asked for it. But if there are in New Brunswick or any other province substantial groups of people speaking the French language and not understanding English, I say that in that case I would give the returning officer the right to decide to publish the proclamation there in French;—no, not the right to decide: if he has knowledge that there is a substantial group of French-speaking people in an electoral district who do not understand English, and will not understand the proclamation if published in English, then it should be his duty to publish the proclamation both in French and in English. With that object in view I am going, not to make a motion, for the matter is too serious to rush into motions, but to offer this for the consideration of my hon. friend from Gloucester, because I think it is his idea, and to ask the minister to give it due consideration. I would not alter the clause as it stands, but I would put in this proviso at the end: "Provided, however, that in any electoral district in which, to the knowledge of the returning officer, there is a considerable number of electors who are familiar with the French language but do not understand the English language, the proclamation shall be issued in both languages."

Mr. RINFRET: In offering a few remarks on this clause I may say that in clear recognition of the principle involved in it, my first intention was to speak in French, but I realize that by so doing I would place some of my hon. friends opposite in precisely the same position in which they want to place the French-speaking electors of New Brunswick. For this reason, therefore, and for the cause of good understanding, I will strive to offer my remarks in English. The minister asked a moment ago if we were asking for the recognition of a right. I must say that personally I have been very much impressed by the case made by my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau). I listened to the reading of the clause by the minister and I think he has well demonstrated that election documents constitute properly "records" of the House and as such come within clause 133. If you turn to page 86 of this Bill you will find Form L which is a:

> Proclamation of the returning officer declaring time and place fixed for the nomination of candidates, and the day for opening the poll.

I understand this form has been translated and constitutes a part of the French translation of the Bill. I submit that these same proclamations come within clause 133 for these reasons: First, because they are records of Parliament and also because they are part of an Act of Parliament. I would go further. I think that we on this side of the House have shown large tolerance. We have been suggesting different ways out of the difficulty. My hon. friend from Gloucester was ready to leave it to the Chief Electoral Officer to decide in which constituencies these proclamations should be translated. My hon. friend from Three Rivers was perfectly willing to leave it to the courts to decide. And now we have another suggestion from my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) who, if I understand him aright, wants merely to put a proviso at the end of the clause in order to cover the case of constituencies where a large portion of the population is French. Any of these suggestions, if the minister will accept it, will meet with our views.

What we do object to is to leave in an Act of the Parliament of Canada a provision that these proclamations may be issued in English only in other electoral districts which means all electoral districts outside of Quebec and Manitoba leaving out those portions of New Brunswick, Nova

Scotia and some parts of Ontario where a large portion of the population is French. It has been shown that in New Brunswick one-third of the population is French; it has been shown that in Ontario you have three hundred thousand people who speak French; and it has been shown that in the Maritime Provinces one hundred and eighty thousand people speak French. Under these circumstances, I submit, a large portion of the population would be deprived of the right of reading these proclamations in their own language.

I would go further and say that what we ask for is not at all cumbersome. To issue these proclamations in the two languages would not be expensive and it would be very useful. This matter receives added importance by reason of the fact that we now have the woman vote. There is a large number of cases where a man will speak both languages whereas his wife and some of his children will not because they have lived within the more restricted area of the family circle. By reason of the increased French population in some of the counties, and also by reason of the fact that women have been given the vote, it is more necessary than ever that the proclamations should be issued in these counties in both languages. It is not only a matter of dealing with the law but it is also a matter of carrying out the spirit of the law. This clause 133 has often come up for consideration in this House. I remember that when it was my pride to be a member of the press gallery I listened very often to the discussion of that clause. There are two classes of opinion as to the meaning of the clause. One is the broad school, the school of broad-minded men, who consider that the recognition of the bilingual principle will be beneficial to this country and who are quite willing to apply it every time that occasion arises. There is another school of opinion, a school—I will say without hesitation—of narrow-minded men who consider the fact that we should have two official languages in this country as a near-calamity and every time an opportunity presents itself for the application of the principle to the French language they are trying to restrict the sense of the clause to their own narrow interpretation of it. I should think that my hon. friend the minister is inclined to be of the former school because when my hon. friend from Gloucester first presented his case the minister admitted that he sympathized with the proposition and said that he would take it into consideration, and that he hoped he would be able to come back with some amendment meeting our views. We went to bed that night with the vain hope that it would materialize. Unfortunately this clause was left over for a few days, and this afternoon the minister makes the statement that he can do nothing. He went as far as to say—I hope I am not misquoting him—I took down his words:

> I am not personally prejudiced against the extension of the French language in this respect, but I know that other people are prejudiced against it.

I think that is what the minister said this afternoon. I would like to ask him: who are those men, who are those members of the House who are prejudiced against the French language to such an extent that they have prevented him against his inclination, from yielding to our demand and forced him to come back here and make the statement that he could not do anything? The other day the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) put a question in this House, as follows:

> Would my hon. friend raise any objection to changing this clause so as to make it compulsory for the proclamation to be printed in forty or fifty languages throughout the Western part of the country?

My hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has just dealt with that side of the matter, but I would like to add this to what has been said: I understand that we have before us an electoral Bill and that in order that a man shall have the right to vote in this country he must first be naturalized. If I turn to the Naturalization Act of 1919 I find in clause 2 subsection (3) that one of the essentials to naturalization is that he is of good character and has an adequate knowledge of either the English or French language. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is not one elector in this country who can vote unless he has been naturalized, and that there is not one elector who has been naturalized without being able to speak either French or English. Therefore, I think that the question put by my hon. friend was altogether irrelevant.

I have much respect for the people of this country who speak Italian or any other language that it pleases them to speak, but I think that if they are electors they are in good standing with our Constitution only if they speak either French or English. I do not wish to extend the discussion any further, but before I take my seat I would like to put on Hansard a few lines from an

editorial in the Montreal Star of yesterday on the bilingual question generally:

The Bilingual Canadian.

A knowledge of French—by which is not meant merely a bowing acquaintance—is a very valuable asset throughout the world. In Canada it is naturally of peculiar value. Ninety per cent of the suspicion and misunderstanding between the two groups that make up this country's population and that retard the progress and well-being of Canada is due to the inability of these groups to understand each other's mother tongue.

Whether or not compulsory French or English in our schools and universities is a wise policy, there is certainly no doubt about the wisdom of the French or English student who determines to learn the other language. He is the master of an asset which will serve and—sooner or later—pay him well. More than that, he is a better Canadian.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are not my words, they are the words of a newspaper that we have no reason to suspect of any partiality towards us. Yet it says that giving due regard and justice to both languages in this country makes one a better Canadian. I hope the minister will resist the opposition to this clause being changed—a change which is likely to have the effect of making many of our people better Canadians—and will yield to our demand that the clause be properly amended.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's said this was a very delicate question, and I think he repeated the word "delicate" several times, so impressed was he with the delicacy of the subject which he was discussing. The hon. gentleman to-day finds this question delicate as he found it in the past. It was too delicate a question for the hon. gentleman to deal with at all, previous to the elections of 1900, 1904, 1908, or 1911 when he was a member of the Government of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. And, for part of that time at least, the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) was a member of that administration as Solicitor General. A great wrong was being inflicted upon certain classes of people in this country then, and there was a great opportunity for those hon. gentlemen who were members of the Government of the day to take the necessary steps to remove these wrongs. Now, as illustrating the wrongs that were being inflicted during all those years upon certain groups of French Canadians who were settled in different parts of the country, I wish to place on record a statement made by the late right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier in this House on the 23rd February, 1910:

To-day the sun in his daily career does not shed his light upon any people on the face of the earth enjoying more liberty than my fellow-countrymen of French extraction.

That was an expression of opinion from the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier one year prior to the election of 1911, and in view of that statement there could not have been any outcry at that time from the hon. member for Three Rivers, the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland), the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, nor the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), who were all members of the Liberal Government. Not one of these gentlemen at that time raised the cry that the French settlers grouped in different parts of the country were being imposed upon or were being deprived of their rights. But my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's now says it is a delicate question. Yes, too delicate for him to touch and too delicate it has been for him to touch in the past. During all the time he had the power, and the right, and the opportunity to afford redress, it was too delicate a question for him and his colleagues to have anything to do with.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this matter may be considered from two standpoints. When it was up in the House a few days ago hon. gentlemen opposite took a somewhat different ground from what they are taking to-day. I do not think that the hon. member for Kent, N.B., took any different ground; but other hon. gentlemen on that occasion rather emphasized this point, that there were in certain parts of the country—in the constituencies of Gloucester and Kent, N.B., and other ridings down there, as well as in certain constituencies in Ontario and other provinces—groups of French Candians who suffered inconvenience or were placed at a disadvantage because they were unable to read the election proclamation as it was printed in English. The other night it was a question of inconvenience or inability on the part of these people to read the proclamation. To-night they have somewhat departed from that attitude. Now if you take the ground that the election proclamation should be printed in another language than English because of the inability of certain portions of the people to read it in English, then I contend that you must open the door to the people of other nationalities who are resident in various parts of this country, because I find that in the province of Manitoba the Germans and the Austrians are each more numerous than the French Canadians in that province. I also find that in the province of Saskatchewan and in the province of Alberta like-

wise, the Germans, Austrians and Scandinavians are much more numerous than the French Canadians. If then it is right to claim that the proclamation should be printed so that all the people of the country may be able to read it and thereby inform themselves as to the instructions to be given to the electors—if that is the ground you are to take, then I say your argument for having it printed in French will apply with equal force to having that document printed in German, Austrian, Scandinavian, and a great many other languages. But hon. gentlemen took a different position to-day. They assumed the position that the proclamations should be printed in the French as well as in English because the constitution conferred that right. In that connection my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's was very emphatic in stating that he would not print the proclamation in Italian, or in Austrian, or in Scandinavian, or in any of these other languages. One part of my hon. friend's argument was that there are certain French Canadians who are unable to inform themselves as to this proclamation because it is printed in a language they cannot understand; and at the same time the hon. gentleman says he will let thousands and tens of thousands of people of other nationalities remain in ignorance so far as the election proclamation is concerned. That is the attitude which these hon. gentlemen have taken.

Mr. BUREAU: If my hon. friend will allow me a correction, I think he is not fair to me; I never took that attitude.

Mr. EDWARDS: I was referring to the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend spoke of hon. members on this side. If the hon. gentleman will refer to Hansard he will find that I took the very same position on the occasion to which he alludes that I have taken to-night.

Mr. EDWARDS: My remarks—and I applied them correctly—had reference to the attitude taken by certain hon. gentlemen opposite. I said that they were taking a somewhat different position from the one they took the other night. Possibly I may not have done justice to my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) in that respect; but my impression of the discussion the other night was that the claim was put forward principally on the ground that there were a number of people—residents of certain constituencies in New Brunswick and elsewhere—who were unable to inform themselves in regard to the proclamation and instructions issued at election time because they could not read the English language. I repeat again that so far as my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's is concerned he is perfectly willing for all other people to remain in that condition of ignorance excepting those of French origin. In that respect I might point out that in so far as hon. gentlemen opposite agree to the position taken by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, they are not quite so kindly disposed towards the people in this country of alien enemy birth as they were yesterday when another matter was in question. They were very solicitous in regard to certain people in this country when discussing another clause of this Franchise Act; they are not so solicitous in regard to those people when it comes to discussing this particular matter.

Now, I want for a few moments to discuss the question from the other standpoint—and the only other standpoint from which, it seems to me, it should be discussed. Is this a question of constitutional right? My hon. friend from Three Rivers is very emphatic in declaring that in his opinion it is. I think I am stating that correctly.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, my hon. friend has a perfect right to that opinion, and I am sure that he will concede to me the right to differ from him. And, Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to say to my hon. friend from St. James (Mr. Rinfret) that if I choose to hold a different opinion in regard to this matter, I do not think he should accuse me of being narrow-minded and arrogate to himself great breadth of vision. Because in this regard I am in very distinguished company—I cannot help but think that I am in the company of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who in his long parliamentary career evidently did not take the view which hon. gentlemen opposite have taken; because had he done so I think he would have adopted measures to give to his French-Canadian compatriots the rights which these hon. gentlemen claim they have under the constitution.

I want to quote an expression of opinion by Senator Belcourt in regard to this very matter, and it seems to me that his opinion has all the greater weight because evidently it was voiced by him with considerable regret. He said:

> The true fact, regrettable as it may be, is that for the federal domain and the provincial domain of Quebec there is but the constitution which defines equality of both languages at the

Dominion Parliament, at the Quebec Parliament, before the federal tribunal or courts; and also before the courts of the province of Quebec is the French language on an equal footing with the English language.

Section 133 of the British North America Act—

which has been referred to here by several hon. members to-night——

—which proclaims equal rights of the French and English before the federal House, the federal courts and before the provincial House of Quebec and the provincial courts, and in section 93 of the same Act, which gives to each province the exclusive power to legislate in matters of education, constitute the sum total of the rights officially recognized in favour of the French-Canadian people of the Dominion of Canada; these are the only rights recognized in favour of our race; they are the only rights which cannot be stripped from us without the intervention of the Imperial Parliament; they are the only rights which the constitution and the law formally guaranteed to us; they are the only rights which the law will permit us to exact and about which it gives us the means whereby to exact the same.

I am giving the words of Senator Belcourt whose position and attitude in regard to the bilingual question no person can question—and a similar interpretation has already been given very clearly by the hon. minister (Mr. Guthrie). As far as I can see, at all events, there is no manner of doubt as regards the constitutional rights of French Canadians to the use of their language in the province of Quebec as laid down by the constitution. No person has thought of depriving them of those rights. In my judgment, hon. members are seeking to read into that constitution words which I cannot see there—and my eyesight to-night is better than the eyesight of my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) was last night.

It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to say that the French language stands on a different footing in this country from any other language except English. That I am quite willing to concede. The manner in which, and the degree to which, the French language stands on that different footing is very clearly laid down in the constitution; and I want to be distinctly understood as expressing my opinion that outside of those constitutional provisions the French language, as such, has no more right to be used, we will say, in the province of Saskatchewan, or the province of Alberta, or the province of Ontario, than has any other language. I ask my hon. friends not to put words in my mouth which I do not use; I say there is no constitutional right—if this is to be argued from the sentimental standpoint, that is another matter entirely, and everybody has a right to his opinion.

[Mr. Edwards.]

But I am challenging the position taken by the hon. members from Kent, N.B., Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), and St. James (Mr. Rinfret) who have argued that the French language has a constitutional right equal to that of the English language in any province of the Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not want to be misquoted. I never argued that the French language was on a par with the English language in every province. I argued that every document of this House should be printed in French as well as in English, and I claim that electoral documents are documents of record. It turns on the word "record".

Mr. EDWARDS: Then I say that a proclamation is not a "record" of this House. It may be presumptuous for me to advance my opinion against that of a lawyer, but I have done so before and escaped with my life, and I shall do so again. I do not regard a proclamation as a record of this House; my hon. friend does. Very well, we must agree to differ. I hope that my hon. friend from St. James (Mr. Rinfret) will not charge me with narrow-mindedness because I do not agree with my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau). It is quite natural for my hon. friend from St. James to consider that all the breadth of vision is to be found on his side of the House, as it is also quite natural for him to think that only those who agree with the hon. member for St. James are to be included in the class of broad-minded men, while those who differ from him belong to the class called narrow-minded. My hon. friend may entertain that opinion if he chooses. I understand that he is a very able lawyer, but if I, as a layman, might venture to say so, he is not very logical in putting forth his claim along that line.

Mr. RINFRET: I understand that my hon. friend has referred to me as a lawyer. I am proud to say that I am a newspaper man.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am very glad indeed to hear my hon. friend say that he is not a lawyer.

Mr. BELAND: So are we.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What have they done to you?

Mr. EDWARDS: I think my hon. friend would be quite justified in rising to a question of privilege when I said he was a lawyer. However, I was under the impression that he was a lawyer. There are

many in the House who would think that my hon. friend ought to take that as a very great compliment.

If we are to consider this matter from the standpoint of convenience, there are in the western provinces thousands of people of different nationalities who have proved themselves to be first-class citizens, who have endeavoured to do their part since coming to this country. Not all have done this, but many have. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) would have the proclamation issued in French in Alberta where, according to the last census, there were some 19,000 French people, but he would not have it printed in Scandinavian, although there are 28,000 Scandinavians in that province. Nor would he permit it to the Austrians and Germans, who number 26,000 and 36,000 respectively. In Saskatchewan there are 68,000 Germans, 41,000 Austrians, 33,000 Scandinavians and only 33,000 French Canadians, but my hon. friend says most emphatically that he would not consent to the printing of the proclamation in Scandinavian, Austrian or any other than the French language. Mr. Chairman, it does not make for unity in this country to have these proclamations printed in these several languages. I venture to say that the proposing of this amendment will have served the purpose of hon. gentlemen opposite, broad-minded though they be, if it has given them for the next election something in the nature of a grievance to parade before their electors. I venture to say that some of them have that in mind, just as it was a part of a well-laid plan when the present member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) in 1916 moved his bilingual resolution in this House—he was paving the way for something that he could present to the electors of the province of Quebec in order to solidify them and hold them together. So that, if hon. gentlemen are thinking along that line, why, the purpose of their resolution will be served.

Now, I recognize the value of being able to speak more than one language. But I want to tell my hon. friends that one difficulty standing in the way of just such moves as the move they are making here to-day is found in the fact that they couple their language and their religion together in such a way as to deprive certain people from living in certain parts of this country. Let me repeat, that, so that my words will be distinctly understood. There are certain places in the province of Ontario; there are certain places in other portions of this Dominion, where English-speaking people cannot live, because conditions make it impossible for them to live there.

Mr. PROULX: What does my hon. friend mean?

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend should be the last one to ask that; he knows perfectly well what I mean.

Mr. PROULX: I do not know.

Mr. EDWARDS: I mean simply this: that in certain sections of the county of Prescott, represented by my hon. friend, it is impossible for an English-speaking Protestant to live and raise his children, because of the fact that there is only one school for those children to go to, and that is a school in which the French language predominates and in which the Roman Catholic catechism is taught. I am not criticizing or saying anything in regard to any man's religion,—

Mr. CANNON: I rise to a point of order. I would like to know if under this clause the hon. member is allowed to discuss the school system in Ontario or in any other province. If he is, I will speak after he finishes.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not understand that the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) had entered into a discussion of that subject. I understood his remark to be a reply to a question put by the member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx). If, however, there is any intention of entering into a discussion of this nature, the point of order would be well taken.

Mr. EDWARDS: I was endeavouring to make clear my opposition to the amendment proposed by the member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon). I am stating candidly and honestly what I believe to be a serious objection to just such movements as this movement which is being made here to-day. I do not want any person to misinterpret anything I say; I do not want any person to be in doubt as to what I say. I was answering my hon. friend (Mr. Proulx) by saying that in certain sections of the country where you have a separate school system and certain church dogma taught, and where you have a certain language as the language of communication and instruction, you make it impossible for English-speaking persons to live in that section of the country. We have had numerous examples throughout Canada; because of the conditions I have indicated persons have been obliged to leave sections of the country and seek homes elsewhere. That is what I

say; my hon. friend understands perfectly the point that I am making. I am not making it in any spirit of harshness at all; I am using it as I believe I am entitled to use it.

Mr. PROULX: But the English language is taught in all those schools.

Mr. EDWARDS: There is no use in discussing this point further, Mr. Chairman. I was using it merely as an argument. I thought I had made myself perfectly clear in regard to it. There does seem to me to be a very great difference, I may tell my hon. friend, in that matter. A person may go into an English section and there is nothing to interfere; the children will hear nothing from morning till night which will cause offence. I think I have made my point clear. But I will say this in regard to this matter of the French language and its use and its recognition: if my hon. friends opposite who are concerned in regard to the use of this language will use their influence to dissociate their language from the prevailing religion of their province so that we can have non-sectarian schools, then they will very largely remove any opposition there would be to the extension and the general use of the French language throughout this country. I leave that with my hon. friends in order that they may consider and weigh it well.

I want to point out to the Government that there is no use in shutting our eyes to certain definite and well-known facts. There is a feeling in Ontario—whether that feeling is rightly or wrongly founded—against bilingualism. There is a feeling in the western provinces somewhat along the same line. In Manitoba it has manifested itself. There they have a one-language school; that represents public opinion in Manitoba. In Saskatchewan and Alberta they have been and are making strenuous efforts to bring the foreign population there to the point of recognizing the public school and the English language.

As a matter of constitutional right, my hon. friend's contention is not well founded, that the French language should have a recognition ahead of all other languages in other parts of the country than the provinces named in the constitution. I cannot conceive of such a thing as this House of Commons, this Parliament, deliberately agreeing to placard the Dominion of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific with proclamations in half a dozen or a dozen different languages at every election. That would be giving a certain amount of encouragement to certain people who are coming to this country to make their homes here, and I do not think that would be in the interest of Canada, nor would it help in unifying the people of this country. Therefore, I am opposed to the amendment. The people of New Brunswick may be put to a certain inconvenience, but I cannot think, according to all I have heard with regard to that province, there is much difference in the population now from what it was at the last election or in the election of 1911. Somehow or another they got along with the proclamation as it was at those times and we heard nothing in the way of complaint. If those hon. gentlemen are so much concerned about people of different nationalities being unable to read the proclamation in English, it will not cost them very much to put their hands into their own pockets and they themselves defray the cost of having the proclamation printed in half a dozen different languages. But it is another matter when you recognize this as a constitutional right, and I am not prepared to accept the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, namely, that they are merely asking for what is their right under the constitution. Let them convince me of that and I will fall in line at once without any further word. I am not convinced of that, and I maintain, although I am not a lawyer, that my argument in this regard is sound, that you cannot give to different races in this country certain privileges which they ask, without, to a certain extent, depriving others of constitutional rights which they enjoy under the British North America Act. My rights and theirs are, to a certain extent, relative, one to the other, and if, on sentimental or any other grounds, you give to any group, certain privileges to which they are not entitled under the constitution, by doing so you are depriving me of some of the rights which I hold under the constitution.

10 p.m.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I hope you will overlook the many errors I am liable to make when I rise to address this House in a language which is not my mother tongue. I intend adding my feeble voice in support of the request made by the revered member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon).

Mr. Chairman, in addressing the House in a tongue which is not my own, I am in the first place encouraged by the example given by the Acting or Outgoing—I do not know which—Prime Minister, who has of late, on many occasions, expressed his

mind in the language of Molière. I am further encouraged to do so by the example given by my French-speaking colleagues on this side of the House, who use the language of Shakespeare with a fluency which all the members of the House of Commons of Canada envy them.

I do not to-night propose to present a very technical argument upon the constitutionality of the question now before the House. I intend to appeal to my fellow-members' spirit of justice and generosity. We live in a bilingual country. In federal matters both languages are on the same footing. As Sir John A. Macdonald once said, "In Canada we have no dominant race," and, in consequence, we have no dominant language. If we consider such a condition as admitted, what is the inference? We have two official languages. The proclamation is an official document which is published in order that every subject, every citizen, may understand it. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) says: "If you take that ground, then you will have to print this document in German and all the languages of the different nationalities, of the different races who live in Canada." Not at all, Mr. Chairman, not at all. The French people hold in this country a position very different from that of the Germans, the Austrians, the Italians and others. I appeal to the history of my country; I appeal to the leading men of the 17th century who are called Champlain, Maisonneuve, La Salle. After all, the inhabitants of the province of Quebec were the foremost pioneers of the land; they have in this country a right which the other new-comers do not possess. That was admitted when the country was transferred over to England; it was admitted at Confederation, and the two races, the French Canadian race and the English or Scotch or Irish-Canadian race are on the same footing, both languages are on the same footing in federal matters.

It is a pleasure for me to point out Quebec as an example. I dare mention the name of Quebec! A few years ago the name of Quebec was spurned throughout the whole Dominion, but to-day it is said to be the last fortress of liberty and civilization. In the province of Quebec we have municipalities where you can find Frenchmen, or rather Canadians, who speak French and Canadians who speak English. In these municipalities all notices are printed in both languages; but where the population is entirely of either language, in such municipalities the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may enact that only one language can be used. That is common sense; this practice is consistent with good sense. We ask for the enforcement of that practice in the present case.

We have in this country of ours some people who are beset, if I am allowed to use that expression, with the fear that the English language may suffer. Mr. Chairman, I am a Canadian of Scotch descent; the English language is my mother-tongue, and notwithstanding the fact that the French language is as beautiful and clear as spring water, the tongue of Molière is not superior in my estimation to the tongue of Shakespeare or Milton. Even if there should be a certain amount of rivalry between the two forms of speech, my mother-tongue has nothing to fear.

Mr. MORPHY (Translation): May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. MORPHY (Translation): Does the hon. member agree with my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), as to the interpretation to be given to the word "only" in the section under discussion?

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): I think I have somewhat wasted my oratorical effort on the hon. member from Perth (Mr. Morphy) for I said at the beginning of my remarks that I did not intend to bring forward technical arguments in this discussion. I believe that the hon. member for Three Rivers is right as usual, yet I want to say this: I am not here to follow the example of the Scribes and Pharisees of old, who scrutinized only the letter of the law; I want to appeal to-day to the spirit of the law, to the sense of justice and to the sense of fairness of my fellow-citizens.

The opponents of the French language in Canada to-day, bring forward especially two arguments in every discussion that arises. The first argument is founded on apprehension. Some people are afraid that the English language may lose some ground in this country through the spread of the French language in this country. If I be permitted, let me call the attention of this House to the fact that the people in the province of Quebec are endeavouring to learn the English language. A lot of my French-speaking friends, in the city of Montreal, see to it that their children are taught in English, even at the same time or even before they are taught their mother tongue. In the province of Quebec, we are anxious to speak English. Such apprehen-

sions as were mentioned a moment ago are absolutely groundless. The other argument brought forward by the opponents of the French language is founded upon hope. Those people entertain the view that a wider and stouter national spirit will be fostered with only one rather than two languages in this country. Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to give the House two illustrations in this regard. You have only one language in Ireland; I believe that is the Connaught and Ulster provinces, only the English language is spoken. But notwithstanding the fact the population of the whole of Ireland speaks one language only, have they succeeded in creating a feeling of harmony between the various nationalities living in that country? Unfortunately, no. I shall give you another illustration: Take Switzerland, that magnificent little republic of Switzerland. Three official languages thrive in that country: German, French and Italian, and I think that republic of Switzerland is fired by a national spirit as vigorous as that existing in any country in the world.

I am very grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, for the kindly attention you have given to my remarks. I beg those of my hon. friends who noticed my too numerous mistakes to excuse me, and I thank the others who did not understand my remarks for the patience they have shown.

Mr. BOYCE: Would the hon. member be good enough to repeat that speech in English? I am sure it must be very good.

Mr. McMASTER: I would be very glad to repeat it, except that it would be an imposition on those members who have so kindly listened to me in French.

Mr. BUREAU: Mr. Chairman, is it not against the rules to repeat the same thing in the House of Commons?

The CHAIRMAN: There is a rule of the House which declares that an hon. member must not repeat his own arguments or the arguments of any other member. The hon. member for Brome very politely declined to repeat his speech in English, and therefore followed very closely the rule of the House.

Mr. BUREAU: The question of the hon. member for Carleton was out of order.

Mr. BURNHAM: This question which has aroused so much antipathy between the French and English in this country ought surely some day to be treated seriously. As hinted by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) it has been used largely in the past as election ammunition. It is too serious a matter for that. The English regard the French with too much affection and respect to treat it otherwise than seriously.

Mr. VIEN: Do you think so?

Mr. BURNHAM: And I hope the French will treat the English a little more seriously. So far the only hon. member who has endeavoured to put this question upon firm ground is the hon. member for Three Rivers. He argues the question as a matter of constitutional right, a right which the French Canadian has had created for him. He has had no other rights created for him than laid down in the law. The hon. member for St. James, and, I am sorry to say, my old friend the hon. member for Gloucester, the hon. member for Kent, N.B., and others, have persisted in dragging in sentiment—they are asking to have this right extended as one of privilege or favour. But the hon. member for Three Rivers repudiates it as a favour, and stands upon his legal right, and with that course I agree. Far be it from me or any other man who has any respect for justice to wish to see the French Canadians or anybody else rifled of their rights under the constitution. When they think those rights are being taken from them, let them appeal to the proper tribunal and have an interpretation given, and the rights restored, if necessary. But this perennial course of insinuation, this everlasting innuendo, this effort to widen the cleavage between the two races, is absolutely wrong and absolutely unjust. We want to give the French their rights. I cannot repeat too often, we insist upon giving the French their rights.

Mr. CANNON: We can look after that all right.

Mr. BEST: The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) was able to take care of himself during the war.

Mr. BURNHAM: Possibly, but my hon. friend prides himself on being an Irishman, not a Frenchman. I am talking to the French Canadians.

Mr. VIEN: All oppressed people sympathize with each other.

Mr. BURNHAM: If hon. gentlemen are going to interrupt in this way, let them carry on the debate. I wish to say further that when we have reached this firm ground of constitutional right, we must continue to

respect it. It is set out in detail, and if it is not clear, it is capable of being made clear by the proper tribunal. To introduce therefore, an amendment at the present time which directly purposes to extend rights, really means that the rights do not exist, and, therefore, on behalf of the French Canadians I repudiate the amendment. If you try to extend rights and admit that you are trying to extend them, as this hon. member who has interrupted so frequently has said—he said that the law was being made here to-night—

Mr. VIEN: Undoubtedly.

Mr. BURNHAM: —I say it is not being made here to-night. That is how this whole question is being bedevilled by people insisting on jumping up and interjecting new laws into the constitution every little while with respect to things which can only be—

Mr. VIEN: I wish to correct the statement of my hon. friend. I did not say that we were initiating a right; I only said that we were at present working on an electoral act, that that is the law we are now making. I did not express any opinion as to whether we had this right previously or not. I only said we were making an electoral act.

Mr. BURNHAM: Then I do not understand, as you will readily see, Mr. Chairman, the purport of his previous interruption, or interjection, or intervention, or whatever you choose to call it. I say further, it is high time that the French-Canadians rested upon the letter of the law and stood upon their rights. If they think they are not obtaining those rights, let them ask for an interpretation and insist on getting them, and we will back them up. But they are placing us in a position where they charge us with being narrow-minded and prejudiced, when as a matter of fact we are here charged with the responsibility of maintaining the law as it stands. That law is well defined. It has been admirably set out by the hon. member for Three Rivers. It is this idea of bringing in all sorts of little sentimental appeals to our sympathy and indulgence, to our generosity, broad-mindedness and liberal-spiritedness, that makes the question not one of law, not one of right, but one of sympathy. It then becomes a political football, to be used at election time, or any other time, throughout this country. Just so sure as those gentlemen insist on making this a matter of sympathy, a matter of natural right, and not of legal right, just so sure as they succeed in establishing that, I, for my part, will vote the Norwegian, and the Scandinavian, and the Italian, and everybody else the same natural rights, because natural rights are not legal rights, but rights that belong by the very nature of the case. These other people have the same natural rights as the French-Canadian or the English-Canadian, but they have not the legal rights that the French-Canadians or the English-Canadians have. Let the French-Canadians therefore insist upon their legal right. Let them stick to that, and not endeavour, as in this case, to introduce amendments that may go very far in the direction of impairing the very rights which they at present enjoy.

Mr. CANNON: In dealing with this clause, I think the members of the committee ought to bear in mind that this is a federal, and not a provincial matter, and secondly, that we are actually engaged in framing a new electoral law for Canada. This House and this committee are therefore perfectly free to insert in this new electoral law whatever clauses they deem fit.

The hon. member for Frontenac founded the main argument of his speech on the basis of what might have happened in previous years in several provinces of Canada. He spoke of the province of Manitoba and the province of Ontario. I say that this House and this committee are not concerned with what might have happened in the province of Manitoba or the province of Ontario, because we are dealing with the French language as it should be dealt with by the House of Commons of Canada, and there is a wide distinction to be observed.

The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), with great generosity, which we certainly will not forget, speaking, as he said, on behalf of and in the name of the French-Canadians, said that he repudiated the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Gloucester, who wishes to amend the clause now under consideration to protect the rights of some of his constituents. I may say to the hon. member for West Peterborough that we on this side of the House are better qualified and better posted to speak on behalf and in the name of the French-Canadians, not only of Quebec, but of all Canada. We do not repudiate the amendment, we stand by it, by every word that it contains. As far as I am concerned, I would go further than the hon. member for Gloucester. I would ask this House, as the hon. member for Three Rivers has asked, to say, not simply that the proclamation by the re-

turning officer shall be printed in English and French in the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba and in certain other sections of the country where the French population is large enough, but my contention is that according to the constitution as it reads to-day, and as it has been since Confederation, from the Pacific to the Atlantic ocean the French and English languages are on an equal footing in federal matters. Let us have a clause in accordance with the provisions of the existing law, not mentioning the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba at all, or the languages in which the proclamation is to be printed, but simply say that the Chief Electoral Officer shall issue a proclamation in the various constituencies of Canada. I am not aware of any law which exists to-day which says that the proclamations ought to be printed in both languages in the nine provinces of Canada.

Before I discuss this proposition on its merits I wish to preface my argument with another remark. The Acting Solicitor General and other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House talked about privileges and favours. We stand in this House not asking for favours or privileges; we are only seeking the legal recognition of our actual rights. The French minority in Canada is a minority that has an historical past. Our forefathers have written in the history of Canada pages that are beautiful enough to justify their children when they rise in the House of Commons not to seek favours but simply to urge their rights, and that is what we are doing. When I heard hon. members on the other side of the House saying that if the French language is to be used in proclamations in other provinces than Quebec and Manitoba, the proclamations would also have to be printed in Italian, German or Austrian, I felt that those who presented such an argument offered an insult to French Canadians and had forgotten the achievements of the French-Canadian people ever since Canada was discovered. We do not stand on the same level as the foreigner who has emigrated within the last fifty or one hundred years. Our forefathers came here when Canada was nothing but a wilderness, and if to-day Canada is a great and prosperous country the English as well as the French people of Canada owe it to those French pioneers who were the first to have the courage to explore its forests and change the wilderness that then existed into the beautiful cities and country districts that we now see. We have had enough of this argument. I do not know whether it is due to the ignorance of hon. members on the other side, I do not say that it is due to their bad faith; but I do say that any man who dares in the House of Commons or anywhere else to pretend that the French Canadians are an inferior race, no matter what position he occupies, is entirely ignorant of the history of this country. We are here, at home. We have been at home in Canada for the last four centuries, and we will remain here, at home, no matter what people in other provinces want or wish. The province of Quebec is to-day setting an example to the rest of the country. For three years insults were hurled in the face of the French-Canadian people. To-day we hear from every side, from every direction, from every lip, compliments to the French Canadian race. Compliments or insults will not disturb our equanimity of mind. We have our rights, and we will stand by them, and insist on them.

I said, Mr. Chairman, that constitutionally speaking the French language in Canada had rights, and rights superior to those of any other nation, and I will prove it. Look up the treaty, which was signed on the battlefield of Montreal, when that city was handed to the British troops; look up the treaty which was further signed at Paris; look up the Act of Quebec which was guaranteed by the British authorities in 1775; look up these documents and in each of them it will be found that the French population of Canada are guaranteed the enjoyment of their language.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is not right.

Mr. CANNON: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon?

Mr. EDWARDS: I say that is not right.

Mr. CANNON: If the hon. gentleman is not of my opinion I would be very grateful if, instead of saying I am not right, he would support his statement with facts; I am perfectly willing to hear him.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am prepared to do so. I merely dissent from the hon. gentleman's very explicit and emphatic statement. He makes a most emphatic statement, which I most emphatically deny, I say that in the Quebec Act of 1774, and in the other Acts to which he refers, there is no mention of language. I have read those Acts as well as my hon. friend.

Mr. CANNON: When the hon. member read those Acts he may have read them in

the same way as the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) read the Ontario Act which was referred to in the discussion last night. I have read those documents, Mr. Chairman, and I say that from e very moment that the British troops were in this country victorious conventions or agreements were signed in the city of Montreal by the general commanding the British army and the general commanding the French army by which the rights of the French population were guaranteed from that very moment.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. gentleman does not say that "language" was mentioned.

Mr. CANNON: I say that at that time there was a mention of our laws, our religious customs and our language.

Mr. MORPHY: No, sir.

Mr. VIEN: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: At Paris the same thing was done. In 1774 when the Quebec Act was passed—my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Morphy) will not deny it—the customs existing in Lower Canada at that time as to laws, as to religion, and as to language, were secured by that Act. Let us go further, Mr. Chairman, in the history of our country; let us go to 1791 when the first Legislative Assembly was convened in Lower Canada. At that time—just as upon the present occasion in this Parliament—though nearly 150 years have elapsed—in the Legislative Assembly of Quebec in 1791 there were members like the hon. members for Frontenac, North Perth, and West Peterborough here, who thought that the rights of the French language should not exist. A gentleman by the name Eichardson got up and made a speech in which my hon. friend from Frontenac may have found all his arguments, the arguments he gave us to-night. This gentleman, Mr. Chairman, in 1791, wanted to treat the French people as an inferior race in their own country. But the question was settled in that year. I would ask the hon. members of this House to read the speeches delivered at that time when it was decided that the French language and the English language should be used in the Legislative Assembly as guaranteed by the existing laws.

The year 1840 gave us our next constitutional enactment. Lord Durham had come to Canada, and he thought that a good method of unifying Canada was to force the two races in this country to speak but one language. The recommendations of his report are well known; I will not take up the time of the House in enumerating them. Under the Union Act as passed the French language was excluded from the House of Parliament. What happened? The French people protested, and when Lafontaine, that great patriot from Quebec, became the Premier of Canada, and when the province of Ontario gave a real Liberal whose name was Baldwin—when Baldwin and Lafontaine formed the great ministry of the Union party, for in those days men came from Ontario who were not afraid of standing for equal rights and equal privileges for both races in this country, and when Baldwin supported Lafontaine, the Union Act was changed and the French language was restored to its former position in Canada. Ever since that day, Mr. Chairman, the beautiful and magnificent language of Racine, Corneille, and Molière has been heard, and heard legally, in our Houses of Parliament.

We now come to Confederation. We have had the British North America Act quoted in this House to-night by hon. gentlemen on both sides. The British North America Act, as you, Mr. Chairman, know, is the reproduction of the resolutions passed by the conference at Quebec in 1864, resolutions agreed to by the representatives of the provinces of Canada then convened in the city of Quebec—that is the provinces of Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec and Ontario—resolutions which were reconsidered at another conference held at Westminster Hotel in London; and finally these resolutions, after having been considered by the Canadian Parliament, were enacted and embodied in what is called to-day the British North America Act. There was one man in Canada who worked—and worked his very hardest—for the achievement of this great thing which we call Confederation, and that man was Sir John A. Macdonald, who had as his right hand man, as everybody knows, Sir George Etienne Cartier. In the House of Parliament at that time this question of language was raised. If hon. gentlemen will refer to the Confederation debates they will see that Hon. Mr. Evanturel rose in the House and asked what about the rights of the French language. "According to these resolutions, and according to the Act which will be passed by the Imperial Parliament, will the rights of the French language be secured and guaranteed?" These are the words spoken in reply by Sir John A. Macdonald, Father of Confederation, and the promoter of the British North America Act:

Hon. Attorney General Macdonald: I desire to say that I agree with my hon. friend that as it stands just now the majority governs; but in order to cure this, it was agreed at the conference to embody the provision in the Imperial Act. (Hear, hear.) This was proposed by the Canadian Government, for fear an accident might arise subsequently, and it was assented to by the deputation from each province that the use of the French language should form one of the principles upon which the Confederation should be established, and that its use, as at present, should be guaranteed by the Imperial Act. (Hear, hear.)

We have here, Mr. Chairman, an express declaration from the then Premier of our country to the effect that the Imperial Act, and the resolutions on which the Imperial Act is based, recognized as a fundamental principle of Confederation the privileges of the French language as they existed at the time of Confederation. For, at the time of Confederation, as no hon. member will deny, the French and English languages were the official languages in both Lower and Upper Canada.

The Bill now before us provides that the Chief Electoral Officer will receive the documents and papers from the returning officer presiding at an election in each constituency. These papers are to be kept of record and will remain in the hands of the Chief Electoral Officer for two years. The argument advanced by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) is that according to the British North America Act every parliamentary record has to be in French and in English; that this proclamation being a parliamentary record, should therefore be in English and French; and the clause as he said, should read simply that the proclamation will be issued, without mentioning in which language; then, according to the law it would mean that the proclamation would be printed both in English and in French.

I do not wish to detain the House much longer, but Mr. Chairman, I have heard arguments to-night which really astonished me. For instance, if I am not wrong, I heard an hon. gentleman say that if in other provinces the proclamations were issued in more than one language racial disunion would be promoted. During the recent war if any country gave to the rest of the world an example of national honour and of patriotic heroism that country was Belgium. In Belgium there are two official languages. When Belgium fought the invading Germans did the fact that she had two official languages prevent her soldiers from giving an example to the rest of the world which will never be forgotten? I think if Canada can do as well as Belgium in so far as national unity is concerned we can rest well satisfied.

As I said before, we are asking, not for privileges or for favours, but for rights. But, even though we were asking for favours or privileges, I think hon. gentlemen on the other side ought to be more generous than the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) seems to be. The French language is not a barbarian tongue. The fact that proclamations were printed in French in British Columbia, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, New Brunswick and the other provinces would not have a tendency to adversely affect the education of our population. Every man in Canada, if he wishes to be completely educated, ought, like the English people who are highly and completely educated to know both languages. In England no gentleman claims to be completely educated unless he speaks French. And every hon. member knows that most of the difficulties at the Peace Conferene arose from the fact that Mr. Wilson did not understand French.

The time has gone by when we should continue to fight over this language question. We have two races speaking two different languages. Let us admit the fact and let us legislate so as to meet the needs of these two races. Let us have laws that will promote the welfare of our people, and let us forget the past fights over these language and racial questions. The language which was good enough to serve Marshal Foch in the war to give the final orders which meant the victory of the Allies is good enough for any part of this country. I say that a language which is used on every official escutcheon of Canada or of England to show the national motto, Dieu et mon Droit, is good enough for every Canadian. Would the hon. member for Frontenac pretend that we ought to translate Dieu et mon Droit into English, or Honi soit qui mal y pense?

I think that the amendment as presented by my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) is fair and ought to carry, for it would be a good piece of legislation—legislation of a character to appease the agitation that now exists in certain sections of this Dominion.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I crave the indulgence of the House to make one statement as a matter of record since the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Cannon) and I very distinctly differ on one point. I make this statement, and I am prepared to submit to the humiliation of being shown I am wrong—if I am wrong,

—that in the terms of capitulation after the Battle of the Plains of Abraham; in the terms of capitulation one year later after the fall of Montreal; in the Peace of Paris of 1763; in the Quebec Act of 1774; in the Constitutional Act of 1791 there is not one single word in regard to language or language rights. Ample and generous provisions were made in some of those documents for safeguarding the interests of the Roman Catholic religion, but I repeat that not one word is to be found in any of those documents relative to language rights. I wish to add this further statement, that in the Act of Union of 1840, not only was there no mention of the French language or of the rights of that language, but that Act made distinct and specific provision that the records of the House should be printed in the English language, and the English language only; and that custom prevailed till several years after the Act of Union was passed.

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask the hon. member from Frontenac: Does he think my offer is a fair one? Since we cannot agree on the interpretation of that section, let us strike out the words in section 37 as I have suggested, and if the proclamation is published in English only, then we have a grievance, which we will bring before the courts, and the courts will give us an interpretation of the British North America Act.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is not necessary to adopt the hon. member's suggestion. I maintain that the clause as it is now and as it has existed for the last thirty or forty years is satisfactory to me, and I see no reason to change it. I do not believe it is in the best interests of the country to change it. If the hon. gentleman has a constitutional grievance, he has a constitutional remedy for the redress of that grievance.

Mr. VIEN: Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the clause as drafted is satisfactory to the hon. gentleman from Frontenac. As was so eloquently put by the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) there are two classes of people and two schools of thought in this House and in Canada—one broad-minded and the other narrow-minded. The minister said that some influence had been brought to bear upon him, and of such a nature that he was not able to bring about this amendment which would allow the Chief Electoral Officer to publish the proclamations in both languages. He did not say what this influence was. The hon. member for St. James—

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is my hon. friend referring to remarks of mine when he says that some influence was brought to bear upon me?

Mr. VIEN: I understand from what the member for St. James said that pressure was brought to bear upon the minister by some people who had prejudices against the French language, or some words to that effect.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did not say so, and I said nothing to that effect.

Mr. RINFRET: May I offer an explanation, Mr. Chairman? What I said was this: The other day the minister sympathized with our proposal; he said he had some sympathy with it and would take it into consideration. This afternoon when he came back he had nothing to offer, but he said: I am not prejudiced on this point, but other people are; therefore I am not disposed to amend the clause.

Mr. VIEN: I accept with pleasure the correction of the hon. member for St. James, but I think that it is to the same effect, if not technically in the same words. Now, Sir, the minister did not take the House into his confidence. He did not tell us who were the gentlemen in this House who were prejudiced against the use of the French language.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Now, Mr. Chairman, I must rise again. I never said that any members of this House were prejudiced. I distinctly deny it.

Mr. VIEN: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) said, if I take the words from my hon. friend (Mr. Rinfret)—

Mr. GUTHRIE: I rise to another point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. I must point out to the hon. member (Mr. Vien) that under our rules he is obliged to accept the statement of the minister, not that of any other hon. member.

Mr. VIEN: I will abide by your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman. If he did not say that other people were prejudiced, he said that he was not himself prejudiced, but notwithstanding that fact he could not stand by the amendment that he was so inclined to accept the other night. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, if not expressly, at least impliedly, he admitted that some other people were so prejudiced against the French language that he could not see his way clear

to have such an amendment accepted by his followers.

Mr. EDWARDS: He never said that he was inclined to accept the amendment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Perhaps I had better read the exact language that I used; I have it here from Hansard.

Mr. VIEN: That will make it clearer.

Mr. GUTHRIE: You will see that I made no reference to any member of this House. I quote:

> I am in no way prejudiced against the extension of the proclamation in the French language, but I know other people are. I know there are people who look upon the matter as a matter of constitutional right.

That is exactly the language I used.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: To whom was the minister referring?

Mr. GUTHRIE: To a large body of people in this country who think they have constitutional rights, just as my hon. friend thinks he has.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Was the minister not referring to some of the members?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, most distinctly not.

Mr. RINFRET: May I ask the minister—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I most distinctly say that I charged no hon. member of this House with prejudice.

Mr. RINFRET: May I ask the minister whether these people that he mentions are represented in the House?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I cannot say whether they are or are not represented in the House. But I charged no member of this House with being prejudiced. I think I am entitled to have my language
11 p.m. taken as I used it. I most certainly object to the statement made by my hon. friend that I was brought under some influence. It is a miserable statement to make about any man.

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister let me have the exact words that he used? He states that the statement that I have made is a miserable one.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. VIEN: Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear." The committee will compare what I have said with the satement made by the minister:

> Personally this is not a matter which appeals to me very strongly I am in no way prejudiced against the extension of the proclamation in the French language, but I know other people are.

An hon. MEMBER: Who are the "other people"?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. VIEN: Hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious to know who these other gentlemen are. So are we. So were we, rather,—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: We are not; we know.

Mr. VIEN: —because we know now.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Read on.

Mr. RINFRET: We have found out.

Mr. VIEN: The minister says further:

> I know there are people who look upon the matter as a matter of constitutional right. Consequently the law that has been efficient and satisfactory during the past thirty or forty years should not be interfered with.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. VIEN: Hon. gentlemen give applause.

Mr. CASGRAIN: We know who they are.

Mr. VIEN: We know who they are. More than that, we do not find in that which I have read, Sir, any correction or contradiction of the statement that I made a minute ago. And if somebody made a miserable—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. VIEN: If somebody made a miserable statement, it was not I in stating, as I did, that the hon. gentleman said that there was somebody who was prejudiced.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Now, Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. My hon. friend is persisting in making his statement over again and in justifying language which he was ordered to withdraw. What I object to in his statement is that he charged me with having said that members of this House were prejudiced. I denied that. He said also that I had been brought under some influence in regard to this matter, and I denied that.

Mr. VIEN: The hon. minister said that he did not say that somebody was prejudiced. I say that from his own words—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. GUTHRIE: He had better be honest about it.

The CHAIRMAN: The minister has just declared for the third time that he denies

absolutely having said that any hon. member of this House was prejudiced against the publication of the proclamation in the French language. That statement the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien) must accept.

Mr. VIEN: I accept the declaration of the hon. gentleman so far as members of this House are concerned.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is all I object to.

Mr. VIEN: But I contend that so far as the rest of my statement is concerned the declaration of the minister is no correction or contradiction of my statement. I take his very words and I say you can draw from them no other inference than that somebody is prejudiced against the use of the French language in this country. But, Sir, this is no surprise to us.

This is not the first time that we have heard in this House and outside of it of gentlemen endeavouring to restrict the use of the French language as it has hitherto been in use. We have had, in many instances, outspoken declarations from hon. gentlemen opposite as well as from people in various parts of this country, endeavouring to liken the French-Canadian group to some kind of Indian, the Six Nations, or the Hurons, or the Crees of the western provinces.

Mr. BURNHAM: That is not correct.

Mr. VIEN: The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) says that is not correct.

Mr. MORPHY: No, the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). The hon. gentleman is a little narrow tonight.

Mr. VIEN: In many sections of this country there are schools of thought which hold that the use of the French language should not only not be extended, but should be restricted, and that the rights which have been enjoyed by the French-Canadian population should be taken away from them, or at least that those rights should be confined to the province of Quebec, just as reserves are set aside for the Indian tribes of this country. Some hon. gentlemen contend that what I say is not true; that no members of this House are opposed to the exercise of those rights; that no section of this country has a tendency to restrict the rights which have been enjoyed by the French-Canadian population hitherto. We have seen some of those hon. gentlemen, the very hon. gentlemen who tried to restrict such use, declare themselves to be the defenders of the French-Canadian students who could not get a sufficient education. May I be permitted to cite, for instance, a declaration by the hon. member for Toronto West (Mr. Hocken), as cited in the Citizen of the 6th March? The hon. gentleman said:

> We are fighting the battles of the French-Canadian boy and girl.

The hon. member at that time was fighting the battles of the French-Canadian boy and girl. What did this hon. gentleman say under his signature in a document which has been, to his knowledge or not, widely circulated?—a document which is headed: "(Strictly confidential.) To be referred to or read only within the tiled doors of lodge, chapter or preceptory. Report of the Joint Legislation Committee of the Orange Order." This is signed by two members of the House, amongst others and it deals with the very question now under consideration, the use of the French language in the various provinces. The document reads:

> Acting in hearty co-operation, as we always do, our own order, through its M.W. Grand Master, Dr. Ellis, and the Royal Black Knights, through their Grand Master, Bro. A. A. Gray, issued an appeal to both memberships to use every legitimate means to secure the support of the members of Parliament in every constituency for the Military Service Act and the War-time Elections Act. We must see to it that the safeguards of this Election Act are not thrown away when the war is over.
>
> We are urging the Government to see to it that people who, by reason of peace treaties at the close of the war may be entitled to come here from alien countries, should not be enfranchised at all, until they can read and write in the English language and until they sign a document agreeing to obey our laws, learn the English language, have it efficiently taught in their schools, and to forfeit all their property and civil rights and be liable to deportation on conviction of failure in these matters.

Further on the document says:

> We have, at the request of our Prince Edward Island brethren, secured the legal opinion of two eminent lawyers on the question of the right to use French in the schools of that province. We believe the opinion will greatly help out Island brethren in their fight against French aggression.
>
> It has become quite apparent that the school situation in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Alberta must be thoroughly investigated, and our brethren in each of these provinces, assisted by legal advice, organization and investigation, so that effective steps may be taken to put an end to Rome's tactics in using French in schools wherever she can.
>
> No doubt you have all read how at the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Convention the tac-

tics of Rome to secure separate schools, bilingual teaching, and other special favours, was triumphantly defeated by the union of the Orangemen, the Sons of England and other loyalists.

This document is absolutely the exposition of the policies of the Orange Order as regards the use of the French language. It says further:

We have notified the Government that the 446 French signs on post offices outside of Quebec, and the 859 bilingual post office signs, also outside of Quebec, must all be removed, as we believe such signs, with any other language on them,—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must call my hon. friend to order on two grounds. The first ground is that the document which he is now reading to the committee is not strictly relevant to the clause under consideration. If I were wrong in that, however, there is a rule which prohibits absolutely the reading of any lengthy document twice during the same session. The House has already been favoured with a complete reading of the document which the hon. member holds in his hand. It will be found complete in Hansard at page 262 (unrevised edition.) I shall, therefore, have to ask the hon. member to desist from repeating it.

Mr. BOYCE: Let him read it.

Mr. VIEN: I will abide by your ruling, Sir, but if this document was read during this session, I will make use of it to illustrate the fact that there is a class of gentlemen in this country, and there are some hon. members in this House, who believe that the use of the French language should be restricted. In answer to the hon. member for West Peterborough, who said it was not true that the French Canadians were considered as Indians in some parts of this country, and that the province of Quebec was not looked upon as a reserve for them, let me quote from this document with which the committee is cognizant, these words:

Permit us to remark here that every French Canadian who comes to Ontario to take the place of the "White Men"—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should not attempt to defy the Chair. He should submit to it or appeal from the ruling.

Mr. VIEN: I do not intend either to defy the Chair or to appeal from the ruling, but I think I am quite within the rules of the House in citing in support of my contention a line or two from a document which has been read. The line which I intended to cite—

The CHAIRMAN: I asked the hon. member to desist from repeating what has already been discussed in the House during a previous debate of the same session, and I must insist upon that ruling.

Mr. VIEN: Is it the ruling of the Chair that I cannot quote from this document for the purpose of supporting my argument?

The CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the Chair is that the hon. member cannot refer to anything said or done in a previous debate during the same session; a rule necessary to economize the time of the committee and a restraint upon members to prevent them from reviving a debate when already concluded.

Mr. VIEN: I shall abide by your ruling, Sir, but I might refer hon. gentlemen to the document to establish the fact that French Canadians were accused of taking the place of white men in Ontario and it was declared they should be sent back to Quebec. If we take the place of white men, that implies that we are not white men, and if we are not white men, we are Indians. That is the argument that I wanted to make on this point—that some gentlemen not only wish to restrict the use of the French language, but to assimilate us to the Indians in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. VIEN: Does not this document say that we have taken the place of white men in Ontario and that we should be sent back to Quebec?

Mr. DAVIDSON: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member's remarks are not relevant to the clause under discussion.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: That is a fine speech.

The CHAIRMAN: The point of order just raised is that the remarks of the hon. member are not relevant to the clause under discussion. I have already drawn the attention of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) to that point. I understand that he has accepted the ruling and is coming back to the subject under discussion.

Mr. VIEN: I made the statement that the French Canadians were in some sections of this country assimilated to Indians, and I referred to the document which you, Sir, prevented me from reading. If I cannot read it I can at all events refer hon. gentlemen opposite to that document in which they will find that the French Canadians

are accused of taking the place of white men in Ontario, and it says that we should be sent back to our Indian reserve, that is to say, the province of Quebec.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is it not true also that in certain sections of the country some English Canadians were referred to as worse than Huns? I do not think either one was taken very seriously, but is it not a fact?

Mr. VIEN: If I entered upon the ground on which the hon. member is trying to draw me, I would be called to order by the Chair for irrelevancy.

Mr. EDWARDS: I think you would.

Mr. VIEN: If the hon. member admits that, surely his question must have been irrelevant and out of order?

Mr. EDWARDS: Out of order, but not irrelevant.

Mr. VIEN: We are just emerging from a great war, and we are facing almost absolutely new conditions. We are trying in many parts of this country to develop this great Canada of ours to the best of our ability. Who will say that the population of the province of Quebec under 150 years of British rule has not done its share in the development of the natural resources of this country? We had an immense section of this country left to us. We tried to develop it. We tried to imbue our children with respect for law and order, and I think we have been successful in obtaining results. I think there is no section of this country which has done more for the development of Canada than the province of Quebec. It is now for us to decide whether we intend to live in harmony and in co-partnership, on an equal footing with our brothers and co-citizens of the other provinces. The people of the other provinces do not fully understand the mentality and the mind of the French Canadians. If we are willing to work for the development of this country in harmony with our co-citizens of other provinces, at the same time we absolutely refuse to be absorbed or to receive the stamp of any other character than we now possess. We consider that we are true Canadians. If we are true Canadians we should be Canadians not only in the province of Quebec but outside of the province of Quebec. We should not be received in other provinces as foreigners or as chasers of white men. We should be received as partners, and co-workers in the development of this country no matter where we come from, and the rights and privileges which were granted by Confederation should not be restricted, but the constitution should be carried on in spirit and in letter. How can hon. gentlemen from other provinces expect that we shall harmoniously work in sympathy with them when every time any one of our fellow-citizens of French origin goes beyond the limits of the province of Quebec he is treated as an alien, an undesirable, the enemy of the white man and as one who should be sent back to the reserve in the province of Quebec? Every time a group of Canadians of French origin go beyond the limits and boundaries of the province of Quebec and wish to develop the teaching of their maternal tongue, not at the expense of other people but at their own expense, they are restricted by that very narrow-minded class of people to which my hon. friend the Acting Solicitor General was referring when he said that some people in this country were prejudiced against the French language.

We must not be considered an inferior race, because we are not an inferior race. We must not be considered as being here by favouritism, because we are here by right. If others want our co-operation they must cater to our sympathy, they must treat us as we treat others,—they must apply to us the same methods that we use towards the English-speaking minority of the province of Quebec. We are ready to co-operate to make of this Canada of ours a great and prosperous country, but it seems to me that it is not the true patriotic spirit which inspires hon. gentlemen when they attempt to prevent 150,000 French-Canadians in the Maritime Provinces from having the proclamations under this Act published in their own maternal tongue. What would be the objection, what harm could be done, by publishing them in French and English? None. Only this system of restriction, this spirit of antagonism to the French language could inspire the refusal from the treasury benches to accept the amendment. Those who inspire such restrictions are not the best of Canadians.

Mr. MORPHY: I have heard the hon. gentleman state several times that some one has referred to the French Canadians as being Indians who should be sent back to the reserve, but I did catch the authority that the hon. gentleman had for making that statement. Who said it? When? And where?

Mr. VIEN: The chairman of this committee prevented me from reading the document. I will refer the hon. gentleman for my authority to a document already on

record in this House and which was put on Hansard at the very opening of this session.

Mr. MORPHY: What were the words, please?

Mr. VIEN: The words were that French Canadians who went to Ontario to take the places of the white men should be sent back to the province of Quebec. I said that these words, that French Canadians had taken the places of white men, impliedly meant that the French Canadians who went to Ontario were not white men and that consequently, if they were not white men, they were Indians.

Mr. MORPHY: That is your inference.

Mr. VIEN: I admit, that was an inference.

Mr. MORPHY: They might have been of some other colour than that of Indians.

Mr. VIEN: The hon. gentleman may draw his inference for himself, but I think that common sense and the meaning of plain English will show that a native of this country who is not a white man is a red man and is an Indian by birth. I do not think there is any other imputation that could be made or any other inference that could be drawn from this statement. I consequently say, Sir, that to my mind the minister should accept one or other of the remedies which were proposed to him. I fail to see how any serious objection can be raised to the use of the French language in the proclamations that are going to be issued under this Act except those which might be urged by that narrow-minded view which inspires some sections of this country and the adoption of which surely will not be beneficial to Canada. Therefore I think the minister should accept one or other of these amendments.

Mr. HOCKEN: I hope to be able to make a few remarks without you, Mr. Chairman, being under the necessity of calling me to order. I had no intention of speaking to the question, and I would not have done so but for the reference of the last speaker (Mr. Vien) to myself and his remarkable straining and effort to read into the reasonable opposition to the unlimited extension of the French language over Canada a hatred of the French race. I want to say to my hon. friend that there has never been any effort made in this House, from Confederation until the present day, by any person, to restrict the use of the French language to any narrower bounds than those which were set forth by the Constitution of this country. I submit that if my hon. friend and those who sit with him have any desire to promote harmony they will be willing to observe the Constitution in that regard. If they had any larger rights than those which they possess there would be no objection from any province in Canada to going to the full limit that was permitted to them under the Constitution. There is no hatred of the French language, and there is no hatred of the French race. On the contrary, we of the province of Ontario have the very kindliest feelings for the French, but we say that their leaders, one of whom we have listened to to-night, are in the habit of doing—what the hon. gentleman has been doing for the last half hour—their very best to provoke discord between the two races. He has strained and stretched every argument that he could imagine or think of, even charging us with calling the French people Indians, something I never heard of in my life, something I have absolutely no sympathy with and something that I would have resented if I had heard it; but he would put such a phrase as that into the mouths of the people of Ontario. Why? Surely not for the purpose of promoting harmony in this country. If that is his idea of harmony I must say that his education has been seriously neglected on that point.

Mr. VIEN: Will the hon. gentleman tell me what meaning he put upon that phrase which he signed to the effect that French Canadians who took the places of white men in Ontario should be sent back to Quebec?

Mr. HOCKEN: I dealt with that when it was introduced into this House and I do not propose to deal with it again. But I want to repeat my statement that I have no sympathy with any such suggestions as he made in this House, that French Canadians should be regarded—

Mr. VIEN: Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOCKEN: No. He seems to object that we should have any regard for the young boys and girls of French Canada. If we have anything that we think is better than they have why should we not give it to them? Why should we not desire above everything else that in Quebec and in every other province of Canada a high type of civilization should prevail and if we have something that is better than what they have why should we not offer it to them?

We have contended at times, Mr. Chairman, that the educational system of Quebec is not such as the French boys and

girls should have, that it did not fit them, or rather fit the masses of the people for the higher employments of life. Now if we were antagonistic, and had any feeling of hatred to the French race we would not take any action at all; we would let the French race be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. But we take the ground that this can never be a great and powerful country unless education is widely diffused, and that every boy and girl—no matter where they are or what language they speak—shall have a complete education that will fit them to take high places in this country. If my hon. friend objects to that, then I submit he is objecting to the very kindliest instincts that to-day are entertained with regard to his race. It is not, as my hon. friend suggests, that we object to French Canadians coming into the province of Ontario; but it is that we object to them coming in and bringing certain peculiar customs that, among the provinces of Canada, prevail only in the province of Quebec, and seeking to establish in those other provinces institutions that are foreign to the temper of the people, and—I want to say to him—institutions that they will resist as long as they have any power to do so. The province of Quebec is large enough, Mr. Chairman, to comfortably contain three or four times the population that it accommodates to-day. If my hon. friend desires for his people that they shall carry their customs with them wherever they go, then I say the only way to do that is for them to fill up the unsettled areas of their own province. Then they can live under their parish system, then they can enjoy all these peculiar laws which seem to please them, and there will be no word of protest uttered from any quarter whatever. No man has ever proposed that the people of the other provinces should go down into Quebec and alter the laws of that province —the educational law or any other. There has never been any attack made upon the province of Quebec since Confederation; it has always been in the other direction; there has been one constant agitation in this country for fifty years to get additional privileges for the French language, and for the establishment of these customs to which we object.

Now my hon. friend wants these proclamations printed all over Canada in French as well as in English. Let me point out a most serious objection to that which I have not yet heard mentioned. In every western province there is to-day the very strongest sentiment against bilingualism whether it has reference to Polish, German, Austrian or French. The people of Western Canada want to speak one language from the Great Lakes to the Pacific ocean. They have made great headway in teaching the Polish, the Ruthenian, and the children of other nationalities, the English language which is the language of this country, especially of that part of Canada. Now let it be said, Sir, by federal enactment, that there is another language than English which has a special provilege or a special standing in this country, and you strengthen and encourage all the racial agitations that have been carried on in the western provinces for the last fifteen or twenty years, and you nullify the effects of the splendid work that has been done by the Government of Hon. T. C. Norris in Manitoba, where they have established a system of schools by which every child—whether Austrian, German, or any other nationality learns the English language and upon attaining the age of twelve can go out into the market place and do business in the language of this country. I want to tell the hon. gentleman the moment he introduces another language into Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia he only gives encouragement to that multitude of foreigners of various languages to carry on their agitation. They will say: "Aha, there is another language that is recognized. All we have to do is to keep fighting and we will get that privilege for ourselves." The most natural thing in the world, Mr. Chairman, for them to say. And, instead of promoting harmony in the West, it would set up a state of discord that would be very difficult to allay or remove. That, in my judgment, is one of the cardinal reasons for objecting to the use of the French or any other language than English in these proclamations. Not only that, but go down into the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. There, in spite of the law, French schools are being operated; the law is openly defied by the operation of bilingual schools. A very large part of the population object to that, but this kind of a proclamation would only give those schools additional standing.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that a clause in the Franchise Act that was good enough for Sir Wilfrid Laurier ought to be good enough for my hon. friends opposite. Sir Wilfrid Laurier did not put the French language on an equality with the English language in the election proclamations. Why did he not do that? There are only

two reasons that I can think of: One was he knew it would be an unconstitutional act, and the other was that he feared, or hesitated, to antagonize that sentiment which would be offended by the spreading of French proclamations all over the province of Ontario. But my hon. friends opposite want that done, knowing full well that this Government could not do any one thing that would so incense the people of the province of Ontario against them as to spread French proclamations all over that province.

Mr. VIEN: Why would they be incensed?

Mr. HOCKEN: For this reason: We know in the province of Ontario that for fifty years the French leaders have been trying to get exactly what they are trying to get here to-night—further official recognition for their language beyond the limits of the constitution,—and the people of the provinces outside of Quebec will not have that if they can prevent it. They want the French language to stand where it is under the British North America Act. They will not endeavour to curtail it any more than it is curtailed by that Act, but they say they are not going to permit if they can prevent it, any further extensions in the other provinces. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was not prepared to face the probable loss of votes that would certainly have taken place in Ontario if he had spread French proclamations over the country. It was either that, Sir, or because he knew that to do so would be absolutely unconstitutional.

It is quite true, as my hon. friends opposite say, that we have two races in this country, which races they tell us must live together. If that is so, Mr. Chairman, it can only be by each respecting the rights of the other. Neither can deprive the other of any rights that they have under the constitution; and when one race gets special privileges that infringes upon the rights of the other race, then I say they are taking sure and certain steps to create discord in this Dominion. There is a way that my hon. friends can promote harmony in this country: It is by standing upon those guarantees for their language, for their customs, and for the protection of their religion—for everything that they have in Quebec—standing right where they were put in 1867. I want to tell my hon. friends that Confederation could never have been formed unless the leaders in the province of Quebec had consented to the terms that are embodied in the Confederation Act to-day. The representatives from the other parts of this country would not have conceded anything more than they did concede,—and he knows that as well as I do. It was not Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George Cartier who together brought about Confederation: the late George Brown and other men had something to do with it, and they exercised their influence, which influence was all exerted to restrict the use of the French language to where it is to-day; and where it is to-day, Mr. Chairman, is where it ought to stay—it is where it must stay unless my hon. friends opposite intend to cause more serious disruption in this country.

They talk about us people in Ontario being prejudiced against the French language. I resent that statement; we have no prejudice against the French language. But I do not think we need more than the exhibition we have had to-night to prove, Sir, that there is a very distinct prejudice on the other side in favour of the French language. Its supporters are trying to push it in where it has no right to be. They are trying, as did the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), to strain language to prove that this election proclamation is a "record" of the House. A more absurd argument I think I never heard. An election proclamation is a record of an election, but it is not a record of this House, and could not be construed in that way. But it is that everlasting straining of every point that comes up, to force further language concessions, that creates all the difficulty between the two races. I appeal to my hon. friends to accept the Act of Confederation as it stands. Let them be as loyal to it as we are in Ontario, and there will be no trouble between these two provinces.

The hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) made a proposition that we should leave out all mention of languages so that he could have a grievance. Why is he looking for a grievance? No one over here has been asking for a grievance—something to be done that would give us a chance to go to the courts. I think that we on this side of the House have shown an entirely different spirit. Besides, if my hon. friend wants to go to the courts, and if, as he argues, an election proclamation is a record of this House, then he can go to the courts and have it so declared; and having it so declared he will get what he wants. The way is open for him to take some particular action to get what he wants

under circumstances that would be more profitable to him and some of his friends in their election contests.

Someone said that a great many women could not read the English language although their husbands could. Well, their husbands can tell them what is in the proclamation. And if those women are living in an English-speaking province they ought to learn to speak English, it ought to be part of their education, if they are ever to be in a position to deal with the people of the province in which they live. I know very well that if I were living in the province of Quebec I would learn to speak the French language. I know that any of my friends who go down to Quebec for any length of time soon learn French, for they must be able to speak and write it in order to do business. Those who come to our province ought to learn our language, and it is no excuse to say that they cannot learn it, and that therefore they must have proclamations of this kind printed in their mother tongue.

I submit that not a single argument has been advanced to-night as to why this clause should not stand exactly as it is. If anything, the use of the French language should be prohibited in Manitoba. We have not argued that; we might have done so. I submit that point to prove that we are not looking for a grievance, we are not looking for a quarrel; all the grievances have been sought on the other side, and all the quarrels are being started there. Then some over-zealous gentleman will stand up and declaim against us for making inroads upon their rights because we are merely refusing to grant them privileges beyond those which their leaders in the most solemn manner fixed in the constitution. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the clause should carry.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My only regret is, Mr. Chairman, that on this vexed question of language one should have to rely upon treaties or statutory enactments in order to give the minority what it claims is but a natural right. The committee will understand that a minority is always jealous, as might be expected, of the rights it enjoys. And when one listens to such arguments as that which we have just been privileged to hear, it is quite natural that the minority would feel somewhat nervous and anxious if it were left to the tender mercies of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hocken). Why, my hon. friend has just exhibited the spirit which animates him in this discussion by stating very coolly that the section should remain as it is, but that if it were amended he might only amend it in such a way as to eliminate the Manitoba law.

My hon. friend says: But the section has been on the statute books for thirty years and has never been challenged; therefore you should be satisfied with it. Sir, I have yet to learn that there is any statute of Limitations against a natural right—because I am not advocating at the present moment a statutory enactment, nor am I advocating rights which one would enjoy by virtue of a treaty. I know by experience what I can expect from certain people when my treaty rights are at stake.

My hon. friend, lording it over us with a superior air, has condescended to lecture the minority. He has compared the respective educational systems of the great province of Ontario and the province of Quebec. I shall not, Mr. Chairman, attempt to answer the arguments of the hon. gentleman, for I know it would be a hopeless task to convince him that at least—at least we are not his inferiors, that at least we should be on a footing of equality.

Mr. HOCKEN: Quite right.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I shall not for one moment argue that my fellowmen are better than the hon. gentleman's electors; or that the province of Quebec has any educational system superior to that in vogue in the province of Ontario. But would my hon. friend accept the testimony, not of a French Canadian, nor of a Roman Catholic, but the statement of a sturdy Scotch Canadian—and Presbyterian, I suppose? I refer to Sir Andrew MacPhail.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Am I right in saying that he is a good Scotch Canadian?

Mr. McMASTER: You could not speak and give him higher praise.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Not long ago Sir Andrew MacPhail addressed a letter to the London Spectator in answer to such statements as have been made this afternoon—statements made in a letter written by a Mr. Stutfield to the London Spectator. I will quote a few sentences of Sir Andrew MacPhail's letter. Remember, Sir Andrew MacPhail is a Professor of McGill University. He hails from the Maritime Provinces; yes he is a son of little Prince Edward Island. In answering the slanderous statement made by Mr. Stutfield he said:

The percentage of school attendance in Quebec is the highest in Canada; crime is the

least prevalent. The allegation that "the 'habitant' of Quebec is hopelessly outclassed by Protestant Canadians in trades and professions" is exactly wrong. Quebec has the most productive farms, the most thrifty and contented workmen, the most successful industries, the most efficient public services in America. Quebec professional men have dominated the Government ever since Confederation by reason of their superior education alone. Within the present month a sum of five million dollars has been raised by voluntary subscriptions for the new French University. By an appeal to the documents all these facts have been verified. The provincial treasurer, himself an English Protestant, will supply them. Of the less specific charges against Quebec I can offer only an opinion, but it is based upon observations extending over a period of thirty years. The people of Quebec—

Will my hon. friend listen to this?

The people of Quebec are most tolerant of all kinds of education and forms of religion, the least tolerant of fanaticism; they are the best-tempered and the most mannered; the least disposed to interfere with personal liberty; the most stalwart and independent in politics; the most careful in administering justice to rich as well as poor. Quebec is the only place in America which has successfully resisted the emissaries of evil from the labour world of Europe and United States. Quebec is the last refuge in America of good order and political sense. Lastly, the only two churches in Canada which do not "interfere in politics" are the Catholic Church and the Church of Scotland.

I shall not delay the committee by commenting upon this opinion expressed by Sir Andrew MacPhail, but it is a good answer to the rather sneering remarks made by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken). My hon. friend claims that he is a promoter of harmony in this country. I wish my hon. friend, in seeking to attain his end, would adopt different means. As one who reads the Orange Sentinel from week to week all the year round, I say, Sir, that my hon. friend is one of the most notorious, one of the most dangerous firebrands that this country has ever known. Yet he is all courtesy; he is all fine manners in the House; he always speaks with a smile on his face. But the moment he dips his pen into the ink bottle, why, the Roman Catholic church, the French-Canadian population, the province of Quebec, all ought to be wiped out from the Dominion of Canada. Is he a promoter of harmony and of good will? My hon. friend ought to reside for a few months, perhaps for a few years, in the good old province of Quebec; there he would learn what is tolerance, what is concord, what is harmony. We have no difficulties with our English-speaking friends. My hon. friend has only one objective with his paper, that is, to promote disunion and discord in Canada; in other words, to make of Ontario the Ulster of Canada. Why should we import into Canada the troubles, the ills, the miseries and the woes of the Old World? You shall not make an Ireland of Canada. Now, let us come to the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have answered the arguments of my hon. friend from West Toronto and I think I have been fair with him. The arguments that I have used are not mine; I have quoted from the letter of a fellow-Canadian of a different race and creed from mine.

Now, the amendment which has been proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Turgeon) is, I contend, a most reasonable one, and it has been presented in a moderate way. If the committee does not think that it should accept this amendment in its present form, I for one, although I think that it smacks to much of a concession, would be ready to accept, for the sake of harmony, the proviso suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding). And the committee should, I think, respond to the noble appeal made in such a moderate way by my hon. friend. Is it possible that in a British legislature any one should question the common sense interpretation of section 133 of the British North America Act? My hon. friend says that the proclamation fixing the day of the election, fixing the place where the polls are to be located, is not a "record;" it is only part of the record of the election. I contend that the spirit of section 133 is that any federal document must be printed in both languages. The language spoken in this House, the language printed in the statute books, in the Canada Gazette, in the journals and in the records of this House, must be French and English alike. Any member elected to this House may be challenged to appear before a committee of the House if it should appear that gross irregularities or frauds have been committed in that election. I have in mind the Elgin election case, and if I delve into past history, I have in mind the Kamouraska election case, where the returning officer, and other officers who had attended to the elections in those particular cases were summoned before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and there the documents of the elections were filed, the proclamation was filed—

Mr. GUTHRIE: That surely proves nothing. Any other document may be filed in

this House. Any committee that has power, may call for documents.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It proves that they are part of the records of the House, so much so that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is obliged by law to keep under his control during a certain period of time, I forget how long, perhaps a year, or at least six months,—

Mr. MORPHY: One year, two years.

Mr. LEMIEUX: —the election records. They are part of the archives, the records, of the House.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery who has hitherto been required to keep these documents was never an officer of this House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is he not a federal officer?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, a federal officer of the Crown, not of the House of Commons.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Hair-splitting.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I know this is a legal point, but the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was always, from the days of Cromwell down to the present, an officer apart from the House; he was the Clerk of the Crown as opposed to the Clerk of the Houses of Parliament. I point this out because technically documents in his custody would not be documents of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who appoints the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Governor in Council.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is, the Dominion Government appoints the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and if he had to be appointed by the Civil Service Commission, he would have to know one of the two languages.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My point is only that, strictly speaking, he is not an officer of this House, if my hon. friend is arguing that point.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend will allow me to say that I take this in argument as a mere quibble. It is unworthy of the minister and of the traditions of the great party to which he once belonged.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The hon. member cannot laugh an argument down in that way. There is the fact, if my hon. friend is going to argue upon the point of custody. That is the fact; let my hon. friend argue on that point. To attempt to laugh down the argument will not affect it in any way.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Any document from the Dominion Government—when I say Dominion Government, I speak of officers appointed by the Dominion Government—must be printed in both languages, the Canada Gazette just as well as any other document.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Why, as a minister of the Crown, did the hon. member not insist on this being done before?

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is no statute of limitations against natural rights. If this clause passed unnoticed before my eyes during the last twenty-five years that I have been a member of this House, I plead guilty to that; but is that a reason or an argument why I should not plead that the clause should be amended in order to make it constitutional? The question was never raised before, it is true; but the question being raised to-night, and this being a right, why should I be prevented from advocating the restitution of that right, especially when it is demonstrated that in many constituencies there is a grievance and in many others there is the possibility of a grievance? Would my hon. friend refuse to that minority which is under a grievance the remedy which is at hand by amending this section? Surely my hon. friend has a more tender heart than that. What can he gain by refusing to give back to the minority what has not been claimed during the past twenty-five years? My hon. friend is interested in having a clean election; we are all interested in having the people of this country understand the meaning of the election, the whys and the wherefores of the election. We are only asking Parliament to enlighten the minority which does not understand one language. Oh, but, we are told, foreigners, immigrants who have come to Canada, might just as well claim the same privilege. That is a very poor argument,—if it be intended as argument. The Galicians, the Germans—who by the way are better treated in Ontario than are the French Canadians—the Austrians, the Russians, were all immigrants who came to this country, knowing full well that their language had here, no special status. They knew the law of the land, and in the immigration leaflets issued by the Department of Immigration, those immigrants were told that English and French were the only two official languages of the land. Therefore, when they reached Canada and accepted the bounty of the Government in the form of thousands of acres of land in the western prairies, they knew full well

that their language had no special status. The case is surely different with your fellow-members of French descent.

I said a moment ago that I regret the spirit which was evinced this evening on the part of some hon. gentlemen as they approached this question. I know this is a vexed and delicate problem. No one cares to discuss those awkward questions. But, Sir, as I said a moment ago, the minority is always jealous of its rights and of its privileges, and it has reason to be nervous when we hear language such as we have heard this evening. Do you believe, Mr. Chairman, that this country can strive for peace and harmony, and therefore for progress and success from a national point of view, if at every moment the constitutional rights of the minority are challenged as they are being challenged by some members of this House. If that system prevails, you will not succeed in restoring harmony in this country, and God knows it needs harmony and concord. I have been in England, and not very long ago I was asked to speak of Canada from the French-Canadian point of view by the President of the Empire Parliamentary Association. I said, "I have no mandate. I occupy no official position in my country which justifies your invitation, but if you insist I will accept. I will not distribute flowers and laurels. I will speak the truth." I was answered, "Sir, we expect you to speak the truth, and we are anxious to know the truth about Canada."

Mr. HOCKEN: And did you?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, Sir, I spoke the truth; and let me tell my hon. friend I would repeat here what I said in London in the hearing of the Speaker. Speaking in St. Stephen's Hall in London I gave an outline of the treatment which for the last twenty-five years has been meted out to the French-Canadian minority in the province of Ontario and in the province of Manitoba. And, Sir, next morning, to my surprise, I found that the great organ of public opinion in Great Britain, the London Times, approved with one reservation only, every word that I had said, and expressed regret, if not shame, that fellow-members of the British Empire were treated as they were in the province represented by my hon. friend from West Toronto. The press of Great Britain re-echoed the comments of the London Times, and statesmen of all parties, Whigs and Tories, Unionists and Coalitionists, all approved of my language. I can give a list of the guests who were present at that dinner. Mr. Chairman, when, during that address, I stated, for instance, that just prior to the war the French-Canadian minority in the province of Ontario had been deprived of a privilege enjoyed since time immemorial—a privilege that was maintained in favour of the German minority—I was interrupted by this exclamation, "Is that possible in the province of Ontario?" I said "It is a fact."

Mr. HOCKEN: They did not know conditions as well as we know them.

Mr. CASGRAIN: You know too much.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Ignorance, thou art bliss! I shall at any time of the year and at any hour of the day take the judgment of plain John Bull of England in preference to the judgment of my hon. friend.

My hon. friend the Acting Solicitor General a moment ago questioned my statement as to the status of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Here is what I find in Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure, page 188:

> The Office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, consisting of three permanent officers and such temporary clerks as may be required from time to time. The clerk of the Crown in chancery is always present at the table of the House of Commons, at the commencement of a new parliament, and hands to the clerk the roll, or return book, which contains the list of members elected to serve in the parliament. In conformity with law he issues writs for elections, makes certificates to the house, in due form, of the return of members. and performs other functions relating to elections. He attends the house with election returns, and amends the same, when so ordered. The various proclamations, summoning, proroguing, and dissolving parliament, are issued by command out of chancery. He is also required to attend in the Senate Chamber at the close of a session, or whenever his Excellency the governor general gives the royal assent to bills, the titles of which it is the duty of this officer to read. From the foregoing summary of this officer's duties it will be seen that, while he is appointed by the Crown to perform certain duties by its command in connection with elections, and also to attend in the upper house on the occasion of the exercise of certain royal prerogatives, he is also an officer of the House of Commons. He must obey its orders to lay on the Table election returns in his possession and even alter them at its direction. The office was formerly specially attached to the privy council, but is now directly under the jurisdiction of the House of Commons.

That disposes of the argument of my hon. friend of a moment ago.

One word more and I am done. I am too old in public life to raise any racial, sentimental, or religious issue, but I feel too much the dignity of my race to tolerate any slurs against it, especially when I know its history. I know too much of politics to be wedded in any slavish fashion to any party.

I am more of a Canadian than I am a Liberal, although I believe, Mr. Chairman, that being a good Liberal means being a good Canadian. I appeal to my fellow-members as fellow-Canadians to stop listening to such arguments as we have heard this evening from my hon. friend from West Toronto, my hon. friend from Frontenac, and my hon. friend from North Perth. Will the Government of Canada, if they want to be strong, accept at any little breeze the dictation of a few firebrands? Surely the Government of Canada has more dignity and more moral courage than that! Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend from West Toronto expresses the hope that Quebec and the French Canadians and their institutions, educational and otherwise, may improve in the years to come—no doubt by contact with him and the institutions he represents. I believe, Sir, that a great deal can be done by daily contact between the two great races of this Dominion. I believe—and this has always been the ideal of my life; it has been my guiding star—that we have to learn one from the other. We must respect each other's virtues, we must respect, as stated this afternoon so wisely by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), even our respective failings and prejudices. But, above all, we must be Canadians. No one should hope that the minority in this country shall learn it all from the other. Surely that is not a healthy sentiment, and if perchance the hon. member for West Toronto believes that, with his narrow views and bigoted policies, as expressed in his paper, he can dispose of the so-called French-Canadian peril, he is completely at sea. Forgetting the intellectual point of view, forgetting the history of the French-Canadians, forgetting their natural aptitudes to be something and somebody in this Canada of ours, let him remember these essential facts. At the time of the conquest in 1763 there were 65,000 French Canadians in Canada; at the time of the Union in 1840 there were about 500,000; in 1867 at the time of Confederation a little over 1,000,000; Sir, at the next census there will be at least 2,500,000 sturdy Canadians of French descent from one end of the country to the other, and there are over 1,000,000 of the same stock in the United States of America. If it be true that a healthy, law-abiding and God-fearing people can double its numbers every thirty years, I predict to the hon. member for West Toronto and to his compeers in Toronto that in thirty years from 1921 his sons, or his grandsons, will awaken to find that there are 5,000,000 French-Canadian people. In sixty years his grandsons will find, by the same process of the doubling of population every thirty years, that there are in Canada 10,000,000 French-Canadians, faithful to their Church, to their institutions, aye faithful to their language, assuredly because they thrive on persecution. Therefore it is useless, it is in vain, for my hon. friend by his campaign of vilification, to dream of wiping out that old and respectable population of 2,500,000 which, without any capital from abroad, without any aid from the ancient Mother country, relying only on its own courage, its own stability, its own love of the land of its ancestors, has maintained itself and progressed in such a remarkable way.

Sir, I appeal to the common sense, to the spirit of fair play which is in every British breast. I will say, in the words which were heard as a last command from the old captain of the "Titanic," addressing himself to his crew and the passengers as his ship was foundering, "Be British; be British!"

Mr. BOYCE: I look upon this as quite a pleasant evening—

An hon. MEMBER: Or morning.

Mr. BOYCE: —Morning. I have got more information than I ever got before. We have heard about this proclamation. I have voted a good many times, I have been all over this province, and I have yet to find the man who lost his vote because the proclamation was not in French. If there was a constituency in which there were French people who could not speak English, you would be very anxious to go there to inform them that there was a proclamation out and that there was going to be an election. You only seek to have this amendment adopted because you are in opposition now and it will be twenty years before you ever get in, and if I got my wish it would be a little longer still. You are in opposition because you are against everything no matter whether it is good or bad. You have been that ever since I have been a member of this House. I think we can hardly give praise enough to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) for the way that he started our hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) to speak. That hon. gentleman commenced with a great deal of wrath directed at the hon. member for West Toronto. He could hardly say anything bad enough about the hon. member. Hon. members find it necessary to

pursue that line of argument because they have not very much else to say on that side of the House. I think the hon. member for West Toronto deserves a great deal of credit for telling us exactly where you (Mr. Lemieux) stand and what you are. You said that you were in Britain. I suppose you were in the House of Commons. You said that you were requested to speak, that you did speak and that the public applauded you. You made a great mistake when you did not stay there, because I do not think you will ever be applauded to any great extent in this country. Another thing that I took in a very good-natured way was the speech of the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien). He went out of his way a good deal, and I never thought that one man could get down as low as he did. There is only one in this House who could have done what he did in reading documents in regard to the Orange Lodge. There is one thing I would tell you, and that is that the great principle of the Orange Lodge is civil and religious liberty for all men. I want you to take note of that. I would hardly think it worth while to reply to the hon. member (Mr. Vien) because what he said came from so low a source that it is beneath me to pay any attention to it. The hon. gentleman talked in such a way that he could not get any reply to it. I want to tell my hon. friend when he talks about the smallness of the people on this side of the House and the bigotry of a certain class that I am an Orangeman,—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

An hon. MEMBER: We know it.

Mr. BOYCE: —and that the principles of Orangemen are far above those held by my hon. friend. His principles are far to small to even measurably approach those of the members of the Orange body.

Mr. TOBIN: How many of them are there?

Mr. BOYCE: I expected to have heard better things from some hon. gentlemen opposite. There is a little instrument over there that they call a "cannon." I have listened to it with a great deal of pleasure very often but there is no harm in it. It only gives utterance to bombast, and we do not pay any attention to it. What the "cannon" says would not hurt one anyway because it does not amount to very much. But there is one thing I do object to. I had a great deal of respect for my hon. friend over there, but I shall never have the same respect for him again because he has done his best to create hard feeling in this Canada of ours. As a resident of this country, who knows the French fairly well, I have a very good opinion of them. But for that hon. gentleman to stand up in this House and try to create divisions between the two races is something I never expected him to do. Something has been said about the late Sir John Macdonald. I knew Sir John Macdonald very well, and I used to hear him on the hustings talking about the French. I heard him say that they had a lot of good habits "but," he says, "you cannot trust them."

Mr. MORPHY: I would not rise at this late hour to say even a word or two had it not been for some remarks made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux).

Mr. TOBIN: Parlez Francais.

Mr. MORPHY: Non, monsieur. The remarks of that hon. gentleman led me to the thought that he has put the proposition on a totally different ground from that on which it was put by all the other members on that side who have spoken. We have been listening to what has been practically a bombardment by many hon. gentlemen opposite based on what they conceive to be the right which exists under the constitution. The hon. gentleman has waived that entirely to one side by claiming that the principle upon which he advocated that the proclamations should be published in French was following what he conceived to be a natural right that was implied, under all the legislation of the past from the Treaty of Paris down. Now in that way the hon. gentleman has really fallen in line with the argument—cited by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards)—laid down by Mr. Belcourt, a member I think of the Senate, and a prominent lawyer who has delivered himself at length upon that subject and in no unmistakable way. I only deal with that argument in the hope that it may do some good in the case of the younger members of the House who take issue with constitutional lawyers, men of long experience, and who set up a different construction of the law from what these men of experience adopt. Hon. gentlemen opposite outside of the argument as to the constitutional right have tried to put an interpretation upon section 133 which I do not think the section is capable of bearing. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) particularly, and I think the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon)

and the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) and others, have tried to interpret section 133 in their own way so far as regards the words:

—and both languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve followed that argument to some extent; but none of these gentlemen have tried for a moment to put what would be the reasonable meaning upon these words. Now that seems to be the crux of the point and the only argument that is left to hon. gentlemen opposite, because it is conceded here that there is no legal right outside of the limits of section 133, and I think the House is pretty well agreed upon the territorial limits within which that territorial right can be exercised. There only remains then the question of the meaning of these words "Records and Journals of the House." I hold in my hand one of the Journals of this House, the official volume 55 for the year 1919—taken at random—which bears the caption "Journals of the House of Commons of Canada." That is what is intended to be meant by the words of the section "Journals of the House of Commons of Canada" This Journal has been printed since Confederation, and every copy can be found in the custody of the proper official of the House printed in both French and English. That is the Journal of the House of Commons.

Now the other question to be ascertained is what constitutes a "Record." We know what the Journal contains. It contains the minutiae of the daily proceedings of the House, everything that takes place from prayers at the opening right through the sitting, and everything that is tabled, is set forth in the Journals of the House.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend knows that there are certain things in the form of returns that are tabled and that are not included in the Journals of the House. Does he claim that these do not form part of the records of the House?

Mr. MORPHY: There is nothing that is tabled that is not noted in the Journals of the House as having been laid upon the Table.

Mr. BUREAU: Even when it is not printed?

Mr. MORPHY: There is a complete daily record in the Journals of the House of what takes place in the House.

Mr. BUREAU: But they are not printed.

Mr. MORPHY: They are printed.

Mr. BUREAU: Not all—

Mr. MORPHY: Absolutely.

Mr. BUREAU: Except by order of the House.

Mr. MORPHY: Everything is printed especially when ordered by the House to be printed. When printed they form part of the records of the House, to a certain extent, and are shown in the Journals. The records consist of the sessional papers laid on the Table and these are most important. If ordered to be printed they are to be printed in French and English. The Hansard is also part of the records of the House being a record of everything that takes place viva voce in the Chamber. The stenographic notes are taken and then transcribed in French and English and are published through the medium of Hansard. The Bills are also part of the records of the House. The Bills that are introduced and passed, together with all their respective changes—from the time of introduction to the final reading; to the stage when they receive their final assent in the Senate—are all noted and form part of the records of the House; and any hon. gentleman, if he desires, can go back to the earliest times—so far as this House is concerned—and in half an hour he can get any original document that is filed as of record in this Parliament from the custodian of those papers. These are the records.

Now the peculiarity is that the original of every Bill that gets the assent is engrossed on parchment in duplicate, one part in French and the other in English, and signed by the Governor in Council or the official acting for him in absentia; these are records also. And if we take the language of the section we shall find that the records and journals of the House are limited to what takes place in this House in the regular parliamentary way under parliamentary practice as detailed in the journals and files of record.

Let us look at the proclamation. The form, as far as the printed bill is concerned, becomes a record because it is in the Bill in draft form with blanks; but the proclamation that is issued by the electoral officer—under the old Act by the returning officer—never was in this Chamber, and under the election law as set forth in this Act never will be in this Chamber unless under some remarkable and unusual circumstances, in which event it would be

tabled and in the custody of the House. Then it would become a record of the House and would be printed in French and English because it was a record long after the election based on the proclamation had been held.

Let us see how far a little further argument along that line will bring us. Hon. gentlemen opposite argue that because it is ordered by the House therefore it is a record of the House. As I have already shown, it never was in the House, it never had an entity, it never was a paper tabled, it never had any meaning as being in the House in the form published. The returning officer has to keep the results of his election after sending in his return, and the only thing that is of record in the House is the return sent in by that officer of the election or of the return of a member. That is read by the Speaker from the Chair, it is taken down by Hansard, and the return is taken note of for the daily journal of the House. But the returning officer has to keep all the papers—I am speaking in a general way and from memory—for one year, and in the case of a contested election as I read the Act for another year if that year be about expired, or for a year from the time the protest was lodged. I asked the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) to-night what would become of those papers then? He replied: Why, he could destroy them if he liked. Is the hon. gentleman serious in suggesting that an official authorized to perform certain functions can of his own will destroy records of this House? No! He destroys them because they never were records of this House and never were intended to be; they are in his custody to do what he likes with after the statutory period has expired.

Mr. BUREAU: What about during the statutory period?

Mr. MORPHY: During the statutory period the returning officer is to keep possession of these papers—that is what the law says. That is long after the election is held, long after the publication of the proclamation, and the operations of the Act have been fulfilled by the publication of the proclamation followed by the election of the returned member. So it is absolutely futile to argue that a mere proclamation is a part of the journals or records of this House.

Let me go a step further. There is a protest, and incidental to the protest, we will assume for the moment, the returning officer was compelled under a subpœna duces tecem to produce the proclamation to the rota of judges trying the election petition. Being so produced it becomes a part of the records of the court. Since when has it been recognized that the records of Parliament may be handled under a subpœna duces tecem through the medium of a man who is not appointed as an official of this House to take under his control documents of that kind? The returning officer producing that paper, the moment that the trial is over, may by virtue of his right say to the court: The exhibit I filed belongs to me. I have a statutory duty to keep it for a year. He may make application for the return of the exhibit, which the court may or may not grant according to the circumstances. But assuming he is allowed to take it off the files of the court, he takes that paper back, and probably there may be some reason why in the strict observance of his duties he must keep it a still longer time until the statutory period is ended.

Mr. CANNON: May I be permitted a remark? I do not know what the practice of the Ontario Courts is, but before our courts in Quebec never in my experience has the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery parted with the possession of the documents in connection with an election. He produces them before the court, but he keeps them in his possession.

Mr. MORPHY: It just makes my argument that much stronger, that neither the court nor any other authority has any right to the papers since there is a statutory obligation upon that man to keep them and, as my hon. friend from Three Rivers says, to destroy them after the statutory period is ended. To argue that they are records of the House is absolutely beside the question.

Mr. JACOBS: I approach this matter without any prejudice whatever, inasmuch as I do not belong to the Orange Order, nor yet have I been taken into the fold of the Roman Catholic Church. Consequently anything I may say will be entirely free from bias, and as such I think ought to be listened to by the committee with a willing ear.

If I may be permitted to give some advice to the Government, I would suggest that in this matter, assuming that there is no right whatever with regard to the use of the French language, the Government ought for political and diplomatic reasons to go a little distance with the province of Quebec. The Government is woefully weak in Quebec representation—that is, numerically. Prac-

tically the entire contingent from Quebec has received seats in the Cabinet—or something just as good. I refer to the position which is now being occupied by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames). Nohting was too good for Quebec. Three seats are held by supporters of the Government from Quebec, and these gentlemen were considered so worthy that two of them are now numbered among the advisers of the King and the other gentleman is in Geneva.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the Postmaster General?

Mr. JACOBS: I did not say anything about the Postmaster General because he is not a member of this House, and I cannot refer to the other House. What I wish to say is that if the Government desires to strengthen its position in Quebec it is certainly not taking the proper course. This by way of a bit of advice to the Government.

The name of Sir John Macdonald was used here to night by the member for Carleton (Mr. Boyce) and I am sorry that he is not in his seat at the present moment. He made the statement that Sir John Macdonald confided to him that "he could not trust the French of Quebec."

Sir John may or may not have made that statement; he is not here to deny it. Perhaps the statement was made such a long time ago that the memory of my hon. friend from Carleton is a little hazy about it. But Sir John Macdonald never had any reason to make a statement of that kind, because he trusted Quebec, and that trust was returned a hundredfold. He held office for many years because he was able to control the province of Quebec, and, at the same time, the Orange Order of Ontario. Now, that was quite a feat. Inasmuch as my hon. friends opposite find that they have practically no representation from Quebec, may I suggest, in spite of the statement made by the member for Carleton, that it would be wise for the Government to see to it that the Quebec representation is strengthened on their side of the House? At present the Government is what I would call a jug-handled government. One-third of the population of this country is not represented on the other side of the House. How is it possible for a government to govern under such conditions? As a matter of politics I suggest to to the minister that even at the last moment he might very well consider the remarks which were made on this side and go a certain length in order to see to it that these—I will not call them rights; call them privileges if you like—are granted to our friends of the province of Quebec.

Now, after all, what is it that is asked? We say that if it is impossible for the people living in a certain community to understand the language of the proclamation, that proclamation ought to be published in the language which they understand. Is that an unreasonable request? I say it is not. Why, if you buy a bottle of patent medicine you will find that the directions for use are published in about fifteen different languages, whereas in the matter of a proclamation under the Franchise Act, a matter which vitally affects the people, this right to read in a language which they understand is denied to the people.

Efforts have been made during the last year or two to conciliate the province of Quebec in a number of ways. The newspapers of the Government of late, instead of roaring like lions, have been roaring as gently as sucking doves, about Quebec. Now, what is the object? The object is to conciliate Quebec and attempt to obtain some representation without which this Government can not live. We heard about the little excursion which was made down the St. Lawrence by the Prime Minister and one or two of his friends in search of some new cabinet material. Many of us were on our guard; we were afraid that the hen roost was going to be robbed. Some people thought that the Prime Minister was aiming at no less a person than Sir Lomer Gouin, and other names were mentioned later when it was found that Sir Lomer was not to be attracted by the offers of the Prime Minister. Now, this goes to show that a determined effort is being made to secure representation for the province of Quebec. Yet when an opportunity is given of in some way conciliating the province of Quebec the Acting Solicitor General refuses pointblank to take advantage of it. He said that his views were rather in favour of the suggested amendment, but that there were others who were against it. Perhaps I may be permitted to use the language which has been made current in this House by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) when speaking on another matter he said that it was a case of "passing the buck," whatever that means. The Canada Gazette is published in two languages, English and French. The Canada Gazette is not a document of the House or a journal of the House. It circulates from Prince Edward

Island to Vancouver Island. The Acting Solicitor General, I understand, has told us that there is nothing in the law which makes it necessary to publish these things in the two languages; that that has only been done as a matter of convenience,—purely by complaisance. If that is the case, he has a precedent for saying to-day that these proclamations are published as a matter of convenience and in that way giving satisfaction to everyone. Had I my way I would be in favour of publishing that proclamation in every language spoken within the confines of this Dominion. I would publish it in Scandinavian, in German, even in Yiddish; I would publish it in every language known, because after all the object of the proclamation is to give the citizens of this country information as to what they are to do and where they are to vote. What is there wrong about that? If it is a matter of convenience; if it is essential that we should have reflected in this House the opinion of everyone in this community no matter what language he speaks, why is it that we restrict the publication of the proclamation to the English language and in certain particular places allow its publication also in French? There is no reason in the wide world, for instance, why the county of Glengarry, where nearly fifty per cent of the people are French Canadian, should not have these proclamations published in French. There is no reason why in the counties of Prescott, Russell and others, the proclamations should not be in French as well as in English. No valid reason has been urged by the Acting Solicitor General why this should not be done. Speaking for myself, as I say, without any prejudice whatever, I think that the Government is making a serious mistake, for diplomatic and political reasons if for no higher object, in denying the rights which are asked for by members on this side.

Mr. BUREAU: In reply to the member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy), I think I can throw some light on the situation if I quote from the French version of the British North America Act. Section 133 says:

(Translation):

Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the Debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec, and both those languages shall be used in the respective Records. . . .

And this is the point, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to emphasize:

[Mr. Jacobs.]

. . . And both those languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is it that constitutes records? These records are documents which are intrusted to an officer of the House of Commons, under an Act of Parliament, in order that they become part of the records of this House, so that subsequently they can be used for some purpose. This Bill provides that an officer of this House, appointed under the law, shall keep those documents during a fixed period. If the man is not obliged to keep those papers indefinitely, it is because we allow him, under the law or implicitly, the privilege to destroy them as soon as the period during which he is bound to preserve them has come to an end. Consequently, the word "used" applies to the papers which are intrusted to an officer of the House of Commons in order that they may be used subsequently for some purpose. Now, Mr. Chairman, according to the definition which I have given to-day, the English word "records" means all the documents which might subsequently be used as evidence when an election is contested before the courts of justice. You cannot give another interpretation to section 75 of this Bill.

To prevent the accumulation of records in the House and to make their destruction a matter of course, once their usefulness is gone, they are given into the custody of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery during a certain period. I submit that our election documents are not records of the House because of the duration of this custody but because of the fact itself that they are given into the custody of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery; because of the fact that it is precisely this officer who has charge of them, and because of the fact that the law requires this very thing.

We have appointed an officer who, under the law, must keep certain documents that have to do with an election. The proof of an election is the proclamation stating that the election is to take place. Without such a proclamation there can be no proof that an election has been held. The first thing that must be established to the satisfaction of the court, in an election dispute, is the fact that an election has been held, and since this evidence is necessary and must be submitted before the proceedings can continue, the proclamation belongs with the other documents that, according to the interpretation clause just quoted, are styled election documents. I claim that, according to the French version of the constitution, all election documents are

records of the House and must be printed in the two official languages, French and English. I fail to see how we can possibly escape from the horns of that dilemma and say that, for the purposes of this Act, the records shall not be records, so as to allow of these gentlemen accomplishing whatever objects they may have in view.

Mr. d'ANJOU (Rimouski). (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to detain the committee very long at this late hour, but I cannot let the debate come to a close without saying a few words. After listening with attention to the speeches made in the House, particularly to those of my hon. friends on this side, I have come to the conclusion that the election proclamations which we are discussing are just as much a part of the records of the House as are the Votes and Proceedings, the Debates, etc., and consequently that they should be printed in both the official languages of this country.

The hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) in the magnificent speech he delivered to the committee introduced a new argument into the discussion, an argument which, it seems to me, deserves consideration. The hon. member from St. James, speaking of the Naturalization Act of 1919, demonstrated to the House that every alien desirous of becoming naturalized must, besides being otherwise qualified, possess a satisfactory knowledge of either the French or the English tongue.

Now, since to vote at a federal election one must be naturalized and since one of the requisites of naturalization is a knowledge of either the French or English, I cannot understand why the Government of Canada should not publish the election proclamations in both the official languages of this country. The Naturalization Act states that in order to be admitted to citizenship one must have a knowledge of either the English or French language; there is no mention of German, nor of any other foreign tongue. The law thus acknowledges the rights of the French tongue in this country.

I shall give my utmost support to the amendment of the hon. member from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon). If I were to offer any word of criticism it would be that his motion is altogether too tame. In so far as I, personally, am concerned, what I am asking the Parliament of Canada for is not a favour, neither is it a privilege; I am demanding the recognition of a right granted our language by the Constitution of this country. I cannot understand why the Government refuses to accept this motion, so eloquently seconded by all the hon. members on this side of the House who spoke here to-day.

Mr. Chairman, in order to strengthen my argument, I wish to draw the attention of the committee to the following resolution which has been on the Order Paper for some time under the name of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Griesbach):

> That, in the opinion of this House, all newspapers, pamphlets, advertisements, political campaign literature, and publications of like nature, printed and published in Canada, or distributed or circulated in Canada, in a language other than the English or French language, should not be permitted to be circulated or distributed unless such publications bear, in parallel columns, a translation of the same in the English or French language.

That only goes to show Mr. Chairman, that there is no question in Canada of the German, or any other tongue and that the equality of rights between the French and English languages in this country is not only acknowledged in an official way, but that it is admitted even by those who dispute our right to speak the French tongue. The argument, it seems to me, is not without worth since it shows that those who pretend to ignore it are forced to recognize the fact that, in Canada, French and English are equal before the law.

If the English language were the only official language used in this country, why should the hon. member for Edmonton not have mentioned the fact that those printed documents and advertisements should be translated into English only, and why should he not have asked that they be translated into German or into any other language?

Mr. Chairman, this shows that the French language as well as the English language, is here to stay, no matter what may be done against it. I do not intend to retain the attention of the House for any further length of time. I considered it my duty, before the debate was at an end, to say a few words in support of this amendment. Unfortunately, the question had been decided beforehand; it is obvious that the Government has yielded to the Orange pack, and eager as it is to please those gentlemen under any circumstances, it has made up its mind not to grant this request submitted by hon. members in the name of the French speaking population of this country towards securing the recognition of a certain right. It seems to me that to speak French when vindicating this right is an

excellent means of showing that we are entitled to use that language in Canada, in this House and out of it as well, and that the best means of preserving a right is to make use of it. Wherefore I have spoken in French, to-night, as I usually do, and it was only natural that I should have done so, because I had risen to vindicate the rights of Her Majesty the French tongue.

Mr. TURGEON: I did not expect that the amendment which I moved would have raised such a debate in this House of Commons of Canada. The debate which has taken place this evening has certainly won my admiration, and although once in a while the discussion may have waxed a little strong between a couple of members on either side of the House, I must say that the lesson taught the country by the speeches which have been delivered on both sides will convince the people of Canada, as it has strengthened me in my conviction, of the truth of the principle that a bilingual Parliament can exist only in a bilingual country. If the members of the House had not felt that we were living in a bilingual country, this House would have adjourned before twelve o'clock. I am confirmed in my conviction, in spite of what has been said by some hon. gentlemen opposite, that seventy-five per cent of the English population of the Dominion are in favour of the amendment which I have moved, and will consider that this is merely an acknowledgement of a right acquired, a privilege which everybody is willing to give to a minority which is willing to accept with such pleasure and gratitude every possible privilege accorded to it. I have been castigated by some hon. members opposite because some years have elapsed and because a similar amendment was not brought in in the election of 1911, or of 1908, or of 1904. The old law, which has been on the statute book for many years, was framed in accordance with the mentality of the people at that time, and no opportune time arose for any member of Parliament, who wished to maintain the prevailing spirit of harmony, to move the amendment which I am moving to-day. Now when the Government is introducing a new franchise law, which will be on the statute book for future elections, which may come in three months or three years, and which law will remain on the statute book for years to come it is an opportune time for any hon. member who desires to have the law amended, to bring in his amendment. The war is over and we are now engaged on the work of reconstruction, and I think reconstruction in matters of harmony and concord should be the first consideration. As I said before, in the twenty years I have been in Parliament I have never advocated extreme measures. I have, however, always expressed my views, and if at times they may have been stronger than at others my actions have always been dictated by a sense of duty and conviction. There is to-day greater proportion of the French element in the Dominion of Canada than existed thirty or forty years ago, and these people have, according to my conviction, the same rights in the matter of language in matters of Federal concern as the English-speaking people. It has been stated that some English-speaking people in the province of Ontario might be offended to have to read a proclamation in French. I do not see why they should be any more offended at that, than at receiving a postal order, which is invariably printed in both languages;—the only offence they could take would be that it was too small in amount. I do not wish at this time to do anything to create disunion, and I am prepared to withdraw the amendment which I have placed on Hansard and which has been debated to-night. I have listened with great pleasure to one of my old leadrs of the Liberal party, whom it has been my pleasure to follow for years in this House, just as I followed him with pleasure in his past career in the Maritime Provinces, where he had been a figure long before he entered this Parliament in 1896. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, ex-Minister of Finance in the Laurier Government, while not finding fault with my amendment, recognizes, however, that there are two views in this country as to the rights of the French language, and in order not to offend one school of thought he has suggested an amendment which might possibly be more acceptable to hon. gentlemen opposite. He has read his suggestion, and I am willing to withdraw my amendment and substitute for it the suggested amendment of my hon. friend for Shelburne and Queen's.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that the hon. gentleman have leave to withdraw his amendment?

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. TURGEON: I beg to move to amend clause 37 by adding at the end of subclause (1) the following words:

Provided however that in any electoral district in which, to the knowledge of the returning offi-

cer, there is a considerable number of electors who are familiar with the French language but do not understand the English language, the proclamation shall be issued in both languages.

Amendment negatived; yeas 38, nays 63.

Section agreed to, on the same division reversed.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell the House adjourned at 1.25 a.m. Wednesday.

Wednesday, May 12, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

ADJOURNMENT OVER ASCENSION DAY.

On the motion of the Right Hon. Sir George Foster (Acting Prime Minister) it was resolved that when the House adjourns this day it stand adjourned until Friday, the fourteenth instant.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. Michael Steele presented the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Return tabled.

Return showing the institutions under the jurisdiction and management of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, the number of patients and employees of each institution and the cost.—Mr. Hugh Clark (Parliamentary Secretary.)

CANADIAN NORTHERN SYSTEM—CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): I lay on the Table three copies of the fifth annual report of the Canadian Northern Railway system and the annual report of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. Other copies are being printed and probably to-morrow, or next day, one will be mailed to each member of the House. If further copies are required they will be available at the department.

WATER CARRIAGE OF GOODS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order being called for the introduction of a Bill to amend the Water Carriage of Goods Act.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): I wish the order to be dropped.

Order dropped.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions to be answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What is the total yearly amount of salary paid to those who are to receive bonuses of $12,500,000?
2. What will be the average percentage per $1,000 of salary?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This question has already been answered.

SALARIES OF MEMBERS' STENOGRAPHERS.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is it true that the salary of the messengers and other attendants of the House of Commons has been increased to $4 per diem from the 1st of April, 1919?
2. Is it true that the salary of the male stenographers on the members' stenographers' staff is $3.50 per diem?
3. If so, what is the reason for this difference?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to increase the salary of the stenographers on the members' stenographers staff this session?
5. If so, to what extent? If not, why?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Yes.
2. From $3.25 to $3.50 per day.
3. The rate of pay has been regulated by the amount paid for similar work in commercial and business establishments.
4. A proposal to effect a further increase in the maximum daily allowance to both female and male stenographers, has been under consideration and it is expected an announcement in this connection will be made in the near future.
5. Answered by number 4.

DEPARTMENT OF SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. POWER:

1. Did any of the officials of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment travel to Europe at the public expense during the years 1919 and 1920?
2. If so, what are their names and what positions do or did they occupy?
3. What was the reason for these trips?
4. What expenses for travelling and entertainment were charged to the department in each case?

Mr. HUGH CLARK (Parliamentary Secretary):

1. Yes.

2. (a) It having been reported to the department that successful methods in the retraining of disabled soldiers had been adopted in England the introduction of which was being advocated in Canada, W. E. Segsworth, previously Director of Vocational Training and T. A. Stevenson, Assistant Director Information and Service Branch (who also represents the Trades and Labour Council of Canada with regard to the industrial retraining of ex-members of the Forces) were sent to England in April 1919, their instructions being to investigate the methods of industrial retraining applied in England; the relationship between organized labour and the Governmental agencies conducting such retraining, and the relationship between organized labour and ex-members of the Forces undergoing such retraining, particularly with respect to the permanent reabsorption of trainees into commercial or industrial life as civilians.

Mr. Segsworth was also appointed to proceed as the representative of the department to the Inter-Allied Conference at Rome which was convened for the purpose of discussing the problem of the rehabilitation of disabled soldiers. It was considered that advantage might be taken of methods which had proven successful in other countries. It was also the desire of those responsible for the conference that definite records of the work conducted by the department in Canada be made available to representatives of other countries confronted with similar problems.

The expenses of Messrs. Segsworth and Stevenson amounted to $3,603.36.

(b) For the purpose of negotiating arrangements whereby former members of the Imperial Forces resident in Canada (numbering about 50,000) would receive at the expense of the Imperial Government post war benefits administered by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and whereby ex-members of the Canadian Forces resident in the United Kingdom (numbering about 20,000) would receive at the expense of the Canadian Government post war benefits made available in England by the Imperial Government, E. H. Scammell, Assistant Deputy Minister, was instructed to proceed to England in May 1919. As a result of the arrangements he made ex-members of the Forces in both countries now obtain benefits with greater convenience than would otherwise have been the case, and considerable savings have been effected in administrative expenses.

The expenses of Mr. E. H. Scammell amounted to $1,148.51.

(c) It having been represented to the department that owing to the heavy demands on the British Government in providing artificial limbs, orthopædic boots and other orthopædic appliances for former members of the Imperial Forces, discharged Canadian soldiers resident in the United Kingdom were not being furnished with such appliances as rapidly as might be desired, F. G. Robinson, Deputy Minister and R. W. Coulthard, Director of Orthopædic and Surgical Appliances, were sent to England in January, 1920, for the purpose of investigating the desirability of operating in England a Branch Orthopædic Fitting Depot, similar to those operated by the department throughout Canada for the issue of artificial limbs, orthopædic boots and other orthopædic appliances. They were also instructed thoroughly to investigate the methods adopted by the British and French Governments in connection with the supply and maintenance of artificial limbs and the design thereof, so that advantage might be taken in Canada of any improved methods or designs not previously applied here.

The deputy minister was also instructed to negotiate with officials of the British Government certain adjustments relative to the administration of benefits to ex-members of the Forces by the British and Canadian Governments reciprocally, the desirability of which had arisen, as the work developed out of experience in applying under constantly varying conditions the general principles previously agreed upon. Mr. Robinson was further instructed to arrange with officials of the British Government the rates at which the Canadian Government would be reimbursed by the British Government for services rendered by the department on their behalf to ex-members of the Imperial Forces resident in Canada; and to investigate the conditions under which ex-members of the Canadian Forces, resident in the United Kingdom, who have been disabled by war service, were receiving benefits through the British Government, and to make any necessary recommendations in this respect.

The expenses of Mr. F. G. Robinson and Major Coulthard amounted to $3,371.71.

3 and 4. Answered by No. 2.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—CAR HAULAGE COST.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

How much does it cost per mile to haul a car on the Canadian National railways?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): The hon. member will appreciate that it would be very difficult to answer this question, for he might know that it would cost a great deal more to haul a car containing 50 or 60 tons of freight than if it were empty. It is a question that I cannot answer in its present form.

Mr. CASGRAIN: How about private cars?

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

MR. F. YOUNG.

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Is F. Young receiving the annual salary of $6,000 from the Canada Wheat Board?
2. Is the Government aware as to whether or not the said F. Young is receiving in addition to the above salary an annual salary of $10,000 from the Lake Shippers' Clearance Association?
3. Are expenditures by the Canada Wheat Board audited by any Government official, or does the said board submit a duly audited detail statement of revenue and expenditure?
4. What sums of public money have been expended in behalf of the Canada Wheat Board?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1 and 2. The department has no information. The board appoints and pays its own working staff.

3. The expenditures of the board are subject to audit by an independent audit company, and they will submit a full statement of their work on its completion.

4. No public moneys have been expended on behalf of the Canada Wheat Board. All costs and charges are defrayed from proceeds of sale, in the hands of the board.

Mr. PACAUD:

1. Has Mr. Joseph Houle still got the contract as rural mail carrier between Pontbriand and Robertsonville?
2. What was the contract price?
3. Was the contract awarded after tenders had been called?
4. Has the contract price been raised in favour of Mr. Houle?
5. If so, when, and for what amount?

Mr. ROWELL:

1. No.
2. $175.
3. No.

4 and 5. On representations of Contractor Houle that $125 per annum—his rate of payment—was so low as to involve him in financial loss in operating the service, and $175 being considered a fair price for this service, a new contract was arranged with him at that rate from the 1st January, 1920.

This contract was, at the request of the contractor, subsequently transferred on the same terms and conditions to another party on the 1st May, 1920.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. McCURDY:

1. Have the Government operations at the Dog Fish Reductions Works at Clark's Harbour, Nova Scotia, been discontinued?
2. If so, what disposition has been made of the property?

Mr. ROSS:

1. What sales of military and other supplies have been made by the War Purchasing Commission in each of the years 1917, 1918 and 1919, and what amount of money was obtained for these supplies in each of the above years?
2. Were these supplies sold by tender, by advertisement, or at public auction?
3. How were military supplies, including rugs, furniture, etc., at Camp Borden sold, who were the purchasers and what prices were received for the various articles?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. CALDWELL:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence, documents, and other papers exchanged between the Dominion Government, or any official thereof, or the officials of the Canadian Government Railways and the Government of New Brunswick, or any official of the said Government, or any of the officials of the St. John and Quebec Railway Company with regard to the procuring of running rights for the trains of the St. John and Quebec Railway over the Canadian Pacific Railway between Westfield Beach and St. John. Also of all papers, documents and correspondence exchanged between the Dominion Government or any official thereof or any officials of the Canadian Government Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any official thereof, regarding the securing of the said running rights.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a return showing the total amounts paid for advertisements or newspaper articles relating to voluntary enlistment before the Military Service Act of 1917 was in force: (a) to English newspapers in Canada and United States; (b) to French newspapers in Canada and United States; (c) to English newspapers in the province of Quebec; (d) to French newspapers in the province of Quebec.

EMPLOYMENT OFFICES CO-ORDINATION.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen, the House returned to the first reading of Senate Bills.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved that Bill No. 124 (from the Senate) to amend the Employment Offices Co-ordination Act be read the first time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This Bill enables the Department of Labour to make arrangement with municipalities of the same character precisely as under the former Bill it was able to make with provinces for the carrying on of employment offices co-operatively with the provincial authorities.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

ORDER OF BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. S. FIELDING: Before proceeding with the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I desire to put a question and to offer a suggestion to my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). In the intimation that is given to us of the programme of business for the day there is mention of a motion for Committee of Supply, but it is at the foot of the Order Paper. It has been there on several occasions lately, and the consequence is that the motion is not reached. If it could be reached at all it would be late in the evening when the House is likely to be weary and very thin. One of the objects of the motion to go into Committee of Supply is to afford an opportunity, which does not otherwise arise, for the discussion of public questions of importance. There is a matter which some members on this side desire to bring to the attention of the House, and we hope that an opportunity may be afforded as early as possible. To-morrow will be a holiday; Friday automatically the Speaker leaves the Chair; Monday is Budget day; so there is no prospect of an early opportunity being afforded unless it be to-day. My suggestion is that the right hon. gentleman, after consultation and at his convenience, will fix an hour, either this afternoon or evening, but not late at night, when the motion for Committee of Supply may be moved, in order that an opportunity may be afforded for the exercise of one of the most vital principles of our parliamentary system.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In answer to my hon. friend, the House will go into Committee of Supply at eight o'clock to-night.

Mr. FIELDING: Thank you.

EXPLOSIVE WORKS AT BELOEIL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) asked yesterday a question as to certain explosions that had taken place in his constituency, and desired to know what action had been taken with regard thereto. The Explosives Division of the Department of Mines has record of two explosions, one on the 27th of April and one on the 3rd of May. Following each explosion an officer was sent for the purpose of making an investigation; he has returned, and his report is almost complete.

HONEY ADULTERATION—SENATE AMENDMENT.

Consideration of an amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 29 respecting Honey.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the Senate has added a section to this Bill, No. 4, the effect of which is to provide that the penalties under the Food and Drugs Act shall apply to the violation of the provisions of this Act in lieu of the penalties under the Criminal Code, which otherwise would be applicable. There is no objection to the change made by the Senate; probably on the whole it is an improvement. The only point is that the Senate has not made the amendment wholly efficacious to accomplish the purpose intended. Therefore I desire to slightly modify the Senate amendment.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. President of the Privy Council to speak in a louder tone of voice? His remarks are quite inaudible at this end of the Chamber, and we do not know what is going on.

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Speaker, the Senate has amended the Bill by adding a new section, Number 4, the effect of which is to provide that the penalties under the Food and Drugs Act shall apply to violations of this Act in lieu of the penalties which would be applicable under the Criminal Code in the absence of this specific provision. I see no objection to the Senate amendment; it is probably, on the whole, wise that the same penalty should apply to violations of this Act as apply to violations of the Food and Drugs Act. But the form of the amendment made by the Senate is hardly such as to accomplish the purpose in view. I therefore move to vary it by striking out the words "section 2 or" in the first line thereof and inserting in the first line after the word "who," the following:

is guilty of wilful adulteration of honey under section 2, or who—

The effect of the change will be as follows. The clause as amended by the Senate reads:

Every one who violates any provision of section 2 or 3 of this Act is guilty of an offence and liable upon summary conviction to the penalties provided by section 16 of the Food and Drugs Act, 1920.

When amended as now proposed, it will read as follows:

Every one who is guilty of wilful adulteration of honey under section 2 or who violates any provision of section 3 of this Act is guilty of an offence and liable upon summary conviction to the penalties provided by section 16 of the Food and Drugs Act, 1920.

The Department of Justice has advised that this amendment should be made.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What are the penalties provided by section 16 of the Food and Drugs Act?

Mr. ROWELL: They are as follows: If the adulteration is deemed to be injurious to health within the meaning of the Act, for a first offence, upon summary conviction a fine not exceeding $200 and costs and not less than $50 and costs or imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, or to both fine and imprisonment; and for each subsequent offence, a fine not exceeding $500 and costs and not less than $50 and costs, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or to both fine and imprisonment. If the adulteration is not deemed to be injurious to health, the provision is, a fine not exceeding $100 and costs and not less than $25 and costs, or imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months; and for each subsequent offence a fine not exceeding $200 and costs and not less than $50 and costs, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, or to both fine and imprisonment.

Mr. KAY: Why is there no provision for penalty in the case of adulteration of honey after it is made by the bees? There is provision here against feeding sugar to the bees, but there is nothing to prevent the beekeeper from adulterating the honey after it is produced.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question submitted by the hon. member (Mr. Kay) is, I think, wide of the motion now before the Chair. I would also direct the attention of the House to the fact that the minister has already spoken. We are not in committee, and there is no right to reply.

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask the minister a question? These amendments have to go back to the Senate, have they not? I have here a letter from a person who is interested in another branch of industry where a food product is produced by animals not out of their own flesh. He suggests that after the word "honey" we should add the word "poultry," and that the following be added as subsection 2A:

Feeding poultry with lard, except for the purpose of being consumed by them as food, or with butter or any oily substance—

Mr. SPEAKER: I doubt very much whether the hon. member is in order. We are limited to a discussion of the amendment which is now before the House.

Mr. BUREAU: The amendments have to go back to the Senate, Mr. Speaker, and we cannot add anything except what the minister says. Do I understand it to be the rule that if the minister submits an amendment I cannot add anything to it?

Mr. SPEAKER: A suggested amendment would have to be germane to the clause under consideration.

Mr. BUREAU: Well, the clause under consideration, as I understand it, deals with penalties imposed upon those who violate the provisions of this Act. The suggestion that I am dealing with is that something else should be added as a protection in the case of food produced by animals not out of their own flesh. But if I am out of order, of course I bow to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. member (Mr. Bureau) that this amendment is a consequential amendment, and one, therefore, which can be made on motion put in this manner. Any other amendment, however, would require that the Bill be referred back to the committee. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Amendment proposed by Hon. Mr. Rowell to the Senate amendment agreed to.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 109, to amend the Supreme Court Act.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have only a few observations to make—

The speech of the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) was interrupted at this point by

the prolonged applause which greeted the entrance into the Chamber to take his seat for the first time this session of the Rt. Hon. Sir R. L. Borden, Prime Minister, who had been absent by reason of illness.

Mr. McKENZIE (Resuming): I am delighted Mr. Speaker, that the good luck has fallen to a member of the Opposition to be in position to welcome the Prime Minister back to the House. Just at that point where we had the delightful experience of welcoming the Prime Minister upon his return, I was addressing you, Sir, upon the Bill now before the House.

What I would like to say—and I direct my remarks particularly to the Minister of Justice, who has charge of this Bill—is that it is not desirable to be amending the constitution and powers of the courts unless it is absolutely necessary to do so. The Supreme Court Act is quite an old enactment. It has been amended a few times, but not very often. The Prime Minister, who is now in his seat, the Minister of Justice, and every lawyer in this House, know that it is exceedingly desirable that the practice and procedure of the courts should continue without very much change. The Supreme Court of Canada is not like a provincial court; it is a court to which all provinces look as an appellate court, and for that reason it is desirable that the practice and procedure and constitution of that court should be well known and well established.

Unless there is most urgent necessity, any change in the constitution of the court, which change would necessarily mean a change in practice, should be avoided and should be indulged in as seldom as possible. Lawyers in this House know that text-books have been written on the Supreme Court Act and that those text-books are in the libraries of lawyers from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Those text-books endeavour to show as clearly as possible the powers and the practice of the court. Several points in regard to the jurisdiction of the court and the scope of it have been settled, upon the old Act, by decisions of the Privy Council. For these reasons it is highly desirable that those text-books which have been written on the old Act and decisions rendered by the Privy Council along those lines should be held as authorities and that nothing should be done by us, unless it is absolutely necessary to do so, which would have the effect of destroying the interpretations which have been given to the Act and also of destroying the usefulness of the text-books I have mentioned.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. There is a volume of conversation going on, not only on the floor of this Chamber, but I regret to say, in other parts of the Chamber. I would ask that more consideration be shown to the business of the House.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have read the Supreme Court Act several times before, but I have read it recently and I have also read the amendments made in different years and the amendments that are now proposed. I am not quite convinced that the amendments now proposed are highly necessary. They may be, and possibly the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) will explain the necessity for them. With these remarks, which will appeal to lawyers, if not to other people, I should like the minister to bear in mind that we should interfere as little as possible with the constitution and the established practice of the court. Every hon. member who is in any particular calling knows that he does not want the tools to which he is accustomed, changed. We have had a good deal of talk about containers of food, of fish, farming implements and all that sort of thing, and a great deal of dissatisfaction is occasioned if there is any undue interference. We are now in the field where we are tampering with the implements of the trade of the much maligned lawyer. I am only anxious that lawyers should be protected as much as is possible by our not interfering with the proper administration of justice as regards this court.

Rt. Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the minister speaks, I must direct the attention of the House to the fact that if the minister exercises his right to reply, the debate is closed. Therefore, if any hon. member desires to speak on this matter, he should do so now.

Mr. DOHERTY: —I fully appreciate and share the views of the hon. gentleman as to the undesirability of unnecessarily modifying the law prescribing the duties, functions and powers of the Supreme Court. I realize also the importance of not making modifications which may render inapplicable decisions which have been made in the past, or possibly the observations of text-books written upon them. But I desire to point out that the purpose of this Bill is one of simplification. It does not affect the

constitution of the court; it affects the jurisdiction of the court, and its principal purpose is to make that jurisdiction the same with regard to cases coming from any of the provinces. Its second purpose is to simplify the provisions that now determine that jurisdiction. As the hon. member has said, the Supreme Court Act has, from time to time, been the subject of amendment, and if one looks at it in its present condition, it is evident that some, at all events, of the amendments that have been made, have been made from the point of view of meeting particular cases that have arisen. The result is that you have these provisions for particular cases bearing upon the question of jurisdiction and dealing with that question in that way, producing, I think, a lack of clearness. This Bill is introduced at the suggestion of the judges of the court, and as a result of their experience in the application of the law. As I have said, its principal purpose is to make the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court applicable to the same classes of cases without distinction between the provinces from which those cases come, and that in itself is a desirable thing. Its second purpose is, as I have said, to simplify the form of the sections in which the jurisdiction is defined, so as to reduce the cases down to limited classes which will cover all the cases intended to be covered without the necessity of having specific provisions for particular kinds of cases.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and the House thereupon went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. DOHERTY: I desire to move to amend subparagraph (a) by striking out the word "and" in the last line thereof and adding the following:

> Provided that except in cases in which such highest court of final resort has concurrent jurisdiction with the court from which it is sought to appeal, special leave shall not be granted in any case which is not appealable to such highest court of last resort and which has not been heretofore appealable to the Supreme Court; and,

The purpose of the amendment is to correct the provision as it stood, which would have produced a result which was not intended. Under the section as it stands in the Bill, cases involving small amounts in the different provinces which are not appealable within the province would have been appealable to the Supreme Court on leave of the court of last resort in the province. There was no intention to produce, and I do not think there would be any justification for producing that result, and it is to prevent that that I am proposing this amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause as amended agreed to.

On section 41—leave of provincial court of last resort:

Mr. LEMIEUX: His Majesty enjoys certain privileges before the courts, but I think it is giving him an unfair advantage to grant this privilege which is refused to the ordinary citizen. I have in mind cases of damages against the Crown, for instance.

Mr. DOHERTY: In so far as His Majesty is given any special right here, it is a right he already has. These classes of cases mentioned here are appealable under the law as it stands, without anybody's leave. At the present time for the provinces other than Quebec $1,000 is the amount fixed for the "de plano" right of appeal. This Bill for the "de plano" right as regards all provinces makes it $2,000, but in other cases there may be an appeal by leave of the court of last resort of the provinces. The reason why a special provision is made for all the classes of cases enumerated in the present section is that there was in all these cases a right to appeal "de plano," and it was thought that to subject that absolute right as it now stands to the condition that there should be leave to appeal given by the highest court of last resort in the province might in certain cases be looked upon as depriving those parties of a very substantial right, and upon that consideration we have this provision, that even if the court of last resort in the provinces does not, with regard to that particular class of cases, think an appeal ought to be granted, it is possible for the Supreme Court to grant it. I do not know whether it is very necessary, but it is put there because in the opinion of the judges it would remove any ground for suggesting that the parties to these particular classes of cases who had this exceptional right of appeal "de plano" were being deprived of resort to the Supreme Court.

Clause agreed to.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: May I be permitted to remark that it is only by exercise of the sense of sight that we at this end of the Chamber can have some shrewd suspicion that certain hon. gentlemen at the other end are speaking.

The CHAIRMAN: The remarks of the hon. member are perfectly justified, and I

think the position of hon. members at the other end of the Chamber is aggravated by the fact that there is altogether too much conversation in the House. The acoustics of this Chamber are not bad; they are very good, and the conversations carried on by hon. members render it absolutely impossible for those at the other end to hear what is being said at this end. I must request hon. members to refrain from indulging in conversation in the Chamber.

On section 3—when appeal shall be brought.

Mr. JACOBS: This section amends section 69 of the Supreme Court Act by adding the following words to that section:

Provided that the months of July and August shall be excluded in the computation of the said sixty days.

Will the minister be kind enough to explain this section in detail?

Mr. DOHERTY: The delay of sixty days is prescribed for certain classes of cases where an application is necessary, and within which time it must be made. This provision is made to meet the fact that July and August are very generally looked upon in the legal profession as vacation months; and in fact, under the laws of some provinces, these months are not included in the delays prescribed for taking certain steps in procedure. I do not say that this is true in all cases. The hon. member knows there are exceptional cases, but this is the general rule, and it was considered fair to make this provision so that the months of July and August, in regard to the particular delay of sixty days referred to in this section, should not count. Difficulties have arisen and people have found their rights jeopardized, and this provision seems to me but reasonable.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the minister not think that this is adding to the law's delays?

Mr. DOHERTY: So long as the long vacation exists I am afraid it will add to the law's delays. I can say that in the opinion of the judges of the court, as well as in my opinion, this is a desirable provision to meet practical conditions that exist.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

BUDGET SPEECH POSTPONED TO TUESDAY NEXT.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In regard to the Budget Speech, I desire to make a final announcement of a decision arrived at by reason of great kindness of heart on my part and insistent persuasion by hon. gentlemen who sit opposite. If the House is agreeable, the Budget Speech will be delivered on Tuesday next and we shall go into Supply on Monday. This will afford my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and his associates an opportunity for some longed-for discussion which they have contemplated for some time.

Mr. FIELDING: May I supplement the observations of my right hon. friend by expressing the assumption that we are to go into Supply on Monday night and not on Monday, as the hon. gentleman says, without qualification. Of course, there is an old proverb that says that one should not look a gift horse in the mouth,

4 p.m.

and we therefore accept my hon. friend's concession. I may say, however, that there has been a little understanding on both sides, and I hope it is to our mutual convenience.

DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT.

The House resumed from May 11, consideration in committee of Bill No. 12 (Hon. Mr. Guthrie) respecting the election of members of the House of Commons and the electoral franchise.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When progress was reported upon this Bill last night, clauses 32, 44, 45, 63 and 101 had been allowed to stand and all of the other clauses had been adopted with the exception of paragraph (k) of clause 2 and clauses 19 and 76 which provide for the expenditure of money and which cannot be adopted until the House has concurred in the required resolution. The last clause adopted was clause 37 and we have now reached clause 44, Mr. Guthrie moves to amend the clause by inserting in line 45 on page 32 of the Bill after the words "in form P" the following words:

—issued under his hand in the English and French languages in every electoral district in the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba, and in the English language only in other electoral districts.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I move to further amend clause 44 by striking out subclause (3) of the said clause and substituting therefor the following:

(3) The returning officer shall at the same time notify in writing each postmaster of the provisions of subsection five of this section.

(4) The returning officer shall, as soon as possible, deliver or send by registered mail ten copies of such notice in form P to each candidate nominated.

(5) Every postmaster shall, forthwith after receipt of such notice in form P, post it up in some conspicuous place within his office to which the public has access and maintain it posted there until the time fixed for polling day has passed, and failure to do so shall be ground for his dismissal from office. For the purposes of this provision such postmaster shall be deemed an election officer and liable as such.

Clauses 44 and 45 as drawn were rather mixed up; some sections of 45 should be in 44, and some in 44 should be in 45. The assistant clerk of the Crown has drawn the sections as they should be. The only important change is that the proclamation setting out the polls should be required to be in English and French in the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba, a provision similar to that which is contained in the clause which was under discussion yesterday.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 45: Further duty of returning officer.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I move to amend clause 45 by striking out the word "and" in the fifteenth line of page 33 and by inserting after the words "in voting" in the seventeenth line of the said page the following words:

—and (e) a copy of this Act and of the instructions referred to in section thirty-six.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 32—preparation of lists of voters.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have a number of amendments to propose to this clause. I do not know that they pertain particularly to the first part of the clause and perhaps it would be better for the convenience of the committee if I were to propose them as we went along rather than to give them now.

Mr. FIELDING: I think it might facilitate the progress of business if the minister would state what the amendments are, because some of us may contemplate proposing amendments of a similar character which would then be unnecessary.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My amendments are not of a radical nature. They do not change the Act materially, but merely correct clerical errors and computations of time which have not been made to fit in the original draft.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My purpose was to suggest to the Acting Solicitor General to give us any amendments that he has to each subsection as it is read. Then we will have the whole section before us with the proposed amendments.

On subsection (3)—certified copies of voters' lists to be furnished by custodian upon payment of fees.

Mr. POWER: I think perhaps it would be well to make a change in line forty-five of subsection 3. Instead of, as the subsection reads, "to any person," I would suggest to the minister that the wording be, "to any duly authorized person." Otherwise, a certain number of people interested in one trade or another might go to the custodian of the electoral lists and ask for a copy of the lists on payment of a fee. I have no objection to that; my objection is this: There is no reason why the Government should keep, for the convenience of the persons I mentioned, a copy of the number of people on the lists in any particular town or constituency.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend suggests that the words "duly authorized" should be inserted. I do not know what an "authorized" person would be under the Act.

Mr. POWER: He would be a man who needs, for federal purposes, to obtain the lists.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Suppose the lists are required for a referendum?

Mr. POWER: That clause has not yet been passed and as far as I am concerned it will not pass.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not see any objection to anybody who feels interested enough in getting a copy of the voters' lists going and paying the fee and getting those lists; it is sometimes a matter of great convenience to be able to get them. Unless some objection is pointed out, and I do not see any, there is no reason why the change suggested should be made.

Mr. POWER: My objection is simply this: I do not see why the Federal or Provincial Government should pay to have voters' lists in order that any man who wishes to advertise any particular article of trade—it may be hats, coats, or some particular thing; it may be as it is in Ontario, intoxicating liquor—should get these lists. Some people in the province of Quebec get copies of the voters' lists, and send circulars to Ontario people. I do not

see why we should pay for that. Therefore I would like the subsection to read that the lists shall be furnished to any "duly authorized man." If a liquor vendor, or any other kind of vendor, wants a list of people in order to circularize them, let him go and get a list of the people himself and not have the Government supply it to him.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If I understand the subsection aright the man who gets the list has to pay for it.

Mr. POWER: He has to pay for it, but I am quite sure the fee he would have to pay would be very small as compared with the cost of making up the list.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is it my hon. friend's idea that such person should not get the list or that the fee should be made larger?

Mr. POWER: My idea is that we should not have such lists at the disposal of people who are not authorized to have them.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The voters' list is more or less a public document, and personally I do not see any objection to making it free and open to anybody who pays the necessary twenty-five cents, or whatever the fee is, for obtaining a copy.

Mr. POWER: I have no objection; I am simply making the statement to the minister, and if he will think it over I am quite sure he will come to the same conclusion as myself.

Mr. BUREAU: There might be a systematic organization to get copies of the voters' lists in order to prevent a man from obtaining a copy who is entitled to do so.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There will have to be a certain number of copies prepared, I presume there will not be any more than the number required for the purposes of the election.

Mr. BUREAU: If I make application, for instance, and there is an organization, there might be a certain number of people ahead of me and I might be deprived of my list, although a candidate.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That could not interfere with candidates obtaining lists. They have to be provided with lists not later than nomination day. Certain lists have to be used for the purpose of posting up, revision, and the like; they would be the first prepared. If other people want to buy lists, I do not see any objection.

Mr. POWER: Here is another objection. Supposing there has been an election within a short time, and the lists are exhausted, any person may require a list, and on payment of a small fee—the Acting Solicitor General has said 25 cents; we will say $1—he will put the Government to the expense of preparing another list for the whole constituency at a cost of $200 or $300. I do not see why anyone should be given the right to do this; only those duly authorized by law should receive these lists.

Mr. GUTHRIE: You want the word "authorized" inserted?

Mr. POWER: "Duly authorized" would be sufficient for my purposes. There are only two persons duly authorized by this law to receive these lists—the returning officer and the registrar.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is for provincial officials.

Mr. POWER: We are asking the provincial officials to produce lists. First of all, I do not think we have any business to do so.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We will discuss that again.

Mr. POWER: Secondly, suppose we put this obligation on the provincial authorities, let us put it on them only in so far as we can do so,—not let every one get lists. If you insert "duly authorized" it would mean that only those whose duty it is to receive these lists will get them.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think it would be better if we put in the words "therefor for the purpose of this Act," There are no authorized persons that I know of.

Mr. POWER: I am quite agreeable.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I move that we add after the word "applying" in the forty-fifth line the words "therefor for the purpose of this Act."

Amendment agreed to.

On subsection (6)—Power to decide status and population of place.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is another clause, Mr. Chairman, to which I propose to move an amendment and which to some extent affects this clause. It is on the lines suggested by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) a few evenings ago, and it will be to the effect:

That the Chief Electoral Officer shall decide and state at the time of the issue of the election writ what places are and what places are not urban or rural divisions.

It will not conflict, however, with this subsection, in which I do not propose to make any change.

On subsection (8)—Date, etc., when revising officers, etc., sit, to be advertised.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Assistant Clerk of the Crown in Chancery advised that this sub-clause should be amended by adding the following words:

But this subsection shall not apply to the certifying of lists prescribed by rule 16 of schedule A to this section.

Amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the committee desire that the schedule be now read? I may point out to the committee that whether the section is adopted in its present form or not, the schedule, if it is considered separately, can be amended afterwards.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Whichever way the committee finds most convenient is satisfactory to me.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Take up the clause first and the schedule afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 32 carry?

Mr. ROSS: I wish to make a few observations in regard to this section, and in doing so I shall apply my remarks largely to the old settled section of the country, the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec, and more particularly Ontario.

This section is an absolute departure from the practice which has prevailed in the preparation of lists in Ontario except as that practice was varied by the War-time Elections Act. It is a decided departure from good and safe principles. It has been recognized in this country for many years that the provincial lists which were in force sixty days before nomination day were the lists used at federal elections. There were some objections taken to these lists being used, because in some cases they were a year or more than a year old and men who were entitled to vote were not on the lists. But there is this to be said: they were prepared by non-partisan men; they were prepared by municipal authorities. Party spirit did not enter into their operation at all. These lists—and this applies also to the preparation of lists in the rural parts of Ontario—were revised by the county judge; no one could say that they were not revised in a fair and upright manner. I do not think that any clause in the Act is more important than this clause, because no matter how broad you make your franchise—and we have made it so broad under our recent laws that it includes every man and every woman twenty-one years of age who is a British subject—no matter how fair you are in the appointment of your returning officers (and I think some improvement could have been made in the Bill in that respect) if your voters' lists are not prepared in a fair and honourable and open manner by non-partisan officials, the very springs of our representative institutions are going to be fouled.

Now, I say that under clause 32 the old principle has been absolutely departed from. In the first place, in the rural parts of Ontario, enumerators—they are called by the more euphonious name of "registrars" in this Bill—are going to be appointed by returning officers who are nominees of this Government or any Government that is in power, which nominees are certain to be partisan officers. The returning officer will be chosen because he is a partisan officer, because he will help the party in power to win the election. I do not say that he is going to do that dishonestly, but I do say that all his sympathies and all his energies will be devoted to doing anything possible within the limits of the law, even with a stretching of the law, sometimes, to see that the party to whom he owes his appointment is returned to power. Under this Bill the returning officer is given the right to name the registrars. As a matter of human nature and as a matter of course, in every riding in this country registrars are going to be appointed who have at heart the interests of the party in power, and who are going to endeavour as far as they can to help advance those interests. As a matter of fact, the registrar is going to become a paid canvasser, I contend, for the Government in power, and his expenses are going to be paid by the people of Canada. I contend that that establishes, so far as the Government are concerned, nothing more or less than practically a large fund that can be improperly used. We heard not so very long ago members on the other side of the House complain about my friends to my left having large campaign funds for the assisting of their candidates at elections. But this provision of the Bill is a far more dangerous provision as a campaign fund to assist the Government than contributions made by individual farmers, as was the case in the constituency of Assiniboia and as may take place in any constituency in which a farmer candidate is running. What does it mean, Mr. Chairman? It means that throughout the Do-

minion of Canada there will be established under this law—I am making only a rough estimate—about thirty thousand polling subdivisions. Under the Act of 1911, when women had not the vote, there were over thirteen thousand polling subdivisions. Under this Act, with the number of voters doubled and the limit of the number of polls put at 300, I do not think that my estimate of from 25,000 to 30,000 polling subdivisions is out of the way. So we come down to this situation: that the Government starts out in the election with the appointment of 25,000 or 30,000 registrars practically as their agents for the purpose of adding names of voters to the lists. I say again that these men will be paid, under the schedule which is attached to the Act, from $50 to $60 each; they become paid canvassers for the party in power. And that is not all. Under this Act these men are given far more power; they are given a more autocratic power, than they were given under the War-time Elections Act.

For instance, under the old Act, the registrar in the Yukon made changes and added names only on statutory declarations. Under this Bill, the registrar is given power to make changes on the representations of any credible witness. Under the old Act, the War-time Elections Act, bad as it was, in Nova Scotia, if the registrar added or struck off names, there was a right to appeal. Under this Bill, there is no right to appeal whatever as regards the rural parts of a constituency; the registrar has absolute discretion whether a man's name shall be added to the list or not, or whether a man's name shall be struck from the list or not, and it is only known nine or ten days from polling day whether that man's name is on the list or not. There is no opportunity for a man whose name is not on the list to get in his vote except that under clause 63 of the Bill he may get in his vote. But the benefits given by clause 63 in that regard are not by any means as great as the disadvantage that would ensue if clause 63 is allowed to remain as it is.

My first contention is that if we are going to have public faith maintained in our representative institutions, we must start out at the very spring and see what these voters' lists are absolutely fair and that nothing remains in the public mind to make them think that the lists are prepared in a partisan way for the purpose of aiding the Government in power. The preparation of the lists should be done impartially by a judicial authority as it was done in the past, and it should not be left to the mere discretion of a partisan officer.

My second contention is that the expense in connection with the preparation of these lists is going to be very large, and at this time of this country's history when we have to look after every thousand dollars and should look after the millions more particularly and considering the fact that this enumeration will cost in the neighbourhood of a million dollars, we should not encourage any system of preparation of lists which has the disadvantage that I have already pointed out and which has the additional disadvantge of putting a large burden of expense upon this country. I took the trouble of looking into the cost of the enumeration at the last election. In that election we had some 234 constituencies, in thirty-two of which members were elected by acclamation. In the balance of those constituencies contests took place. I find by looking at the Auditor General's Report, that the cost of the enumeration at the election of 1917 was $685,555. If we calculate on that basis the cost of enumeration for the thirty-two constituencies had contests taken place in them, I figure that the cost of enumeration for the 234 constituencies would have been at least $800,000. I have a statement here prepared by the Provincial Auditor of Ontario on behalf of the treasurer of that province from which statement I find that at the last election in Ontario the total expense of enumeration in that province alone was $518,266.77. This is another good and valid reason why the old system should be adopted and we should go back to the preparation of lists by the provincial authorities. If the lists in Ontario cost $518,266.77 for enumeration alone, and you consider Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick as being together equal in population to Ontario, we shall find that the lists in those four provinces will cost at least $1,000,000 for enumeration alone at the next election. But that is not all. If I read the Bill aright and go forward to clause 101 under which lists have to be prepared under the Canada Temperance Act for taking a referendum, and if the lists are prepared by the system which the Acting Solicitor General suggests in this Bill, it is hard to say what expense this country will be put to, because every time a referendum takes place under the Canada Temperance Act, lists will have to be prepared under this Bill and the province which asks for the referendum will not have to pay the expense, but the expense will be borne by the Dominion Government. There-

fore, on the ground of expense alone, we should seek some fairer and more economical method of preparing the lists. Affairs in Toronto at the present time are in a condition of flux; but we have before the Ontario Legislature a very fair Bill as regards the preparation of lists. This Bill is in the name of Mr. Drury, and I have no doubt that it will be passed. As an additional argument in support of my contention that we should go back from the system of enumeration to the old system of preparation of lists by local authorities, I need only point out that the Ontario Government, after one experience, has thrown aside the enumeration system and has reverted to the old system. The system adopted in the new Ontario legislation, which I am sure will become the law of Ontario in a few days or a couple of weeks, is simply this, and it will so correspond with our old franchise and will work in so nicely with our Act that I plead with the Acting Solicitor General to adopt it in the preparation of our lists as a matter of fairness and economy. Under the new Ontario legislation, the municipal authorities in preparing the assessment roll, are compelled to put on that assessment roll the name of every man or woman of twenty-one years of age; that roll is then transcribed by the clerk of the municipality and is made into a municipal voters' list for municipal purposes. That list is then subject to revision by the Court of Revision of the municipality, and then it is subject to revision, as in the olden days, as my hon. friend is well aware, by a judge of the county court. In the case of a general election or in the case of a by-election on account of the death or resignation of a member of the Ontario Legislature, under this new provincial legislation, an election board is appointed in each county consisting of officials such as the county judge, and the deputy registrar, five in all. As soon as a dissolution occurs, or a writ is issued on account of a vacancy in the Assembly this board proceeds at once with the municipal lists which have been prepared as I have described, and it prepares the list for the election of members to the legislature. Nothing could be simpler, fairer or more economical as regards this Government, because this will cost them practically nothing the work being all done and paid for by the municipal authorities. The only expense to be incurred would be this, that in the case of a dissolution of this Houe or in the case of the issue of a writ, this Government would have to pay the election board some expenses in connection with the revision of the lists prepared by the municipal authorities. This is a matter which the committee should consider very carefully. The Acting Solicitor General has repeatedly, in the course of this discussion said that he wants these lists to be absolutely fair; that he does not want anything of a partisan nature to enter into this legislation; that he wants, in effect, the people of this country to have confidence in our institutions by knowing that our lists are prepared in a capable, honest and unpartisan fashion. I do not think any amendment can be suggested to this House that will give the public more confidence in this Administration than the suggestion I have made in regard to the preparation of the lists. Without saying more, I will give notice that at some time in the course of the discussion on this Bill, not now unless some other arrangement is made, I shall move an amendment along these lines, though perhaps not in these very words:

That section 32 be amended by the addition of the following subsection, called 32A:

Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, for the purpose of any Dominion election held within the limits of the province of Ontario, the voters' lists shall, except as hereinafter provided, be those prepared and completed for municipal purposes for the several polling subdivisions under the laws of the province of Ontario, and which were at the date of the issue of the writ for said election under such laws in force for municipal purposes, and all persons named therein as entitled to vote for members of the Legislative Assembly, unless disentitled by the terms of this Act, shall be entitled to vote for members of the House of Commons, provided always that to the said lists there may be added all persons qualified to vote under this Act and there may be subtracted all persons disentitled to vote under this Act, and in revising such lists and making such additions and subtractions, the provisions of the laws of the province of Ontario regulating the revision and bringing into force of the provincial voters' lists in such case shall as far as possible be observed and followed. In such parts of the province of Ontario as are without municipal organization, the voters' lists therefor shall be prepared in accordance with the laws of the province of Ontario in force for the purpose of the election of members to the assembly, but all persons entitled to vote hereunder may be named in said lists and those disentitled to vote shall not be named in said lists.

I trust that the Acting Solicitor General will take the suggestions I have made into his very serious consideration.

Mr. FIELDING: I shall be glad to have the attention of the committee, particularly of the minister in charge of the Bill, while I ask that for a short time consideration be given to the question of the preparation of the voters' lists, from the point of view chiefly of the province of

Nova Scotia. I do not rise for the purpose of criticising the Bill or the action of the Government in the matter at all. I am giving my attention entirely to the making of suggestions which I hope may be found so reasonable that the minister can see the propriety of accepting them. At an earlier stage of the discussion of this measure I spoke of the desirability of using the provincial lists as far as possible, and it is along that line that I wish to speak to the committee now. I suppose we can all admit that if the provincial lists are fair and reasonable, it would be well to have them adopted. The preparation of an electoral list is a matter of difficulty, a matter of expense, and a matter of trouble for the men who are interested in politics and sometimes where the political battle wages fiercely, it is a matter of considerable political strife. Now it is not desirable that these troubles and this strife shall be repeated if you can get from the province a fair list as a basis. Why should not that be adopted for Dominion purposes if it is a fair and reasonable list? I do not suppose there would be any dispute on that point.

There is an impression, I have gathered from conversations with some hon. members, and reference has been made to it in the House that the electoral list of Nova Scotia is largely a list based upon property qualifications. I want to point out that that is practically a mistake. There is a property qualification which is taken into consideration in preparing the original list, but it is not a fact that any man in Nova Scotia who ought to be entitled to vote is disqualified for lack of property qualifications. The existing electoral law of Nova Scotia comes so near to the Dominion franchise that even if there were no change to be made in it, there would be no good reason for having separate lists.

I am going to ask the attention of the committee while I give them briefly a little history of the preparation of electoral lists and the creation of the franchise in Nova Scotia. There was a time, very long ago, when there was a property qualification, not a large one, but still a property qualification. Prior to 1863 there had been universal suffrage, what is now called manhood suffrage, but in that year the Government of the day brought in a Bill to adopt a restricted franchise. How that Bill came to be adopted, and what were its consequences on the political history of Nova Scotia, is a very interesting chapter, but does not concern us here. A restricted franchise was adopted in 1863, and that remained the law without any material change until 1885. At that time I had the honour of being Prime Minister of the province, and it fell to my lot and was my privilege to introduce a Bill to widen the franchise by bringing in a very large proportion of the young men of the province. The new Bill proposed that the sons of farmers and sons living with their parents, if their property qualification either as owners or as yearly tenants was sufficient, should be brought in, and under that law the vast majority of the young men of the province were given the franchise in 1885, and that is a long time ago. At a later stage in our history there was added an income franchise, and when that franchise calling for an annual income of $250, I think, was added to the former we had a franchise so near to manhood suffrage that even if we took the provincial lists as they are to-day they would be practically the same as the Dominion lists prepared under this legislation. But there is to-day before the legislature of Nova Scotia a Bill introduced by a member of the Government and supported by the leader of the Opposition, and therefore likely to become law, to make the franchise of Nova Scotia correspond exactly with the Dominion franchise. I have already pointed out that even if there was no change made in the provincial law there would be no material difference, but that there may be no room for difficulty on that score I point out to my hon. friends that this Bill introduced by a member of the Government and supported by the leader of the Opposition is now in process of passing through the legislature of Nova Scotia, and I take it for granted, for the reasons I have mentioned, that it will be enacted. So there will be no difference between the franchise law of the Dominion and the franchise law of Nova Scotia.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There are differences in the Bill. I have seen it.

Mr. FIELDING: Material differences?

Mr. GUTHRIE: There are differences, but I understand there have been some amendments since I last saw the Bill.

Mr. FIELDING: I read only a newspaper report, and it stated that the object was to bring the Nova Scotia franchise substantially into harmony with the Dominion franchise. I have not had the Bill before me, but I take it for granted, having regard to the object of the legislation, that if there are any material differences, amendments

will be made, because I saw it stated by the minister introducing the Bill that the object sought was to conform with the Dominion franchise. Even if it were not so, the franchise law actually existing to-day is so near manhood suffrage that it is not worth while paying much attention to the difference, and I hope the minister will see that there is no reason why we should not adopt the Nova Scotia lists as they stand.

I am not going to move an amendment, but I shall read one which I have drafted, and leave it for the consideration of my hon. friend at a later moment. My object now is only to assist in the discussion of this matter, and to give reasons why I think we ought not to have the two lists. My hon. friend (Mr. Ross) has given figures to show the enormous cost involved in preparing the lists, and I think that must be obvious to all. We will all surely agree that if the provincial lists are fair lists they ought to be adopted. Oot only for the convenience of the public, nor to save expense to the public treasury, but on both these grounds we should guard against having a repetition of the lists.

How are the Nova Scotia lists made up? There is an impression, I find, that there is some partisanship in the making up of the lists. That is not so, as far as I can learn. The lists are prepared by revisers appointed by the municipal councils, and I think it has come to be a very generally understood thing that men of both political parties are appointed to the revising board. The preliminary list is made up and published in all public places, and a day is fixed when those who are interested in the matter can apply to have a name added or a name struck off. On the day appointed they appear, and the lists are revised at that stage. Then there is a final stage; there is a court of appeal in the sheriffs of the province. I have heard it suggested—I will not say argued, because it is no argument—that because the sheriffs are appointed by the Provincial Government, therefore they will be partisans. Let me repeat a suggestion I offered on a previous occasion. This Dominion Franchise Act assigns certain duties to the county judges. They are appointed by the Dominion Government. If I should object to that on the ground that because they are appointed by the Dominion Government they will therefore be partisan, that would be a very foolish argument. It would be no argument at all, nor is it any argument to say that the sheriffs of Nova Scotia because they are appointed by the Provincial Government must be partisan. It so happens that nearly all the sheriffs in Nova Scotia are old and experienced public officials. Most of them are longer in the public service than any judges we have on the bench. There are eighteen sheriffs in Nova Scotia, sixteen of whom have held office for over five years, fifteen have held office for more than ten years, eight have held office for more than twenty years, and in my own constituency, where there are two sheriffs, one has been in office thirty-six years and the other forty-three years. These sheriffs are old and experienced officers, and although they may have had their predilections, as we all have, before appointment, I submit that when men are appointed to public office—and I care not to what side they belong,—in nine cases out of ten they realize a sense of responsibility not to party but to the state in which they are permanent officers. It is therefore but fair to say that men who have held the office of sheriff for all these years I have indicated are just as likely to be just and reasonable and non-partisan as any judge of the Supreme Court or of the County Court of Nova Scotia, or any other province. I think that that is a fair argument, and I can see no answer for it. I urge that the fact that the appeal is to the sheriff of the province should not be regarded for a single moment as an indication that the sheriffs of this country will be partisan in this matter. I for one am confident that they will not be. It so happens that the Government of the province of Nova Scotia for a very long period has been Liberal, and inevitably they have appointed their friends. We do not blame them; we do not blame the Government of the day for appointing their friends to offices. It follows therefore that most of these men I have mentioned are Liberals, although in one case in my own county the sheriff is a Conservative. Whether they are Liberals or Conservatives, however, when such men, being good and worthy citizens, are appointed to responsible offices of this permanent character, they bring to their duties a sense of responsibility and justice and they should not be assumed to be partisans any more than the judges of the country are regarded as partisans because of the fact that at one time before they came to the Bench they had their own political preferences. The question of expense is a considerable one. My hon. friend from Middlesex has dealt with that question and has submitted certain figures. He says that there will not be much expense incurred in Ontario if

we adopt this proposal. Well, there will not be a dollar of expense in Nova Scotia if you adopt what I suggest. The lists are always ready; they are revised every year, and you do not want any special lists. You can never have an election there without having a list ready, and if my suggestion were adopted it would not cost the Dominion of Canada one single penny. Why, then, should not lists of that kind be accepted as a finality? Why should lists made up in the way I have described be submitted to any one else in order that they may be added to or subtracted from? I do not discuss the question of motives or party at all in regard to this matter; I am simply stating the case from the point of view of common sense. The motion I am about to read includes the province of New Brunswick, as I am informed by my hon. friend from that province that the situation there is pretty much the same as in Nova Scotia. I will leave them, however, at a later stage to speak on the question from their point of view, but they assure me that the case of New Brunswick is very much like our own. I confine my remarks to Nova Scotia because I am best acquainted with conditions in that province and the suggestion I offer to the minister is that we insert a section 32-A the following:

5 p.m.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Act, the lists of voters for the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall be those prepared and completed for the several polling divisions under the laws of the respective provinces for the purposes of provincial elections if they are completed within one year immediately preceding the issue of the writ for such election, and no names shall be added to or subtracted from such lists.

Now, I trust I have given the minister ample reason why he should not ask for any special lists in the province of Nova Scotia. I believe that there is no reason in the world why the lists prepared in the way I have described should not be accepted for Dominion purposes.

Mr. BUTTS: It is only in view of the remarks of my hon. friend that I attempt to speak this afternoon, for I am suffering from hoarseness due to a severe cold.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): Will the hon. member please come further to the front? We are anxious to hear what is being said, but we simply cannot.

Mr. BUTTS: Why don't you come up to the front?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is what we did in the old House; we all gathered around.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. BUTTS: I speak only in view of what has been said by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) because of all men in this House he is the last who should speak on the franchise. In the year 1882 he became Premier of Nova Scotia. At that time there was on the Statute Book of Nova Scotia a law which provided that no person holding office under the Dominion Government had a right to vote in provincial elections. You were Premier of Nova Scotia for thirteen years, and in 1896 by some freak of fortune, you were taken into the Laurier Cabinet.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out to the hon. member—

Mr. BUTTS: I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman; I perceive my error. My hon. friend was Minister of Finance in the Laurier Cabinet for some time from 1896. Now, a few nights ago when my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) was speaking, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's interrupted to say that he did not believe the statement of my hon. friend to be correct. Had it not been for my hoarseness I would have asked the hon. member to go with me into the library, and if he did not know I would have shown him there that D. C. Fraser, who was member of Parliament for Guysborough and a bosom friend of the hon. member, debated this very question of the franchise against Mr. Black of Cumberland and Mr. Owen, of my hon. friend's own county, when they wanted to amend the franchise law.

In those days, gentlemen of this House will remember—and they can refresh their recollection by a reference to the records to be found in the Parliamentary library—my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's was disfranchising British subjects. To-day he is solicitous about the enfranchising of enemy aliens. Is that not true? Answer me? I wait for an answer. Will you answer?

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. BUTTS: Do not deny it because I will bring the Hansard of Nova Scotia legislature to prove to you that I am right. I ask you for a reply? I ask the hon. gentleman through you, Mr. Chairman, to reply to me, and say whether I am right or wrong. Ah, yes! solicitous for the foreign alien enemy, but not solicitous for the man who was not only a British subject but of British origin. When the Fielding Government came into power in Nova Scotia in 1882, and in that connection my

hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) made a mistake the other day—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must point out to the hon. member that he is out of order.

Mr. BUTTS: I know I am always wrong, but I ask to be granted a little indulgence.

The CHAIRMAN: I call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the question now under discussion is the making of the voters' lists.

Mr. BUTTS: That, Mr. Chairman, is what I am getting at now.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member will be good enough to come to the point.

Mr. BUTTS: That is what I am getting at, and I have no doubt in the world that you will recognize that I will come around to it sooner or later. My hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's now seems to be solicitous that every one should have the vote. Would I be out of order if I were to recount, or retell, a little incident that occured in the local legislature between myself and the Premier of Nova Scotia? Perhaps I would not be altogether in order in doing that, but I do not think it would do any harm to tell the story. I and my colleague from Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Douglas) had occasion to complain one time that twenty of our voters —twenty Conservative voters—were struck off the list because there were no Liberal magistrates who would take their oath when they went to swear. You will find all this set fo th in the Hansard of Nova Scotia. I complained about it in the local House. The Hon. George H. Murray, the successor of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's, told me, as to the reason for this, that he knew not why, and I said to him across the floor: "If you know not why, will you give me your promise here this evening that you will appoint two magistrates in Cape Breton county—one to be named by myself and one to be named by Mr. Douglas? He promised me that he would. We submitted those two names but up till to-day neither one of them has ever been appointed, and we could not get a name on the list except by force. Now my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) gets up and swells out his chest and talks about the honour and the honesty of politics. Ah, yes! but when he was in power where was his honesty or integrity?

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must point out to the hon. member that this committee is not dealing with the honesty and integrity of any member of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

The CHAIRMAN: We are discussing a certain clause, and the rule is clear that the discussion must be strictly relevant to that clause. I do hope that old political sores will not be raked over in the course of this discussion.

An hon. MEMBER: Bravo.

Mr. BUTTS: I know, Mr. Chairman, that you are perfectly right, and you may have noticed that I have always bowed to the decision of the Chair. But let me go one little bit further and, I hope, not in a disorderly manner. Let me say this: That the first election that was run by the Laurier Government after its return to office, took place, if you remember, in 1901.

An hon. MEMBER: No, 1900.

Mr. BUTTS: Very true, 1900. If you make search in the library yonder you will find that the previous year the statutes of Nova Scotia had been revised—and in that revision—one year before the election—entirely to my mind at the suggestion of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's, George Murray, the Premier of Nova Scotia, had dropped from the statutes the Act that disqualified officials that were appointed by the Dominion Government. Now I ask you, gentlemen on both sides of this House, is it possible that sane men are going to take their standards from the member for Shelburne and Queen's? I won't.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I regret that I am not able to agree with all of the statements which have been made by my hon. friend who represents the constituency of Shelburne and Queen's. I do not suppose for a moment that the hon. member intended to mislead the committee, but it really does seem to me that he could hardly have compressed more inaccuracies within the four corners of his speech if he had really set out with that object in view. I think therefore, Mr. Chairman, I will have to ask the committee to bear with me while I go very briefly—if I can—into matters of a somewhat provincial character, in order to show exactly what the conditions in the province of Nova Scotia are as far as the revising of the lists is concerned. I am opposed to the proposition made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's

(Mr. Fielding) for various reasons. In the first place, the lists in the province of Nova Scotia, are, as he stated, revised by revisers appointed by the municipal councils. But unfortunately, for reasons which I will later explain, in that province the municipal councils are run on strictly party lines. Rural municipal elections—I do not now refer to municipal elections in cities and towns—are quite as partisan as are the Dominion and provincial elections. The result is that in every rural district partisans, or at least very strong party men, are elected to represent the various municipal districts. These men naturally appoint revisers whom they think will prepare lists which will make their re-election easy. I may say, so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, that I think that, with one or two exceptions, the party to which my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) belongs has control of all the municipal councils of the province, which means that they have the appointment of all the revisers.

The councillors who appoint these revisers, as may be expected, are not men of quite the same stamp as members of the Provincial Legislature, and they are not quite as careful in their appointments as members of a larger and more influential body would be. I am speaking now of both Liberals and Conservatives. Consequently the revisers are as a rule intense party men, They are not at all skilled in the construction of statutes, they are just men picked up anywhere, without any particular knowledge of law, without any other qualification than the fact that they are capable supporters of the councillor from their district and may be depended upon to prepare a list favourable to his re-election. Into the hands of these laymen is placed a very complicated piece of legislation. I am not saying that it is designedly ambiguous, but I do say that there is not on the statute books of Nova Scotia a more ambiguous and difficult piece of legislation to construe than is the Franchise Act.

My hon. friend has said that there has been practically manhood suffrage in the province for a number of years. I am obliged to take very decided issue with him on that point. If he refers to the statutes of 1918 he will find two pages are covered in describing the different franchise qualifications. A man may vote: if he owns $150 worth of real estate; if he owns $300 of real estate and personal property combined; if he rents a house or a piece of land worth $150; and there are various other qualifications. If a person owns $150 worth of real estate in the province, whether he is a resident of his district or not, in the past he has been entitled to be registered as a voter. Moreover if a man is assessed for $150 worth of real estate on the municipal assessment roll, whether he is properly assessed or not, whether he owns any property or not, and whether he lives in the province or not, that qualifies him for a vote.

What has been the result of that legislation? It has led to the bedevilment of the assessment rolls. Unscrupulous assessors have in many instances loaded up the municipal assessment rolls with the names of men who are not owners of property, who are not residents in the province, but in many instances reside in the United States. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), if he will examine the assessment rolls of his own county, will, I am quite sure, find that condition of affairs there. I was unfortunate enough at one time to be connected with a by-election in my hon. friend's constituency, and I remember going very carefully over the lists and finding something like 400 non-resident voters in that county—persons with doubtful or no qualifications whatever, persons who were residing in the United States and who never came to the county except at election time, when they were brought over to deposit their ballots. I say that is a most vicious condition of affairs, and unfortunately that condition exists not only in my hon. friend's constituency but in almost every other constituency in that province.

But while there is no residence qualification in so far as persons who are assessed as property owners are concerned, there is a very rigid residential qualification in so far as persons voting—

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): If my hon. friend will permit me. Does he say there is no residence qualification for voters in the province?

Mr. DAVIDSON: If my hon. friend had possessed his soul in patience a little while longer he would have found his question unnecessary; but I will answer it. I say that so far as persons who are assessed as owners of real estate of the qualifying amount are concerned, no residential qualification is required; but I do say that so far as other persons are concerned, there is a very exacting residential qualification required, and it is this——

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): But my hon. friend is aware that the Dominion Franchise Act requires a man to live in a constituency, and if the oath can be put to him, and he is on the list, that does not

affect the question at all, because the law that we are now passing contains a provision whereby that can be checked.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I think my hon. friend misses the point absolutely. The proposition, as I understand it from my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), is that we shall adopt the provincial lists, and that a person who is on the provincial lists shall be eligible to vote on a federal election.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): That is all.

Mr. DAVIDSON: As I said before, if a person does not happen to be assessed for property, if he is obliged to vote on his income qualification, he is surrounded with very strict provisions. Take, for example, the case of a clergyman, of a bank clerk, or of a commercial traveller—men who are changing their residence very frequently; they find under the law of the province that they are debarred from voting. The residential qualification is something like this: A man must be a resident of the county in which he is to vote for one year from the first day of January preceding the day of the revision of the lists. The lists are revised on the fifth of March. If therefore a clergyman moves into my county on the 2nd of January, 1920, he cannot be registered on the 5th March, 1920, because he has not been in the county a year; more than that, he cannot be registered in 1921 because he has not been a resident of the county for a year from the 1st January preceding the date of revision. The list made up in 1921 holds good until the middle of April, 1922. Consequently that clergyman could not vote if an election was held before the middle of April, 1923. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) dwelt very pathetically the other day upon the awful sense of injustice and wrong which would rankle in the heart of the child of a woman who, under the clause that was put through the other night, would, by reason of her alien birth, have to go before a judge to get a certificate in order that she might be enabled to vote. If we were to adopt the proposal of the member for Shelburne and Queen's, what would be the position of the clergyman's child, who, when election day came around, found that all the dishonourable thugs in the community had a vote while he, whose father was a leader in spiritual matters in the community, was debarred? I object to that proposition.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have been told that on the same principle as that which my hon. friend has laid before the committee, a man in Nova Scotia may be required to be twenty-three years of age before he may vote.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. GUTHRIE: A very high authority in this House has demonstrated to me that that is so.

Mr. DUFF: It is not so.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I do not know that he is required to be twenty-three years of age, but I think there are many cases in which he would be required to be twenty-two and a half.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is, perhaps, near enough.

Mr. McKENZIE: The clergyman of which my hon. friend speaks would have sufficient income to enable his name to go on the list, and he would be on the assessment list.

Mr. DAVIDSON: My hon. friend is wrong. He would have the income all right, but according to the law he would have to have more than the income; he would have to have residence qualification. He would have to swear that he had been a resident of the county of which the polling district forms a part for a year from the first day of January preceding the revision. Now, my hon. friend says that he would be on the assessment roll. But under the laws of Nova Scotia a man is exempted from assessment on income up to $1,500.

Mr. McKENZIE: No.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Absolutely.

Mr. McKENZIE: That does not deprive him of his vote. Although he is exempt from taxation, he is qualified to vote.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I have the greatest respect for the legal acumen of my hon. friend, but I am obliged to think that he is absolutely wrong.

Mr. McKENZIE: Not at all.

Mr. DAVIDSON: A man who is exempt from assessment certainly is not assessed, and the law says that a man must be assessed for $250 income before he can vote on that qualification. If he is exempt to the extent of $1,500 in assessment on income, then he must get $1,750 before he can be assessed. Unfortunately in Nova Scotia a great many devout and good men

who occupy pulpits do not receive that remuneration, although in almost every case they deserve much more.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is there a special clause in regard to clergymen or ministers, or does the same rule apply to all?

Mr. DAVIDSON: The same rule applies to all; I am just citing the clergymen as an instance. The same applies to a bank manager, to a school teacher, to the hundred and one different occupations engaged in by people who frequently have occasion to change their places of residence. Then, it must be remembered that the list is closed on the tenth day of April and if an election comes say the next February, under the proposal of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) the voter would be voting on lists almost a year old. That would mean that intelligent men, men occupying high positions, who have lived in the district for four years, would be debarred from the right to vote.

Now, my hon. friend said that an appeal to the sheriff makes for a fair list; that a sheriff is just as good a man as a county court judge. I take very decided issue with him there. There is a great difference between a county court judge and a sheriff. For many years the Opposition in Nova Scotia have asked the Government to amend the law so that an appeal would lie to a county court judge. There are seven county court judges in Nova Scotia; four were appointed by the party to which my hon. friend belongs, and three by either the Liberal-Conservative party or the Union Government. The Nova Scotia Government refused point-blank to permit an appeal to the county court judge; they insisted upon an appeal to the sheriff,—who, my hon. friend says, is an absolutely independent, capable officer. My hon. friend will admit that the sheriff is not as well versed in the law as is the county court judge. The minimum salary of a sheriff in Nova Scotia is, I think, $700; you can readily understand that a salary of that kind does not attract the most acute legal minds in the province. An appeal lies from the three laymen revisers to the layman sheriff. The sheriff is in an entirely different position from that of the county court judge. The county court judge has a knowledge of law; the sheriff is usually a man who was acting as constable or something of that kind and, because of his political proclivities, made himself so useful to the party in power that he was appointed to the more remunerative and more honourable position of sheriff. That is the kind of men who were appointed. I admit that the sheriffs in Nova Scotia are of a very much better class than they were when my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) was Premier of that province. But they are far from being men who have judicial minds. They get their inspiration and their advice from the Attorney General of the province. In cases of dispute the sheriffs feel bound to take the advice of the Attorney General,—and right there I want to relate just a little incident which will illustrate my point and give you some insight into the condition of affairs in Nova Scotia.

In 1911, I as prospective candidate for the provincial legislature, took a good deal of interest in the revising of the lists. I organized my county as best I could, and had the interests of my parts fairly represented before the revisers. Following that I fought the thing out before the sheriff of the county; we looked after the technicalities and did the work as well as we could. Under the law the sheriff is obliged to file his list with the county clerk, on the tenth day of April, I think,—anyway, the date is not material. I made a point of being at the municipal clerk's office the day that the sheriff was to file his list. I looked it over and found that apart altogether from appeals, apart altogether from cases which were legally brought before him, the sheriff had, by striking off without cause the names of my friends and putting on the names of political opponents, made a net change in the list to the tune of 193 votes. I called by telephone the Attorney General, who was then the Hon. A. K. Maclean, and explained that this thing was an outrage and that it must be stopped. Mr. Maclean agreed that it must be stopped and finally he promised that he would wire the sheriff to make a correction and to see that this scandal was not carried out.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Will the hon. member state what was the year in which that happened?

Mr. DAVIDSON: In April, 1911. If my hon. friend wants any confirmation of my story, I refer him to the member for Halifax (Hon. A. K. Maclean). Although I have no word from the then Attorney General to substantiate my statement, I believe that he was as good as his word. I did observe afterwards a messenger from the telegraph office deliver a telegram to the sheriff, who was then in the clerk's office. The clerk afterwards informed me that when the sheriff got the message he left

the office and went to the office of Hon. O. T. Daniels, then provincial member for the county. After spending a little time with Mr. Daniels the sheriff returned to his office and said: "Mr. Daniels says this thing is all right; I am going to put this list through just as it is."

Mr. Daniels, who was then provincial member for the county and who afterwards became Attorney General for the province of Nova Scotia, is the man who would be the final court of appeal on these federal lists if the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) were agreed to.

Mr. BUTTS: Is this same Mr. O. T. Daniels, Attorney General of Nova Scotia, the man whose picture figured in the Police Gazette in New York?

Mr. DAVIDSON: I am always glad to answer any question of my hon. friend, but perhaps this question is not relevant to the subject under consideration. I can, however, satisfy him outside.

Mr. BUTTS: I am right, am I?

Mr. DAVIDSON: As I said before, I could multiply cases of this character, but I do not think that is necessary. I have dealt so far only with the law as it formerly was. I am now going to deal for a moment or two with the proposition as amended. It is a most extraordinary thing that for years and years the Opposition in the provincial legislature of Nova Scotia has been trying to get the Provincial Government to abolish the fictitious qualifications of the old Act and to adopt manhood suffrage. That was not accomplished until within the last few weeks when a measure was introduced into the provincial legislature, and the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) who is endeavouring to steer this amendment through, seems to know all about the matter. I do not want to be suspicious; but it looks to me almost as though there was a guilty knowledge between these two gentlemen and that the scheme in Nova Scotia was part of the scheme as we have seen it attempted in this House to-day. However that may be, my hon. friend is very much in error in reference to the contents of this Bill and its success in getting through the House. As a matter of fact, the Bill, as introduced into the provincial legislature, is decidedly different in many respects, which I may have occasion to point out later on in this debate, from the Bill which is at present before this House. I am going to point out just one or two striking differences. In the first place, the Bill that we are discussing to-day provides that any person who is a British subject, who is a resident of Canada for one year and a resident of the polling district in which he desires to vote, for two months preceding the election, is qualified to be registered. That is the only qualification. In Nova Scotia, the qualification is very different. The Act as it passed in the provincial legislature requires that the applicant must be a resident of the county of which the polling district forms a part for one year previous to the first day of January last past. Therefore, this is open to exactly the objections I have stated before in reference to the old Act. It is even worse than that, because by the affidavit which the applicant is obliged to take, his residence is confined not only to the county, but to the polling district itself. Let me read the affidavit which it is necessary for a man to make if he wishes to have his name added to the voters' list.

I, solemnly swear:

1. That I am (or he or she is) a British subject by birth or naturalization of the full age of twenty-one years.

2. That I am and have been (or he or she is and has been) a resident of the province of Nova Scotia for at least one year next before the first day of January last and so resided in polling district No. in the county of during said period.

That means that before a man can vote under the Nova Scotia Act as amended, he must actually be a resident of the polling district from one year from the first day of January preceding the date of the revision. That, at one stroke, would practically disqualify, I believe, fully one-quarter of the total electorate of the province of Nova Scotia. That is the kind of a list which my hon. friend suggests that this House should adopt.

My particular reason against this House adopting any municipal or provincial list is this, that I believe it will have a tendency to introduce federal politics into municipal affairs, and that I consider would be an outrage. The criticism is raised and, I fear with too much force, that we residents of Nova Scotia are a bit partisan in our nature. That certainly applies to hon. members opposite from Nova Scotia; I do not know whether it applies to members on this side of the House. It is, to some extent, true that we in Nova Scotia take, perhaps, too extreme political views on public questions. I believe the secret of the whole thing is in the system inaugurated by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), which he would try to induce this committee to perpetuate. When my hon. friend became premier of Nova Scotia as a very shrewd and astute

politician, he decided that he must have control of the lists. Therefore he went to work to capture every municipal council in Nova Scotia. I do not condemn him for that; I think his action was wise. He said: We must have a list favourable to ourselves and so we must have municipal councils in sympathy with and of the same stripe as the Government. The result was that he introduced a vein of party politics into municipal affairs, and that has been there ever since. That is a curse. When the people of a municipality are called upon to elect a councillor, they should not ask the question whether he be a Unionist or a Liberal; they should inquire only into his personal qualifications. Furthermore, when a municipal council appoints a man to prepare the assessment rolls, it should have no regard whatever for his political proclivities. But if we are going to put the question of revision of the lists for federal purposes into the hands of these men, by that very act we make partisans of them; we introduce the curse of party politics into municipal affairs. I certainly entertain a strong conviction that this House will not consider any proposal such as that.

Mr. LEGER: I should like to say a few words in reference to the electoral list of New Brunswick. I shall certainly ask the Government to adopt this list because I believe, on account of the way in which it is prepared, it is as perfect a list as can be made in the whole Dominion. From what I can understand as regards making up the lists throughout Canada, I believe New Brunswick is, I shall not say ahead of any other province, but equal to any other province. The list is a perfect one because it is acceptable without any complaints from either political party, and if any other hon. member from New Brunswick is present, he will bear me out in that statement. This list is prepared by a very independent board of revisers. This board is composed of one gentleman appointed by the Provincial Government, who is the chairman, and two others who are appointed by the electors of each parish of a county. In this way the councillors when they are elected are revisers. They are the choice of the people from each and every parish. This board of revisers meets in September, I think, of each year and prepares a list of the voters, which is posted up in every public place in the province. A new list is made every year. After making the list, notice is given that the board will sit one month later, before which applicants can be heard as to the adding of names to the list or striking them off. When this has been done by the board in November, the lists are filed with the county secretary, who makes a copy of the lists filed from every parish and every county of the province. He then notifies the sheriffs of the counties who go over the lists with him to see that they are true copies. The sheriff then certifies the list, putting his name on every page. There you have the official list for the county, and on the first of January of each year these lists come into force and are available in case of an election being held throughout the year.

As to qualifications, we have manhood suffrage in New Brunswick. A man twenty-one years of age, whether he owns property or not, has the right to vote. We have also extended the franchise to women on the same basis. I think by the method I have described we get a perfect list. I have handled the lists many times myself, and I have never received a complaint from any candidate or any man belonging to either one party or the other, that the lists were not right. They are as perfect as they can be made, and I would therefore urge the minister to accept these provincial lists as the basis for the Dominion lists. I think every member of this House from the province of New Brunswick, no matter on which side he sits, will admit that the lists are as perfect as they can be made.

Mr. DUFF: I have not taken part in the discussion or any of the clauses of the Franchise Bill, and I would not have done so this afternoon if it had not been for the speeches I have heard to-day from certain hon. members from the province of Nova Scotia. I do not profess to be a politician, but I certainly have some knowledge of the manner in which the provincial lists are made up in the province of Nova Scotia. My hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) smiles. I do not know how much he knows about canned beans, but I do know how the electoral lists are made up in the province of Nova Scotia. I had the honour of being municipal clerk and treasurer for the municipality of Lunenburg for twelve years, during which time I offered to resign on two occasions, but I was presented with a petition signed not only by the Liberal members of the council but also by every Conservative member, asking me to retain the position. While my business affairs would not allow me to devote my whole time and attention to the office, the council, Conservative members as well as Liberals, prevailed on me to stay, and I stayed in that office a

number of years longer than I had intended. I had custody of the voters' lists during that time, and was in a position to know how the lists were made up. I had the confidence of both Conservative and Liberal members of the council while I was municipal clerk and treasurer.

The hon. member for Annapolis has told us how the lists are made up in the province of Nova Scotia. In my county we have a number of Conservative assessors and a number of Liberal assessors. We have also a number of Conservative as well as Liberal revisers of the electoral lists, and from my knowledge of the character of these men I would not like to stand up in my place and state, as the hon. member for Annapolis did, that we had unscrupulous assessors and revisers in Nova Scotia I have known Conservative assessors and Conservative revisers to be appointed in my county, and I want to say that they are just as good men as the Liberal assessors and revisers. I think I have some knowledge of every county in Nova Scotia, and I would not dare to say that in any one of those counties there were unscrupulous assessors or revisers. Any hon. member not a resident of the province of Nova Scotia, might think as he listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Annapolis that the municipal councils of Nova Scotia were made up entirely, or practically so, of Liberals. That is not the case. If any hon. member will go to the library of this House and look up the records he will find that about 52 per cent of the municipal councillors in the province of Nova Scotia are Liberals and 48 per cent Conservatives. In the hon. member's own county of Annapolis, in the last twenty-five years there has never been a majority of more than one or two Liberals in that council.

Mr. DAVIDSON: It is quite correct that at the present time the Liberals are in a majority of two, but it is the majority that names the revisers, and the individual councillor has not a chance to name his own officers. The warden in that county is the chairman of the Nova Scotia Highway Board.

Mr. DUFF: I was coming to that. I said a moment ago that in the hon. gentleman's own county there has not been in the last twenty-five years a majority of more than one or two Liberals in that council. The same is true of every other municipality. There are just as many Conservative revisers appointed as Liberal revisers. There are almost as many Conservatives in the council as there are Liberals. In some counties the Liberals have a majority, while in other counties the Conservatives are in the majority. Take my own county, in which there are two municipalities, the municipality of Chester and the municipality of Lunenburg. In the municipality of Chester, until the last election, every councillor elected was a Conservative, and I want to go on record as saying that the revisers of electoral lists and the assessors of the county, appointed by Conservative councillors of Chester, were good citizens; and during twenty-five years that I resided in the county of Lunenburg we never had occasion to go to the sheriff or the deputy sheriff or any one else to complain that any one elector put on the list by the revisers of the electoral lists was not properly put there, nor that any Liberal electors were left off. In the municipality of Chester in twenty-five years neither the Liberal workers nor the candidates made one single complaint, and I say therefore that the way in which the lists were made up was fair. Now, how are the lists made up? The hon. member (Mr. Davidson) with his legal knowledge, endeavoured to show that it was a bad system, but in my poor language I shall try to put the matter before the committee. The municipal councils meet in January and appoint certain officers. This is the case in my county and I think this rule applies in most other counties. Every councillor has the privilege of appointing his own revisers. The hon. member said a moment ago that in his county that was not done. A committee was appointed, and a councillor for one district could appoint a reviser for another district. That may happen in his own county, but I am doubtful.

Mr. DAVIDSON: What does the hon. member say? I did not catch his remarks.

Mr. DUFF: I said I was doubtful.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I desire the hon. gentleman to take that statement back. I can assure him that I have personal knowledge of the matter, and I do not think he has any right to cast aspersion on the veracity of any member of the House.

Mr. DUFF: I will not take back that statement.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I ask that the hon. member withdraw it.

Mr. DUFF: I see no reason to withdraw the statement.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Order.

Mr. DUFF: Keep quiet Mr. Solicitor General.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I will not.

Mr. DUFF: We made you keep quiet the other night.

Mr. DAVIDSON: In my county a committee of the council appointed by a majority of the council name the revisers of the lists. The hon. member says that that statement is not correct.

Mr. DUFF: I did not say that at all.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Well the hon. gentleman threw some doubt on my assertion. He said he did not believe it.

Mr. DUFF: My word is as good as that of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Does the hon. gentleman say he did not say that?

The CHAIRMAN: I understood the hon. member to say that that was not what he said. That is why I gave no ruling on the point.

Mr. DUFF: In most counties in the province of Nova Scotia the municipal councillors, whether Conservative or Liberal, appoint the reviser for the electoral district they represent. That is the way in which it is done, and if the hon. member says it is not done that way in his district I am not going to contradict him here; but as I said a moment ago I am doubtful.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I should like to have a ruling on that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that any hon. member has the right to cast a doubt on the word of any other hon. member. I, therefore, do not think that the expression is quite in order.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, I simply doubt that the hon. gentleman's information is correct; I do not doubt his word. I have heard something of the way in which the lists are made up in the adjoining county to mine, the county of Annapolis, and I have as much right to express my views in that respect as the hon. member has. In most counties of Nova Scotia the municipal councillors, Conservative or Liberal, have been in the habit of appointing the revisers for their own districts. These men make up the lists and do what they think is right. They put practically every man in the district on the lists. The hon. gentleman has told us about the property qualification and the income qualification, but he certainly knows that in Nova Scotia that is not followed to the strict letter of the law. I know that in my county and several others every man who is entitled to vote votes whether or not—

Mr. DAVIDSON: The Blue Rocks?

Mr. DUFF: You had better not bring up the Blue Rocks or I will show you what the Tories did there, and it is no credit to one of your friends. What about St. Peter's? I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, that although it is quite true that in Nova Scotia the Franchise Act says there must be a property or income qualification, it is a well-known fact that practically every man in the district is placed on the voters' lists by the revisers. The hon. gentleman also told us that clergymen who came to the county could not vote for one or two years.

Mr. COWAN: If these people in Nova Scotia do not live up to the law why do they want us to adopt it?

Mr. DUFF: I cannot catch the hon. gentleman's remark.

Mr. COWAN: Why ask us to adopt a law that you do not live up to?

Mr. DUFF: I do not ask you to adopt anything; you are going to vote for the Solicitor General's Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: I trust that after recess hon. members will confine their remarks to the subject before the committee.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. DUFF: When the committee took recess at six o'clock I was speaking to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), and which had been replied to by the hon. member for Digby and Annapolis (Mr. Davidson). I was endeavouring to answer some of the remarks made by the latter hon. member and was interrupted three times, once by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan)—who asked me a fair question—and on the other two occasions by the hon. member for Digby and Annapolis and the Acting Solicitor General respectively. I was discussing the manner in which the voters' lists were made up for the province of Nova Scotia, and I said whilst it was quite true that either a property qualification or an income qualification was necessary, yet in making up those lists the revisers did not adhere to the

strict letter of the law. I do not mean by that that they evaded the law. I mean to say that under the existing law as it stands practically every British subject over twenty-one years of age is entitled to be placed on the voters' list for the simple reason—and I think I am safe in making this statement—that there is not one such man in the province of Nova Scotia who does not possess either of those qualifications. The hon. member for Digby and Annapolis then interrupted me with some remarks about "Blue Rocks." I do not know what the hon. member had reference to, but I wish to say to him that if he wishes to discuss "Blue Rocks," "Black Rocks," or "Back Woods," I am ready to discuss either one of these three matters with him at any time. If the hon. member desires to insinuate anything about "Blue Rocks," or any other place in my riding, let him be man enough to come out and state plainly what he means.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Does the hon. member wish me to explain?

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, it is you, is it?

Mr. DUFF: Yes, I wish the hon. member to explain what he means.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I understand that at the last general election at the Blue Rocks poll, in the county of Lunenburg, there was a great deal of lawlessness and a great deal of confusion. That is what I had reference to.

Mr. DUFF: I am very much obliged for the explanation which the hon. member has given. The conduct of the 1917 election has nothing whatever to do with the matter we are now considering, but in view of what the hon. member has said I think it is only fair to the law-abiding citizens of Blue Rocks to make a short explanation. The hon. member said there was lawlessness at the Blue Rocks poll. Now, if anything of the kind happened at that poll, and I certainly do not admit it, it was caused by an official of the hon. member's own political persuasion—appointed by the returning officer—who was acting as deputy returning officer at that place. What caused the trouble was this: Outside of twelve men, I received every vote that was polled at Blue Rocks, where there are some three hundred voters, and I would have received seventy more votes if the deputy returning officer at Blue Rocks had not deliberately interfered with the conduct at that poll so that those seventy men could not vote before five o'clock. I did not wish to bring this matter up because I have forgiven and forgotten the episode; but if my Conservative friend in the town of Lunenburg who was deputy returning officer at that time finds any fault with what has been said here to-night, the blame rests with his political friend from Digby and Annapolis. Whilst the little altercation was going on between the hon. member (Mr. Davidson and myself, the Acting Solicitor General intervened. I am a compartively new member in the House and for that reason I have carefully watched proceedings so as to ascertain how a new member should comport himself, and during the last three sessions I have observed the course of different members of the Government when introducing legislation, and the manner in which they conducted the proceedings from the time that measures are brought in until they are finally passed. I have watched the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster), the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), the Minister of Marine and several other ministers introduce and guide legislation through this House, and I want to say, Sir, that I am surprised at the manner in which the hon. Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) has treated the measure that we are now considering. This afternoon when I was having an altercation with the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) the hon. minister deliberately shouted across the Chamber, some fifty feet, about me to the hon. member of Annapolis some unseemly remarks. This is not the first time such an incident has occurred. During the progress of the debate on this measure we on this side of the House, whilst we could not hear what the hon. Acting Solicitor General said, have seen him deliberately turn round and, judging by the expression on his face, make some sneering remark which we on this side could not hear but which was distinctly heard in the galleries. The hon. gentleman ought to have more respect for the dignity of this House and for his position. He ought to watch the proceedings from his place and be ready to answer questions that may be put to him from time to time, and not turn away from the hon. gentlemen speaking on this side.

Before the committee rose at six o'clock I was explaining the manner in which the voters' lists were made up in the province of Nova Scotia, and I said that the municipal councils, which were fairly evenly divided between the two political parties, appointed the revisers of the electoral lists for the various counties. The hon.

member for Digby and Annapolis said that in his county a committee of the council got together and appointed the revisers. Well, I am not going to deny that statement, because under the rules of the House we must accept what an hon. member says. But I think I am making a fair statement when I say that if, for instance, fifteen revisers are appointed by the municipal council of the county of Annapolis, at least 40 or 45 per cent of those revisers will be Conservatives; that is to say, those revisers would not be all Liberals or all Conservatives. That being the condition of things, the hon. gentleman's suggestion that the revisers were all Liberals, and that consequently the list would be affected to the detriment of Conservatives, is not to my mind borne out by the facts.

In a number of counties I know that both Liberal and Conservative revisers are appointed. I am aware that in my own county and in the neighbouring counties not only do Liberal and Conservative councillors not follow strict party lines in making these appointments, but Conservative councillors appoint Liberal revisers and Liberal councillors appoint Conservative revisers. And when we find that the two political parties do not confine the appointments strictly to their own supporters, it may be safely assumed that we are going to have a pretty fair list.

These revisers, as I said, are appointed by the municipal council, they meet on a certain day, and they receive applications for names to be placed on the list. In addition to those applications they examine the assessment roll and place practically every name there on the electoral list. After that work is done there is another safeguard. But before I proceed further I might point out to the committee that the people in Nova Scotia, or in any other part of Canada for that matter, are not as the hon. member for Annapolis charged, unscrupulous. Let us take the oath which these revisers have to swear to before they proceed with their work. It is in this form:

> We, the undersigned revisers for revisal section number.....(or for the town of.....), in the county of.....solemnly swear:
>
> 1. That we will well and faithfully perform our duties as such revisers without fear, favour or partiality.
>
> 2. That we will not place the name of any person on the list of voters for any polling district in said revisal section unless we believe such person to be entitled to be registered on such list.
>
> 3. That we will not strike the name of any person off such list of voters unless we believe such person is not entitled to be registered on such list.
>
> 4. That we will in all respects, to the best of our ability, comply with the requirements of the Nova Scotia Franchise Act.
>
> Sworn to by .....and..... at.....

I would not like to get on my feet and say that any man who took that oath would not discharge his duty to the very best of his ability whether he was a Liberal or a Conservative. I am sure he would discharge his duty faithfully and well.

Mr. POWER: Are there Conservatives in Nova Scotia, Mr. Solicitor General?

Mr. DUFF: In addition to these revisers being appointed for every municipal district, there are also what are known as revisal sections. A revisal section is composed of three or five revisers. After the individual reviser makes up the electoral lists this revisal section meets at a certain place on a certain date, and whether the revisal section consists of three or five revisers, as the case may be, those revisers are not all Liberals, nor are they all Conservatives; they are composed of supporters of both parties, sometimes in the proportion of two Liberals to three Conservatives, at other times three Liberals to two Conservatives. Those men meet for a whole day to receive complaints or applications. If any one feels that his name should be placed on the list, or that some other person's name should be taken off, he can go before that revisal board and make complaint, and the board will decide whether or not it is well founded.

These revisal sections afterwards makes up a revised list, and if any one has a complaint to make in regard to that revised list he can appeal to the sheriff of the county. The hon. member for Annapolis said that the Conservative party in Nova Scotia introduced an amendment to the provincial Franchise Act that instead of the complainant going before the sheriff he should go before the county court judge. I have no fault to find with that proposal, but I do say that the records of Nova Scotia will prove that during the last twenty or thirty years very few applications have been made to the sheriffs when they sit on the 5th of April to hear complaints. Now, Sir, if the sheriff was not a fair man, or if the revisers were not fair men and did not make up proper lists it seems to me that we would have had many complaints. In my own county, as I said at the opening of my remarks in one municipality but one at the last election every councillor was a Conservative, and I never heard any of my Liberal friends make a complaint regard-

ing the manner in which the Conservative revisers made up the electoral lists; nor have I ever heard similar complaints from Conservatives regarding the work of the Liberal revisers. So I think we have a fair electoral list in the province, and I am very sorry indeed that any member coming from Nova Scotia should charge either the assessors or the revisers in any part of that province with being unscrupulous in the discharge of their duties. It is quite true that once in a while a reviser for selfish reasons, or for personal spite, may leave a man off the list, or wrongfully put some man on, but I say—and we take our politics very seriously in the province and perhaps adhere more closely to party lines than any other part of the Dominion—but I say without hesitation that I will take the word of my Conservative friends and the word of Conservative people whom I know that the lists are made up as fair as any lists can possibly be prepared.

Now, Sir, with regard to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) I have only to say that if the provincial lists are adopted it will save this country a great deal of money. As I said before recess, I have not been very much interested in this new Franchise Act, for the simple reason—and I do not say it harshly at all—that it does not make much difference in Nova Scotia what kind of electoral law we have at the next election; the Liberals in that province have nothing to fear from any electoral law. But if we can do so we should endeavour to save the large sum which would be involved in the preparation of these lists. Each year from 1908 until 1917 the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery asked the municipal clerk in each county in Nova Scotia to prepare for him a list of municipal voters. The municipal clerk was paid for that service at the rate of one-half cent per name; the list was sent to Ottawa and adopted as the federal list. Now, what will happen if under this law we appoint enumerators? New lists will have to be made, and in very few counties in Nova Scotia will there be less than fifty enumerators; in some counties there will be more. These enumerators will have to make up the voters' lists. They cannot do that work at less than $50 each, which makes at least $2,500 as the cost of the lists in each constituency. As I have indicated, the cost involved in adopting the provincial lists is about $2,500 for each constituency. Now, if we can save $2,450 by using the provincial lists, and if nobody will be hurt thereby, it seems to me that we should do so. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) has said that many influential men, such as clergymen, were left off the list. Well, if that is the case, and I do not say it is as many Liberal clergymen and school teachers were left off as Conservatives; neither party is hurt. Moreover, assuming the argument of my hon. friend to be correct—and I take issue with him—a clergyman who moves from Lunenburg to Annapolis and finds that his name is not on the Annapolis list may be sure that it is on the Lunenburg list. If certain clergymen, school teachers and so on are not in the county in sufficient time to have had their names placed on the list, their names are usually placed on the list by the reviser, whether he be a Liberal or a Conservative, so that they may have a vote.

Mr. COWAN: But the law has to be broken to do it.

Mr. DUFF: Not broken, exactly—strained a little. Both Conservative revisers and Liberal revisers would want to see that these men got a vote; consequently their names would be put on the list, either by application or otherwise. I repeat, Sir, if we can save a large amount of money by adopting the provincial lists, and if neither party is hurt by the transaction, it is in the interests of this country that we should do so.

Mr. MARTIN: I do not intend to object to what hon. members have said for the different constituencies in Nova Scotia except so far as Halifax is concerned. I wish to take exception to the remarks made on more than one occasion by the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). He praises the provincial lists as highly as he possibly can. But, Sir, he does not know the lists of Nova Scotia; he has lived so long out of the province that it is hard for him to know. I will say this: that in the county of Halifax the list is the best padded list in Canada. I say further, Sir, that is no fault of the reviser, who, to my knowledge, has endeavoured, on more than one occasion to obtain a small grant from the local Government in order that the lists might be thoroughly revised. But they have always turned him down, for reasons best known to themselves. If, then, there is an opportunity to have a fair, honest and above-board list, let us have it.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the discussion goes further on this clause, I feel it my duty to point out to the committee that I am at

a loss to understand how electoral matters in Nova Scotia can be discussed on the clause now under consideration. I must remind the committee that while an amendment was suggested this afternoon, there is no amendment before the Chair, and in the absence of any amendment, if the discussion continues along the same line I will be obliged to rule that it is out of order.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I rise to point out that this is not a Nova Scotia question; it is a question that affects other provinces as well. As I understand it, the amendment of the member for Shelburne and Queen's—

The CHAIRMAN: No amendment has been moved by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is before the committee

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 32.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I presume that we are free to discuss the whole clause.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: And incidentally refer to proposals that are made for amending the clause. As I said, this is not a question for Nova Scotia; it applies to any province where there are electoral lists which conform to the requirements of the Dominion franchise, and I would like to see hon. members deal with it on its merits. It is not a new question. The Acting Solicitor General has been pointing out from day to day that certain questions that came up in this franchise legislation were dealt with in the old law. He seems to hold the view that the old law is a very perfect one; that any clause that was in the old law is a pretty good clause and one which merits the consideration of the committee. Now, the principle of using the provincial lists for the purposes of a Dominion election is an old principle; it has prevailed in Canada for twenty years. There is nothing new about it; it has been used for a long time.

Mr. COWAN: When the hon. member says that this principle has prevailed in Canada for twenty years, does he except the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Territories, where the principle was never adopted?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: If they did not adopt the principle in the western provinces, that was because they did not have regular provincial lists. It would apply to them if they had lists made by municipal councils or the provincial authorities. The

[The Chairman.]

principle is one that has existed for a long time in our franchise and it has worked well. No one will deny that it did work well. Did we ever have fairer elections than we had between the time this was introduced in 1897 and the election of 1917? The hon. member for Digby and Annapolis (Mr. Davidson), who found so much fault with this system, was himself elected in 1911 on lists prepared by those very revisers. He is a living example of a member being elected on lists prepared by revisers in Annapolis county. Annapolis for many years was regarded as a Liberal riding. He was elected on lists made up as he says improperly by the revisors of that county.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Excuse me—

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Perhaps I should not use the word "improperly," but that is the inference I drew from the hon. member's statement.

Mr. DAVIDSON:—I said this afternoon that the sheriff made an unjust change of 193 in the lists in 1911. I fought a provincial election a few weeks afterwards, and was defeated by seven, so you can understand that it was the sheriff who defeated me.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I am not acquainted with the circumstances of which the hon. gentleman speaks, but if anything like that happened in the county of Annapolis, I would say to the committee that such an occurrence is very rare in Nova Scotia; I do not think he will find it anywhere else. We pride ourselves in that province on our fairness in matters of this kind. Our people have always been liberal as regards the franchise, and from the earliest history of Nova Scotia that has been the character of our people. Catholic emancipation was adopted in Nova Scotia before it was adopted in Great Britain; Nova Scotia was the first province in the British Dominions which emancipated Roman Catholic citizens and allowed them to vote and qualified them as members. That is one of the chapters of our history that we are proud of, and I am sorry hon. gentlemen in this House should find it necessary to besmirch the province from which they come. I could point out to my hon. friend that, when he says that we are all extreme partisans in Nova Scotia, if he looks back over the history of the province for some years back he will find there are no facts to substantiate that statement. He will find on the contrary that Conservatives have been appointed to high public offices

by a Liberal administration. I can give him several examples of that, such an example as the Commissioner of Mines of Nova Scotia who was a leading Conservative but was appointed by a Liberal administration; the Secretary of Agriculture of that province, who still holds that office and who belongs to a well-known Conservative family; the Superintendent of Education, who is also a Conservative and was appointed by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) when he was Premier of Nova Scotia and who still holds that position; Lieut.-Col. Cantley one of the Provincial Road Commissioners who is a well-known Conservative and was appointed by a Liberal administration. If my hon. friend looks over the list of King's counsel, he will find dozens of them, prominent Conservatives in the province, appointed by a Liberal administration. I do not know whether my hon. friend is one of them or not, but I could point out a large number. I do not want to dwell on this question too much as regards Nova Scotia, because I think my hon. friend, when he reads in Hansard what he has said this afternoon, will be sorry for it himself.

He made one statement which I should like, with the permission of the Chair, to correct. He said that the municipal councils of that province are partisan. I should not like that statement to go on record without being contradicted. I have the honour to represent the county of Antigonish in which the present municipal council is Conservative, and I would have no hesitation in accepting the lists which shall be prepared by that council. I have absolute confidence in their fairness. The statement made by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) was true to my personal knowledge regarding eastern Nova Scotia, that is, that the councillor for the district almost invariably nominates the reviser, and his nomination is accepted by the council. That is the case in the county of Pictou in which I live; it is the case in the county of Antigonish, in the municipality of St. Mary's, in the county of Guysborough. With these four counties I am well acquainted and that is the prevailing practice in them. My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) tells me that it is the prevailing practice in Cape Breton. Therefore in the eastern part of the province the municipal councillor for the district nominates the reviser, whether he is Liberal or Conservative, and that nomination is accepted by the rest of the council. What could be fairer than that? There is absolutely no complaint. Our franchise is so close to the Dominion franchise that there is very little difference. One might be able to point out some slight differences, but they are very trifling.

There are two principles on which I appeal to the Acting Solicitor General, and I think they are principles which ought to prevail with him. We have abolished patronage in this country. The Prime Minister ran the last election having that plank in his platform, and when the election was over he announced that that was to be the policy of the Government. This is a very important plum in the patronage basket, the appointment of all these registrars. I suppose there are perhaps from fifty to a hundred in each riding. I do not know how many there are in western ridings, but if I am not correct, some one will put me right. If we estimate that there are fifty in each riding throughout the Dominion—and that is not an excessive estimate—if you multiply that by the number of ridings in the Dominion, that means the appointment of over 20,000 men at the time of an election to do the work of enumeration. I put the case on the ground that it is a principle of the present Government to avoid patronage wherever it can be avoided. The Government would avoid patronage by accepting the provincial lists where they conform with the principles of the Dominion franchise. That is one argument that should weigh with the minister.

The question of expense is a very important one. It has also been referred to. In Nova Scotia alone we have sixten ridings, There will be more than fifty registrars in each of those ridings. Let us say, for the sake of argument, that the average will be fifty. If we appoint fifty in each riding and give them a fee of one hundred dollars apiece, which will be the least they can manage the work for, that would mean an expenditure of $5,000. But that is not the whole expense, because typewriting and printing will have to be done, and there will be travelling and various other expenses which will bring the sum up to perhaps $6,000 or $7,000. Then each of the candidates will have to have a staff of men looking after his interests at all the polls in his riding, and we may take the expense of each candidate as at least $1,000. That will bring the expense for each constituency up to at least $8,000, and if you multiply that by sixteen, you get an expenditure of $128,000 for the province. That is a very large sum of money which we can save in one province alone by

adopting this proposal. Is not that worth while? What advantage will my hon. friend from Annapolis, or any other hon. member be deprived of that would be equivalent to the expenditure of $128,000 at a time like this when everybody wants to save money? Last night I was asking for a very small sum of money to help build a hospital for sick sailors, and I hope I will get it. I was not asking the Government to assess the taxpayers of this country for the amount required, but to collect it from the ships, but there was hesitation on the part of the Government on the ground that we were spending so much money. Here is a proposal by which we could save $128,000 at each election in one province alone, and no person will be injured by it. I submit, therefore, it should be adopted because, in the first place, it is a fair proposal; secondly, it avoids the exercise of patronage, and thirdly, it is a proposal by which $128,000 can be saved to the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. COWAN: I have learned enough about the introduction of party politics into municipal affairs this afternoon from hon. gentlemen opposite to teach me that I do not want to have anything to do with the system they are advocating. To my mind one of the greatest crimes you could commit in this country would be to do just what hon. gentlemen opposite have told us has already been done in the province of Nova Scotia. I have learned from them and from nobody else that they have adopted provincial lists in that part of the country, and that those provincial lists are made up by municipal officers and revised by them, with the inevitable result that the whole municipal machinery in Nova Scotia is reduced to the ridiculous position of being run on a party basis, for that is what it amounts to. I can quite understand now why the villages and towns and cities of Nova Scotia are so small and unprogressive, because wherever you introduce party politics into municipal affairs you are going to get in the same position as they are in down in Nova Scotia. I do not know what kind of Liberalism we have in this House, but it is a mighty different brand of Liberalism from what we have in Western Canada. If you told the Liberals of the city of Regina that you were going to run the city on a system of party politics, you would be told that you were not going to do it on any account, that the loyalty of the people to their city was far above everything of that kind. The brand of Liberalism we have out there is based on loyalty to our city, loyalty to our country, loyalty to common sense—and there is no common sense in introducing federal party politics into municipal affairs. I have heard some of the strangest things this afternoon from my Liberal friends opposite. Take, for instance, what the hon. member for Lunenburg said. It may be true, he said, that a lot of preachers may be disfranchised under their proposal.

Mr. DUFF: I said, a few.

Mr. COWAN: Say that only one is disfranchised through moving from one constituency to another. He says, what difference does it make, because there will be just as many Liberals disfranchised as Tories? Is that the basis of Liberal enfranchisement, that as long as a certain number of Tories are disfranchised along with a certain number of Grits, it is all right? I thought last week that the whole point they were contending for was that everybody in Canada should have the right to vote, but now, if Tories are disfranchised as well as Liberals, it is all right. Then my hon. friend from Antigonish and Guysborough talks about the expense. He says it will cost an awful lot of money to adopt the minister's proposals. Let us save this money, he says, by adopting the provincial lists. It is all right to save the money, but under that system many of our people would be disfranchised, as has been proven here this afternoon. The fact that under the system which they are advocating a man has to reside in a polling division for one year means that thousands and thousands would be disfranchised; that is bound to be the result. In Regina we have, I think, about one hundred polling divisions, and the same is true of other cities of the same size. About the first of May, about one-fifth of the population in Montreal, Ottawa, and other large cities moves from one polling division to another, and under the system which hon. gentlemen opposite propose every one of these people would be disfranchised. My hon. friend says that his proposal would save $120,000, but I want to lay this down as my principle: the vote of a man is too sacred to be counted in dollars and cents. Hon. gentlemen opposite this afternoon have been valuing the franchise at so many dollars and cents.

I have seen how the system proposed by the Acting Solicitor General here to-night works and I know it is absolutely all right. In the Northwest Territories, where I voted for twenty-odd years, we have exactly the system which the minister now proposes

to introduce throughout the Dominion. We had enumerators, and if they failed or refused to put a man's name on the list, that man could go to the polls on election day and insist on being sworn, and then he could vote. If he took a false oath, he could be charged with perjury before the courts. That system has continued out there until the present time, for the Liberal party when they introduced their Franchise Act in 1896 or 1897 exempted the Territories from the operation of that Act, and when the provinces were created they again did the same thing, with the result that this system has continued in Alberta and Saskatchewan up to the present day. I want to say that cleaner or purer elections were never held than under that system. In no elections held in any other part of Canada under any other system have there been as few prosecutions and protests, nor as few complaints, because every man had the right on election day to go to the polls and demand to vote, and he got his vote and was satisfied. If that is what history proves, and it is, why should we not adopt that system for the whole of Canada and give equal satisfaction to the people throughout the whole Dominion? I shall certainly support the proposal of the Acting Solicitor General.

Mr. McKENZIE: I hope we will all be good now, after the speech of my hon. friend.

Mr. COWAN: You should be.

Mr. McKENZIE: This lecturing comes with great force from my hon. friend. I thought he was a Unionist in Regina, but here he is a Tory.

Mr. COWAN: Tory in politics and Christian in religion.

Mr. McKENZIE: He is putting in full time on his Toryism, but I am afraid that on the other side, if his little boy was asked if his father was a Christian he would have to reply: Yes, but he is not doing much at it now. That is the mongrel Christianity of my hon. friend.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not speaking of the hon. gentlemen himself, but of his style of Christianity—"By their fruits ye shall know them." In spite of my many weaknesses I am perhaps just as strong a believer in the Christian faith as anybody on the other side, but when Christianity does not show any fruit I do not mind calling it mongrel, because it is mixed up with so much dross that it is hard to find the real thing.

If my hon. friend from Regina is perfectly satisfied with the manner of making up the lists in Regina, there is nobody on this side of the House who has suggested for a moment that we should take away from him and the people out West the system they now have. If they are satisfied with that system, let them enjoy it to their hearts' content. My hon. friend must not forget that Nova Scotia was a flourishing province with splendid institutions, both municipal and parliamentary, while the bear and the prairie rabbit occupied the city of which he is so proud, and if we are anxious to hold on to these splendid institutions that we had long ago, while the bear and prairie rabbit were carrying on their municipal business as they thought best in and around the city of Regina, I think we have a perfect right to do so—just as good a right as my hon. friend has to hold on to the system that has proved satisfactory to him and his people. I do not mention the bear and the prairie rabbit with any idea of reflecting on the city of Regina, but I am simply pointing out that the people of the province of Nova Scotia with its splendid institutions are not going to be lectured by people who have not yet attained proper municipal institutions and proper methods of making up the voters' lists.

This is by no means a new question. Since Confederation we have held in Canada some thirteen or fourteen general elections. If my memory serves me well I think we have had thirteen. Ten of those elections were conducted under the system of franchise which we are advocating in regard to the making of lists, and only three were held under the system of registration or revising barristers as the case may be. When the Dominion of Canada came into being as such Sir John Macdonald, who I suppose had most to do with the drafting of the British North America Act, put into that Act the provision that until a franchise was prepared by the Dominion Parliament, the local lists in each province should be used. That arrangement continued absolutely satisfactory, as far as I know, to both Liberals and Conservatives down to the year 1885, when the Revising Barristers Act was put through this Parliament after a very strenuous fight and the crossing of swords by such gladiators as Sir John Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper, Hon. Edward Blake, Sir Richard Cartwright, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and other men of that calibre who debated the question

at that time. That franchise came into force in 1885 and the first election that was held under it took place in 1887. That was the first election conducted in Canada on anything but the provincial franchise. The election of 1887, the election of 1891, and the election of 1896 were conducted with lists prepared by revising barristers. Before the election of 1896 Sir John Thompson, who was then Prime Minister of Canada, introduced a Bill for the purpose of readjusting the franchise, and from what we can gather from his speech on that occasion, it is clear that he intended to repeal the Revising Barristers Act and revert to the law as it stood before. In his speech on June 14, 1894, in the House of Commons, when introducing the Bill Sir John Thompson said, as reported in Hansard, at page 4301 of that year:

> The change is also proposed in this Bill which I indicated a few days ago, that the questions upon which so much difference has arisen in the past as to the basis of the franchise, shall be adjusted by adopting the franchises of the several provinces. . . . . The number of differences which exist between the provincial franchises and the Dominion franchise as established by our own Act, are so few as not to be worth the contest and the expense which are involved in keeping them up, and the adoption of a general system, which will apply both to the local and Dominion Legislatures, has recommendations as regards simplicity and facilities for economy which cannot exist under a dual system such as we have been keeping up for the past few years.

Now what we are looking for in regard to the franchise, so eminent a man, so great a jurist and so able a statesman as Sir John Thompson recommended. Among his last utterances in this Parliament he said he intended to go back to the old system of provincial lists in order to avoid the expense and trouble of keeping up a dual system. He made that speech in 1894, and for some reason or other the Bill, although introduced, did not go through the House; but he made the promise that it would be introduced at the next session of Parliament. Unfortunately however Sir John did not return to the House. He died, but he leaves on Hansard clear evidences that he was tired of the revising barristers and of all the trouble and expense connected with the Revising Barristers Act. He wanted us to enjoy the simplicity of one list and one franchise throughout Canada. That idea was carried out when the

9 p.m. Liberals came into power in 1896. Two years after, a Bill passed the House carrying out what Sir John Thompson had had in mind, repealing the Revising Barristers Act and bringing into effect the old system as we had it before that Act was passed in 1885. I was not in the House at the time—I presume there are some hon. gentlemen here who were members of Parliament then—but I imagine that hon. members will search Hansard reports of that day in vain to find one single objection having been raised against the Act of 1898 which abolished the conditions that existed under the Revising Barristers Act. Every one was perfectly satisfied to go back to the old conditions.

The system that was resumed then worked very well until we got the War-time Elections Act of 1917. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House are quite familiar with that Act and they know what criticisms have been showered upon it. I need not say anything about it, for I could not begin to paint it in the lurid language in which it was described by hon. gentlemen who since that time have become members of the Government. Indeed, nothing that I could say would as adequately characterize that legislation as it was described at the time of its enactment by hon. gentlemen who are now supporting the Union Government. So far as I am personally concerned, I am not advocating anything new in urging the preparation of lists locally. Speaking in this House in February, 1919, when I had the honour for the time being of leading the Opposition, and when it was hinted in the speech from the Throne that a franchise Act would be brought down, I had occasion to review the question of the franchise and the express desirability of having a simple system by which every one would get his name on the list; and after describing the way in which we make our lists in Nova Scotia I said, as appears at page 25 of Hansard of 1919, first session:

> Now, if the Government is not satisfied with the work of these boards, if it thinks that the appointment of these boards to revise the lists is too much in the hands of one party, whichever party may be in power, I would suggest that a mixed board be chosen composed of members representing equally the Dominion and local authorities, and let that board compile the voters' list and avoid the duplication of which I have complained.

I think that is perfectly clear and consistent. I said to the Government of that day —which is also the Government of to-day —If you think our revising boards are partisans, place legislation on the statute books by which, by arrangement, the local government should have the appointment of one-half of each board and you appoint the

other half. Then that board which is composed of one-half Liberals, if you please, and of one-half Conservatives will deal with the lists, and they certainly ought to give us a fair revision. That was the position I have always taken; that is the position I take to-day. Last year when the By-elections Act was being put through, certain members of the Administration made a proposition to me as to what was going to happen when we came to deal with the new Franchise Act. The idea was that we should put through the By-elections Act with as little trouble as possible, knowing that it was only a temporary measure, and that soon we would come to deal with the fairer and general lists. Now, one of the propositions that two representatives of the Government at that time passed over to me was the following:

> The adoption of existing permanent lists, if any exist, in the respective provinces to which the women's names have been added. This probably applies to Nova Scotia and British Columbia.

That was one of the proposals made to me at that time. Here is another proposition to which I particularly wish to call the attention of the Acting Solicitor General, because it came from two members of the Government to which he belongs.

> Wherever officials, either municipal or provincial, now exist, whose duty it is to prepare provincial voters' lists, these officials should be appointed enumerators for the purpose of making the necessary additions.

That was another proposition which came to me from the Government a little over a year ago, and it would be absolutely fair and would be satisfactory. If in Nova Scotia there must be enumerators to prepare new lists that proposition should be adopted. If it is adopted I have no great fault to find, because these enumerators in my province are appointed by the direct representatives of the people who, at the end of their three years' term of office, must go to the different districts which they represent and account for their stewardship as councillors. If the minister will adopt those boards, adding a member to them of his own choosing if he likes, then he will be carrying out the proposition that was made to me in good faith by the present Government. Surely if there is any consistency at all about the Government, if there is any continuity at all in their ideas, they will be satisfied to carry out the scheme which they submitted to me and which I accepted in good faith. At that time we practically, as the minister must remember, gave no opposition at all to the By-elections Act which was simply a temporary measure, and was not to have any long life in this country being merely intended for the period between the time of its passage and the time with which we are now dealing. I cannot too strongly impress upon the minister the desirability of carrying out the proposition which the Government made themselves. I did not go after them for it; I had no power to compel them to give me any undertaking; it was given to me by members of the Cabinet and I have every reason to believe that the two ministers who did so had full power to act as they did. Now why should the Government go back upon their solemn pledge, an undertaking sent to me upon that occasion? I would think, Sir, that I am on strong ground when I say to the minister that this proposition should be carried out; and that wherever he goes in any of the provinces and finds existing machinery for the purpose of making a list, if he must have enumerators, he will accept those men who have acted in the past, among whom he may find Conservatives as well as Liberals. Then people will say they have been treated fairly and no fault will be found with any such system.

I heard a vigorous attack made upon the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) by the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Butts). I am very sorry he thought it necessary to make any such attack upon the venerable and much beloved member from Shelburne and Queen's. Does the hon. member (Mr. Butts) not recall the fact that for the fourteen years the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's was the able and honoured Premier of the province of Nova Scotia he did not have a more enthusiastic supporter during the whole of that period than my hon. friend (Mr. Butts)?—and if anything was done by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's while he was Premier of Nova Scotia which could be criticised he had the faithful support of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Butts), who never for one moment questioned anything that was done by the then Premier of the province. Now I think the hon. member should have explained that he had taken a trip to Damascus and seen a great light, and so wishes to forget those fourteen or twenty years during which he stood so faithfully and strongly behind the then Premier of Nova Scotia. I am not going to say anything

further on the subject except that I hold my hon. friend (Mr. Butts) responsible for the doings of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's during the years that the latter was Prime Minister of Nova Scotia because he supported him in his every action.

There has been a great deal of talk to the effect that we are not entitled to have the privilege of preparing those lists because for ninety years we were taking certain officials off the lists in Nova Scotia. That is a matter which dates back earlier than the administration of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's, and since nobody seems to have given light on that point I will touch upon it very briefly, because we are told that because of the facts of history and of the partiality that is alleged to have been displayed in the past we in the province of Nova Scotia should not be given the power to prepare our own lists. It is well known that Nova Scotia was forced into Confederation absolutely against her will. In 1867 there was a general election in the province of Nova Scotia, and out of a Dominion representation of eighteen or twenty members one solitary man, the late Sir Charles Tupper, was returned to this House on the Confederation issue. In the local legislature only two men were returned on that issue, their names being Blanchard and Pineo, and the names of these three men will go down in history. That was the feeling of Nova Scotia in 1867 against Confederation into which the province was forced without the people being consulted. There was such a furore against anything from Ottawa that the Government of that day passed an Act that officials of the Departments of Customs and Railways—those were the only two departments selected, why I do not know—should not be allowed to vote. Of course, that law did not apply to the Dominion franchise. It was allowed to remain on the statute book for years, and the Tory party when in power in 1872 and again in 1882 did not attempt to repeal it. I am proud to be able to say that in 1900 I had the honour of introducing into the legislature of Nova Scotia, for the first time as far as I know, the Bill that repealed this disability. That Bill passed the Legislative Assembly but was defeated in the Council, but later it was re-introduced and passed both Houses. To cast this up to the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) is absurd, for he had nothing whatever to do with that disability. He was not in politics until many years after that Act was put on the statute books.

I have only to say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that the exercise of the local franchise for fifty-three years with only one single solitary case of irregularity is a fairly good record. We have 18 counties in the province and several cities and incorporated towns, but the only single report of anything irregular in those fifty-three years is the case that comes to us from the county of Annapolis. I venture to tell my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) that if he had made complaint to the Premier of Nova Scotia an investigation would have been ordered at once, and the sheriff he speaks of would have been removed if found to have been remiss in his duty.

The extreme partisanship that has been referred to does not exist in Nova Scotia. For fourteen years I was a member of the municipal council of my town; five of those years I was mayor; and all through the fourteen years, although we had a strong Liberal majority in the council, we had three good Tory revisers. Does not that prove to my good friend from Regina that we are not the outlaws he thinks we are, refusing to give any one an appointment unless he pronounces the shibboleth of Liberalism or something akin to it?

With the exception of the interval between 1887 and 1898, for over forty years we have had in Nova Scotia an absolutely local franchise, and nothing can be brought against its administration except one single questionable case. I think that that record justifies us in asking that we be left with a system in which we have absolute confidence. If any other province wants different lists, well and good; we do not want to interfere. All we want is to retain what we were promised by the memorandum that was handed to me and what we are accustomed to. I hope no such mistake will be made as to tear apart every list we have and commence a new list which cannot by any possibility be satisfactory, under a system with which we are not acquainted and for the preparation of which there will not be sufficient time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. McKENZIE: I will gratify my hon. friend in a few minutes. But if any hon. gentleman thinks that we are so kaiserized in this House that it is an offence for me to make these remarks let me assure him that I do not propose to be deprived of the liberty of speaking for my people because some hon. gentleman who has had his mind made up for him shouts "carried." That gentleman will have to settle with the hon.

member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), who has told us that some hon. members have no minds to make up because everything is settled for them. I shall cling tenaciously to our British parliamentary procedure and put my case before the House. If hon. gentlemen on the other side do not agree with me, that is their privilege under constitutional majority rule; but let me assure them that as there was of old an appeal to Caesar, so there will be an appeal to Caesar in this case.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Chairman, I have heard for the first time from my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) that some solemn pledge and undertaking was given to him by some members of this Government prior to the passage of the By-Elections Act one or two sessions ago.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have the original document here which I can pass over to my hon. friend.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would like very much to see the document. I must inform the committee that up till the moment my hon. friend spoke I was in entire ignorance of the existence of such a document.

The document has now been handed to me by my hon. friend. It is headed, as I assumed it would be:

> Proposals for the Creation of a Franchise Act for the Purpose of holding By-elections until after the next Session of Parliament.

It does not appear to be dated, but I have no doubt that it was prior to the passage of the By-elections Act. The committee will pardon me if I read it; it is all new to me:

> 1. The proposed legislation is contingent upon a public announcement by the Prime Minister to the House of Commons that he will not advise His Excellency the Governor General to dissolve Parliament until after another session has been held.
>
> 2. Complete demobilization under the War-times Election Act shall be in effect on August 1st, 1919, and the Election Law as it stood prior to the War-times Election Act then to be brought into force with such amendments as may be absolutely necessary to meet changed conditions, including:—
>
> (a) The creation of machinery by which the names of women qualified to vote can be placed upon lists where none such now exist, e.g., New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario.
>
> (b) The adoption of existing permanent lists, if any exist, in the respective provinces to which the women's names have been added. This probably applies to Nova Scotia and British Columbia.
>
> (c) The creation of machinery whereby lists can be created so that an election could be held within thirty days in any province where lists are not now complete, the most outstanding example being the province of Ontario, where no lists exist, as a new law was passed in 1917, and no lists so far have been prepared under the law.
>
> (d) Where it is necessary either to make new lists or to add to the existing lists, that the principles of the local law of the province of Saskatchewan be adopted, which generally are as follows:—
>
> Personal registration in cities and incorporated towns with a right of appeal to the County Court or District Judge and enumeration in rural committees, with the right to any person to swear in his or her vote on election day, in case the name has been omitted from the list made up by the enumerators, no ballots to be tied up.
>
> (e) Wherever officials, either municipal or provincial, now exist whose duty it is to prepare provincial voters' lists these officials should be appointed enumerators for the purpose of making the necessary additions.
>
> (f) No person of foreign birth, male or female, to have the franchise unless personally naturalized.
>
> (g) A Public Prosecutor to be appointed in each constituency whose duty it will be to prosecute all persons who falsely swear their names upon a list or swear in a vote.
>
> (h) This Act to continue for the purpose of by-elections until March 1st, 1920, unless previously superseded by a general franchise Act.

Mr. COWAN: What is wrong with that?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, I take it from the heading that it was a proposal; for it is headed "Proposals for the Creation of a Franchise Act for the purpose of holding By-elections until after the next session of Parliament."

Mr. McKENZIE: And to be continued into the new Act. That is not written there, but that is the intent of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKENZIE: Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I am not afraid of their laughter. That was the statement that was given to me by two ministers. It would be quite like them not to stand by it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The first observation I have to make is that my hon. friend refers to this as a solemn pledge and undertaking by the Government which he accepted. Well, I think there must be some misunderstanding on the part of my hon. friend if he accepted that proposal, which distinctly says, in paragraph (f):

> No person of foreign birth, male or female, to have the franchise unless personally naturalized.

If my hon. friend accepted that proposal, I cannot understand the speech he made a night or two ago. I think I am right when I say that this was really a proposal; it was to be the basis of a discussion between the Government and my hon. friend,

who was then the leader of the Opposition. But it could not in any sense of the word be regarded as a solemn pledge and undertaking which he accepted; otherwise he would never have made the speech he did the other night upon the question of the naturalization of aliens.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister will permit me, he may think that clever—

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, I do not think it clever.

Mr. McKENZIE: The speech I made in reference to the By-election Act was quoted here the night before last. If my hon. friend will do me the honour of reading the quotation he will see that I said: For the present we will accept this, holding to ourselves absolutely the right to criticize any franchise proposals that may be brought down; preserving all our rights intact. My speech was quoted the other night by the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) and my hon. friend can see it at any time.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That may be all right. The point I make is that the document I have now read must, from its very nature, have been a proposal in regard to the By-elections Act and not in regard to the general Elections Act. If this is a solemn pledge and undertaking by the Government which he accepted—that is his own language—as the basis of a general election Act or as a basis of the present Act, then my hon. friend accepted an agreement in regard to the franchise for aliens entirely contrary to the opinions which he expressed in this House two or three nights ago. I think I am right in assuming that this document which I have just read referred only to the By-elections Act, and formed only what it says it is, "proposals" as to what legislation should be enacted in respect to by-elections. Now, I want to have a chance to confer with my colleagues in regard to the matter. I may be wrong, but from the circumstances and from the language of the document I think I am right in assuming that it was purely and simply a basis of discussion for the then proposed By-election Act and had nothing to do with the permanent Act. But if I find, after discussing the matter with my colleagues, that I am wrong, I shall be quite glad to say so.

My hon. friend also, during the course of his remarks, in discussing the merits of the Voters' Act of Nova Scotia, referred to a statement made in this House in 1894 by the late Sir John Thompson, when he expressed the opinion that the franchises in existence in the various provinces had become so nearly alike that there was not much object in maintaining distinctions as between federal and provincial franchises. Sir John Thompson certainly did make that statement. But he made another statement immediately afterwards which my hon. friend failed to read. Sir John Thompson said we could not continue any distinctions in regard to franchises, but he said also—this is on the same page of Hansard:

> The great principle which underlay the Franchise Act of 1885 was the control by this Parliament over matters connected with the franchise. . . . We adhere to the principle that this House and the electors who return members to this House ought not to be under the control as regards the exercise of their franchise of the officers of any other Government or Legislature whatever in the country.

That is the point that we are trying to maintain in the present Bill. My hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) discussed the question of provincial franchise and provincial voters' lists this afternoon and offered a suggestion which he said he would later in the proceedings move as an amendment. His object in stating the purport of the amendment at this time was that the Government might have an opportunity of considering it before coming to a conclusion. The suggested amendment was long and somewhat involved, and I would like to have an opportunity of giving it careful study before pronouncing upon it. But as I understand from my hon. friend's reading of it, it involves our accepting in Ontario as final and complete the provincial voters' lists of that province provided they are not more than a year old and that any names which might be added to those lists or taken from them should be so added to or taken from them by a board appointed by the Ontario Government for that purpose. That system is not very different from the system laid down in clause 32 of the Bill. Clause 32 provides that provincial lists shall be accepted, shall be the lists, where they are not more than twelve months old. If the provincial lists in Ontario are more than twelve months old, we must have new lists. The Ontario franchise and the Dominion franchise are not exactly alike; there are differences. I was very familiar with these differences a short time ago, but I have had so many franchise Acts in my head lately, that I cannot express a positive opinion at

the present time as regards the provincial Act. There were differences between the last provincial Franchise Act and the present proposals of the Government. The differences were not radical, it is true. There were differences in the requirement as to residence and matters of that kind; there were differences, I think, as regards the disqualification of Indians; there was a difference as regards the disqualification of officials. Then the Ontario Voters' List Act which is now in force differs radically from this proposal. There is a proposal before the Ontario legislature at the present time, but I do not know whether it will be carried in the form in which it was introduced or not. I know that in the preparation of that Bill the Ontario Government had the advantage of reading the proposed Dominion Bill and in many instances followed our clauses, but in many other cases they did not follow our clauses. The only practical difference as regards lists between what the hon. member for Middlesex West (Mr. Ross) proposes and what this Bill proposes is this, that provided the Ontario list is not more than twelve months old, under clause 32 of the present Bill names may be added to the list or struck from the list by a court designated by this Parliament, whereas under the provincial law this is done by a board composed of the county judge and some other individuals. I am not sure, for the moment, who compose the board, and I see the hon. member (Mr. Ross) who has a copy of the Bill, is not in his seat. As I have no copy of the Bill, I would like a little more time to consider that matter further. But the difference between the two proposals is not very great.

Mr. McCOIG: Provided that the Ontario lists have been revised in certain counties and not in others, would the lists be used in a Dominion election in counties in which the lists had been revised and would they not be used in counties in which the lists had not been revised?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Clause 32 reads:

> For the purposes of any Dominion election held within the limits of a province the voters' lists shall, except as hereinafter provided, be those prepared and completed for the several polling divisions, under the laws of that province, within one year immediately preceding the issue of the writ for such election.

Yes, I think they would.

Mr. BUREAU: Is there any special reason for making the lists revised within one year?

Mr. GUTHRIE: So many changes take place after a list is one year old that it cannot be relied on; it is considered old or stale, and that is the object of having a one-year limitation. In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. McCoig), I may say that in any riding in Ontario where there is a list which can be legally used for any election in Ontario and which is not more than one year old from the date of revision to the date of the issue of the writ, under this Bill that list will be the list for the Dominion election, and if names are omitted from it which should be added or if names should be stricken from it, the machinery is provided by this clause whereby that end may be attained. The question is—shall that end be attained by the machinery provided by clause 32, or shall it be attained by the procedure provided by the proposal of the Ontario Legislature when that proposal becomes law? It is important, as Sir John Thompson pointed out in 1894, that the House recognize the principle that it should control the individuals who have charge of the revision and completion of these lists. Apart from that single distinction, there is not very much in the proposal of the hon. member (Mr. Ross) which does not appear in clause 32 at the present moment. If we take the case where there is no provincial list that is not more than twelve months old, what does the hon. member propose to do in that case? If our provincial voters' lists are more than a year old, they cannot be used. I assume if such a thing should happen—and it has happened in Ontario—we would then be driven back to the provisions of clause 32 in its entirety.

Just a word now as regards the suggestion of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) regarding the provincial voters' lists of Nova Scotia. There is perhaps greater objection on his side of the House to the proposal to accept as final and complete the lists of the province of Nova Scotia in regard to the lists of the province of Ontario. Rightly or wrongly, I gather only from what I hear from others, there exists on this side of the House a feeling amongst hon. gentlemen who represent constituents in Nova Scotia, that the lists of that province are not as absolutely fair as my hon. friends from that province who sit opposite to me would have the committee believe. This may be a difference of opinion only; but certainly there is a deep-rooted feeling amongst hon. members on this side of the House from Nova Scotia that the provincial lists are not

fair to them and are generally unsatisfactory. I state that because it is a feeling that exists and that must be recognized. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) goes further than my hon. friend (Mr. Ross); he says that the Government should accept an amendment which would provide that the lists, as finally revised in Nova Scotia by the provincial authorities, shall be final; in other words, that the Government, in passing its own Franchise Act, its own election law, should be bound by lists prepared by officials of another government, at the present moment not on altogether friendly terms towards this Government. The main objection that has been urged upon me by hon. members with whom I have discussed the question is this, that at the present moment the only valid Voters' List Act in Nova Scotia is one involving a property qualification. There is at the present moment before the legislature of Nova Scotia a proposal to make their franchise generally upon the basis of the proposed Dominion franchise. Whether that Bill will be passed or not and in what form it will be passed, I cannot offer a prediction; but in a copy of the Bill which I had the privilege of reading, I found some distinctions as regards residence, and some as regards other matters which have escaped my mind. But it is purely problematical what the Bill will actually be when it becomes law. The present Voters' List Act of Nova Scotia would not agree with ours at all. The requirements are entirely different. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) minimizes the property requirements under the present law in Nova Scotia but they are there, and they apply to man and to woman. That would not meet our Franchise Act in any respect. When the Act now pending before the legislature becomes law one might be able to form some opinion as to whether they meet us upon common ground in regard to the franchise; perhaps not identically the same ground, but approximately the same ground. We might then discuss whether or not we could to some extent or to any extent adopt the provincial lists in Nova Scotia. For my own part—I cannot speak for my colleagues because I have not had an opportunity of discussing this proposal with them—I would hesitate to adopt those lists as final and complete, and I will give the reasons that strike me. The appeal in the province of Nova Scotia is to the sheriff. Except in Scotland, I never heard of an appeal to the sheriff, and in Scotland the sheriff is a judicial officer. Why the appeal to the sheriff in Nova Scotia, I do not know.

Mr. McKENZIE: Because we have eighteen counties in Nova Scotia and only seventeen county court judges. It was the only alternative. An appeal to the judges would not have met the convenience of the people.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That may be the reason, but it does not strike me as a very good one. Sheriffs in the province of Ontario as far as I know, are not lawyers. I do not know a single sheriff in the province that ever was a lawyer, and I think from what my hon. friend (Mr. Davidson) has said, that it is so in Nova Scotia. I do not know whether they have any qualifications to decide a legal point, and certainly legal judgment is necessary in deciding these appeals. I have been told that time and again it has been urged on the Government of Nova Scotia to allow the appeals to be decided by the county court judges, and time and again that request has been refused. I think it is an objection to the system that the final decision rests with the sheriff.

But there is a far greater objection than that. In Ontario the sheriff is an officer accountable to the Attorney General's department and when the sheriff in Ontario wants advice he communicates with the Attorney General's department. I fancy the same system is in vogue in Nova Scotia. If a sheriff hearing an appeal is in doubt, he calls up the Attorney General. Now the Attorney General is certainly a very much interested individual, and if his voice is to govern, I think it might be termed a partisan voice. I think—this is only my own judgment—that that system is defective, and I would not be disposed to ask the Government to accept a proposal of that kind unless better machinery for the hearing of these appeals was provided for. That would appeal to me to be reasonable, and I trust it strikes the committee as reasonable too.

The only difference, then, between the Bill as drawn and the suggestion of my hon. friend this afternoon is this: The Bill as drawn says that in the province of Nova Scotia we shall accept the provincial lists if they are not more than twelve months old, and there shall be power to add names to the list or strike names off it. In the cities and towns that will be before the judge, and in the rural districts before the rural registrar. If he acts improperly and strikes your name off the list we have put in the safeguard that on polling day you

can go and cast your vote upon taking the necessary oath, and you will not be asked to put in what is known as a tied ballot. That proposal always has appeared to me to be a reasonable one. There is no way of depriving a man of a vote under the machinery provided in section 32. If a man wants to vote and is entitled to vote, there is no way of depriving him of his vote. That, I think, is something in advance of any electoral Act we have had in this country before.

When we come to section 63 of this Act, which has been allowed to stand as dependent on section 32, I propose to move an amendment to safeguard the right which we give to an elector to vote on election day. The amendment is to this effect: That the elector must bring forward two resident ratepayers of the polling division who will vouch for him, who will take an oath that they know him and know that he is entitled to vote. I am proposing to add that since the Bill was introduced. It will leave the matter this way: that any man in a rural division who is left off the list through the evil mind or ill disposition of any official of the Government can go to the polls on polling day and claim the right to vote. He must bring with him two resident ratepayers of that division who are willing to swear that he is entitled to vote. He has also to swear it himself. His name is entered in the poll book with the names of his two bondsmen, and I do not think you will find in any rural division of this country three men who will perjure themselves for the sake of a single vote. I think that safeguard is almost absolute. In the city divisions the procedure is different. There we allow an appeal, and the appeal goes to the judge. If in large centres there may be more appeals than a single judge can attend to, we do not appoint an appellate court even, but the judge himself designates other persons, not necessarily judges, to form an appellate court. If my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) will reconsider his own suggestion and will take from it those words "final and complete" he will find that my views very largely coincide with his, and I think the section is going to work out very largely as he desires if we leave it just as it is. I understand from hon. members from Nova Scotia that the lists there are prepared annually. We can safely say, then, that an election would fall within that twelve-month limitation, and under section 32 we would then be bound to accept that list. We will be saving the expense of making a new list. Then we provide as simple machinery as possible to allow people to have their names added to the list, and opportunity is given to have names struck off. This is carried on by officers designated in the Act, and I think it is as fair a way as anybody could suggest.

I see the difficulty pointed out by my hon. friend (Mr. Davidson). I have heard it discussed by at least half a dozen members from Nova Scotia. To us in Ontario it seems little short of an outrage that by any possibility a man may have to wait three or four years before he can vote. If it so happens that he moves into a district on the 2nd of January, instead of before the 1st of January, he may be kept there almost indefinitely before he has a legal right to get on the list. My hon. friend from Lunenburg says: We strain the law a little in a case of that kind and we put these people on. But that is not the legal way of doing the thing. I was told by another member, and a high authority too, that on account of these peculiar dates that are adopted in the Nova Scotia law, a man may actually be twenty-three before he can vote, instead of having the right to vote at twenty-one. They may continue these restrictions if they like, but I repeat, we must accept their list if it is not twelve months old. We are not going to allow, however, any class of people to be disqualified on account of difficulties of that kind with regard to duties; these people can have their names added under this section. There is an objection to what my hon. friend speaks of as municipal and provincial lists. We find it every day in the province of Ontario. Every man who is assessed is entitled to have his name on the list, and it is always difficult at election time to strike off the non-residents, and in large cities there are on the voters' lists the names of a great many people who are not legally entitled to vote. Men happen to own property but do not live in the division, and there is a great opportunity in the larger centres for what is known as "plugging." A man comes along whom nobody knows; he says "I am So-and-So," and no one can refute the statement, and he votes in the name of some non-resident. This cannot be done in rural districts and smaller towns where practically everybody knows everybody else. In the larger cities, however, it has been practised extensively in the past, and this is a matter for the consideration of my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross).

Mr. McCOIG: May I draw the minister's attention to the fact that non-residents are always put in part 3 of the list?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I can show my hon. friend lists of last year where I can find twenty names of people non-resident in the division.

Mr. McCOIG: Possibly they have moved away.

Mr. GUTHRIE: A man is on the list to-day and he moves away to-morrow and his name remains, and that is what I object to. In a county such as my hon. friend represents, and in my own county, every one knows every one else pretty much, but in such places as London, Hamilton and Toronto we know that plugging has been carried on extensively by reason of the fact that names of non-resident electors appeared on the list. When the plugger comes along no one can dispute his right to vote; he casts his vote and away he goes.

Mr. McCOIG: That would be possible under any circumstances.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Not under a list prepared here within forty days of the poll; you can strike off or add to it at any time. One of the chief advantages of this law is the fact that it will give an up-to-date list, and so far as I can see that list will be an absolutely non-partisan one. I do not see any ground for all the fears expressed by my hon. friend from West Middlesex, who must be nervous or must have qualms of conscience. Unless you begin on the assumption that every one is crooked I do not see what objection there can be to the law.

Mr. McCOIG: The minister says that a lot of plugging has been practised. Well, that can go on under any conditions.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Not under this law.

Mr. McCOIG: This will not prevent personation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Actually the list will not be more than two or three weeks old when it is voted on, and any unknown names will be stricken off. Non-resident voters will go off and the names of those who should be on the list will be added. You will have an up-to-date list, a list prepared almost up to nomination day. It will be a last-minute list. There might be an exceptional case where an unknown man might work in.

Mr. PARDEE: How many cases of plugging does the minister know of in his constituency? As a matter of fact there has been little plugging, and I think that the minister is exaggerating in that respect.

[Mr. McCoig.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: I should not like to give the source of my information, but we have strong reasons for believing that in 1896 we lost the election in my riding through plugging. I will tell my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Pardee), when he puts his innocent question in that bland manner of his, that I could not teach him anything about the matter.

10 p.m.

Mr. PARDEE: Well, I do not know what the minister means by that assertion, I am sure; but if he implies that I have ever been guilty of anything unfair, I desire to inform him that he is absolutely wrong.

Mr. GUTHRIE: You asked me the question.

Mr. PARDEE: I simply asked the minister how much plugging there had been, and when he says that he cannot teach me anything, I can only say that evil minds conceive what ought not to be thought of.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, I do not like any assumption of innocence in this matter.

Mr. PARDEE: Nobody does.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We have been long enough in politics to know what the records of the courts are.

Mr. PARDEE: You need not impute any plugging to me; I do not know anything about it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: You know as much as I do.

Mr. PARDEE: Then God knows you know nothing, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, we are on even ground.

Mr. McCOIG: I think it comes with very bad grace from the minister to make such insinuations.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. McCOIG: It is in very bad taste.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): Order; I must point out that the minister has the floor.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If the discussion in this direction goes any further I can also refer to the instance of the London election when—

Mr. PARDEE: Well?

Mr. GUTHRIE: —an election was stolen from the Liberal party in 1887 by plugging;

and I know the experience in South Wellington in 1896. We always thought we lost the election by plugging by reason of the fact that the non-resident vote in those days was allowed, and the voters' list was full of names of non-residents whom we could not locate.

Mr. PARDEE: Does the minister connect me with anything of that kind?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I made my remark in perfect innocence, and thought it would be accepted in that way.

Mr. PARDEE: I take it that way then.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I hope the indignation has passed away.

Mr. PARDEE: Quite so.

Mr. GUTHRIE: To get back to the clause, Mr. Chairman, I say that the safeguards provided in this clause are the most complete that I have ever come across in an Election Act. I do not believe that a band of crooked election officials could deprive a man of his vote under this law if he wanted to vote. If he were deprived it would be because of his own carelessness. I do not want to see any objection in either of the proposals that have been suggested. I do not object to them except in regard to the machinery they propose in the way of appeal. I think we should provide for the Appellate Court here. If my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's will think the matter out a little further I think he will agree with me in that respect. Now, we will accept the lists of Nova Scotia provided they are not more than a year old, and I believe they are annually prepared. If the machinery here provided under section 32 is allowed to prevail in regard to appeal, I shall be willing to advise my colleagues to accept the Nova Scotia lists, under the condition, of course, that they are not more than a year old. As I say however, I think they are annually prepared in that province. Then we shall have our own franchise and any one who is disfranchised under the law of Nova Scotia could come to the appellate tribunal and be put on the list in accordance with our franchise. If names are improperly on the list they can be stricken off in accordance with section 32; and voters whose names are left off can on election day bring sureties or vouchers with them and cast their votes. That proposal I could accept. I could not however accept the proposal to make these lists absolute and binding, because I do not believe it is a fair proposal in regard to Ontario. I do not think my hon. friend from West Middlesex and I are so far apart on the general question but I would insist on the appellate machinery provided in this Bill. New Brunswick, I think, probably offers a Franchise Act more nearly coincident with the present Bill than any of the provinces. I have not read that Act for several weeks and possibly I may be confused as regards its provisions; but my recollection is that it is very nearly the same as this Bill. If their lists are annually prepared they will be accepted; I will accept them unhesitatingly; but I would not allow them to be final. I would allow people to get on those lists in the way provided under section 32.

Now we come to other difficulties. There is Prince Edward Island where they have no voters' list; we must prepare them there. Saskatchewan and Alberta have no voters' lists—I know in Saskatchewan they have not; we must prepare them there. Other provinces have varying periods for preparing the lists—not annual preparation but longer periods. There the lists may be too old in every instance and we would have to provide the machinery to prepare lists. But, while personally I have had no experience whatever under the Saskatchewan law—I have never taken any part in an election in the province,—I am assured on all hands and by representatives, I think, of all parties, that in the two elections that have been held under Saskatchewan law, there has been absolutely no complaint—no party has objected. The machinery provided by section 32 is very nearly the Saskatchewan law; it is adapted from the law of that province. If it has worked well there, will it not work well here? We do not want to lose control of the machinery. We are willing to accept your lists where you have lists; and where you have not, we give as fair a method as we know how to provide to get those lists.

I say to my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's—who is now in the House—that as in Nova Scotia they have an annual preparation of provincial voters' lists I accept that part of his proposal, but I cannot say I would accept the proposal to make them absolute and complete. If my hon. friend wants a plain statement in the Act that the provincial lists there shall be accepted, with power to add to them or take from them as provided by section 32, I see no reason why we cannot agree upon that proposal. Similarly in the province of Ontario; and I have had a better oppor-

tunity of reading the Bill now before the legislature of that province and a better opportunity of reading the motion and amendment which my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) suggested. I think my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's sees what I am trying to arrive at. It has been pointed out in this House, and has been pointed out to me on other occasions by representatives from Nova Scotia, that under the Nova Scotia lists as framed for provincial purposes two years and even three years may possibly elapse before a man is legally qualified to vote. The dates are so conflicting, or the periods are so tightly drawn, that there is a possibility, they tell me, of a man being twenty-three years of age before he can vote, even if he had only come of age just before the first day after the first of January in any particular year. As the hon. member for Digby and Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) pointed out, some men may be disqualified for two or three years by some residence qualification; under this Act they would not. Now there should be an opportunity to add to the lists the names of these men; the provincial lists should not be accepted as final and complete. All that we ask is that machinery provided for that purpose, or for that adding to, shall be the machinery provided in section 32. But, as against some of the other provinces we will have to provide elaborate machinery because there are no up-to-date lists at all.

However, I am glad the discussion has taken place, and it may be continued for that matter. I cannot give the final decision in regard to the suggestions of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's and my hon. friend from West Middlesex; what I have stated on the matter expresses my own views.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not hear the whole of the minister's statement, but I think that what I did hear is perhaps the essence of the situation with regard to the Nova Scotia lists, and I am very glad that the minister is disposed to receive even in part the suggestions I ventured to offer. With regard to a man being twenty-three or twenty-four years of age before he can vote, I suppose that a man who became twenty-one years of age after the last Dominion election will be twenty-five years before he gets a vote. If you have an annual list I do not see what better you can do; I do not see how you can devise any better system.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Under the machinery that we create a man who only became twenty-one about two weeks before the election would get on the list providing he lived in the riding.

Mr. FIELDING: With regard, however, to the more important question I am very glad to have an assurance of the minister's willingness to accept the Nova Scotia lists for a certain purpose; but when he says that he will not accept them as final, and then goes on to remark that they ought to be added to or substracted from by the machinery he has provided here, does he mean that that will be done by the appointment of registrars?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, because in the urban districts the application goes before the judge of the county, or in case more than one judge is necessary, before an appointee of the county judge. In the country districts it would be before the registrar; but in the country districts the matter is not of so much consequence, because a man who is not on the list can on polling day go and vote anyway if he swears himself in. It is in the cities that the matter becomes more important because there is no privilege of going on election day and tendering the oath and getting the ballot. The point is this, as my hon. friend will see: The people of Nova Scotia say they have a grievance in the appointment of a sheriff as the revising officer. Sheriffs are not lawyers—I pointed all this out a minute ago—they have no legal qualifications more than the ordinary qualifications of a sheriff in serving a writ or a subpœna, or something of the kind, or the enforcement of the criminal law of the country; they have no education that will train them to decide a question of law in regard to the franchise. But the judges have. I understand from hon. members on this side of the House that time after time motions have been moved in the legislature to allow the judges to be the final court of revision, but the Provincial Government refuse every time the request is made. They say, "No, we will stick to the sheriff." This Bill proposes that the judges, who are much better qualified to discharge this duty than the sheriff, shall act. Another objection urged upon me is that the sheriff is responsible to the Attorney General. The sheriff is responsible in Ontario. He belongs to the Attorney General's Department, and when the sheriff needs advice he asks the Attorney General for it. They tell me the sheriffs also do so in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. FIELDING: Why not?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then if the case comes up for decision, and the sheriff asks for advice the Government that appointed him may and can remove him.

Mr. FIELDING: They can only remove him for cause.

Mr. GUTHRIE: For partisanship and improper dealing. I do not say that such actually exists, but the system is quite open to the charge that it may be abused. Now that can be removed if the simple procedure of this Bill is adopted. Why does my hon. friend object to this procedure? Why does he object to these appeals being heard by a judge or by some appointee of the judge? I think the judge would appoint a qualified man if more than one person is necessary for the decision of the question. The element of expense is utterly removed because we are going to adopt the provincial lists of Nova Scotia. The question of appeals will often involve some expense but not much expense; there will be a limited number of appeals in every riding. But that is what is urged upon me by hon. members from Nova Scotia, and it is not only urged upon me but it meets with my approval, therefore my judgment agrees with theirs in the matter. I think it most improper to ask an appointee of the Government, such as the sheriff, to decide these appeals when that sheriff knows that if he does wrong in the eyes of the Government they can cut his head off. They not only appoint him but they have the power to remove him. When he gets into a tangle or into a legal difficulty he asks the Attorney General and the Attorney General is the head of the department that is affected in connection with these voters' lists. That leaves the door pretty wide open for the charge that there may be wrong-doing some day and the possibility of that will be removed if the machinery proposed in section thirty-two for appeals or for additions to the list is adopted.

Mr. FIELDING: Of course there are a thousand and one duties for which the county judge, or any judge, is qualified by his legal training, and for which the sheriff will not be qualified. But I believe it to be the experience in Nova Scotia—I understand it is so, I have not been of late years so intimately associated with the province by residence as formerly—that the decisions of the sheriff as a rule are accepted and very little exception is taken to those decisions.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is my hon. friend's objection to what is proposed?

Mr. FIELDING: I am coming to that in a moment. While I admit at once that on a thousand and one questions a judge is the more competent man, I do not think the mere deciding of whether Smith or Brown should go on the voter's list is a great legal question at all—it is a question that any honest and intelligent layman can determine. That is why I do not think it is so vital that a judge should do it; that is one point. The next point is that my hon. friend says that the Government appoints him, and the Government can dismiss him. Suppose I were to say that the Government appoints a judge, and the Government can dismiss him?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend overlooks the vital point, that the judge is appointed for life, and no government can dismiss him according to their displeasure. The same condition applies to the appointment of a sheriff. His appointment is permanent in the sense that he holds office during good behaviour. My hon. friend as a lawyer and administrator knows what that means. A sheriff cannot be dismissed because he has displeased the particular government of the day in connection with the electoral lists.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: No, no. I gave an instance of a sheriff who had been in office 43 years, but my hon. friend says the Government can dismiss him. That is not reasonable, for it is neither in accordance with the law nor with the facts. However, I do not want to press that point too far. There is some force in what my hon. friend says, and if there is any sincere belief on the part of any one that the decisions in Nova Scotia are partisan, and he wants an appeal, I will be perfectly content to have it said that in any such case an appeal shall be made to a county judge; but I do not want it to be made to a reviser, to a registrar or to an enumerator. I do not think it is fair that an enumerator appointed by a returning officer, who may be a partisan, and who is going to be appointed perhaps because he is a partisan, should be allowed to say the final word, I would accept that amendment that the lists of Nova Scotia as revised by the sheriffs shall be subject to appeal to the county judge. I do not want any man left off the lists who is entitled to vote. I want to point out to my hon. friend that while he emphasizes the appeal to the judge, as

a matter of fact the appeal is going to be largely to the registrar, for there are constituencies in Nova Scotia in which there are no cities at all, practically speaking, and it is only in urban centres that the appeals can be referred to the judge. I would accept with pleasure a provision for appeal from the sheriff to the county judge; but I do not think it is fair to take the appeal from the sheriff to an officer who is appointed mainly because he is a partisan.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think my hon. friend understands the Act. He speaks of an enumerator, but an enumerator has no power to make any final binding judgment in the matter. Let me put the case as it will be. We will assume under this clause as drawn that the lists of Nova Scotia are not a year old, in which case they become the voters' lists. Now, I am going to take a rural division. There may be some people who have come into that riding and lived there the requisite time, which is only 60 days, but although entitled to vote they are not on the list. They go to the registrar and ask to be put on. We will assume that he is a crook and does not want to do his duty, and says, "No, I will not put you on." That is not final. It would be a convenience to have the man's name put on. But supposing the officer is crooked and fails in his duty, all that man has to do on election day is to go to the polling station, take the necessary oath, and he becomes entitled to vote. If there was a final binding decision from the enumerator to the registrar I would oppose it; but we have safeguarded it, and I think it is the best safeguard ever embodied in a Franchise Act. In the urban division, as my hon. friend will see, the appeal is to the judge. I cannot make it any clearer. I could not consent to the sheriff being the final revising officer. What I said when my hon. friend was out I may as well say now, that whether well-founded or ill-founded there is a settled feeling on the part of hon. members from Nova Scotia sitting on this side of the House that they do not get fair treatment under the Provincial Franchise Act. I am told by some of those members that they are under a tremendous handicap at every election, and under the circumstances I cannot accept those lists as final. Those hon. members are convinced that they are right and it seems so eminently proper to adopt the course I suggest of leaving the matter to the judge that I do not feel that I need labour the point any longer.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. FIELDING: What my hon. friend puts forward as an appeal or remedy does not commend itself to my judgment. Perhaps it was discussed when I was not here, but the idea that a man shall be allowed to go to the poll and swear himself on at the last moment is to my mind a very objectionable feature of the law.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There has been a qualification of that. I propose, when this section is discussed, to add an amendment providing that two resident ratepayers of the polling subdivision will swear that a man is entitled and qualified to vote, and that he himself will swear the same, the names of the three will be entered in the poll book and he will be entitled to vote. I think that is a safeguard.

Mr. FIELDING: The whole idea seems to me to be utterly unsound. However, at the most the hon. gentleman is only interposing an extra cog in the machine. If the sheriff is partisan—and I cannot see any justification for taking that ground because his appointment is made by the local government; however, let us waive that; if there is any suspicion that the decision of the sheriff is partisan—I would welcome any machinery which would take the case direct to the county judge, I do not care in what form, whether you call it an appeal or anything else. But I am afraid any machinery that will allow enumerators or registrars the right to strike off or put on names without the right of appeal to the county judge is not sound. Why not revise the Bill so that in case a man is dissatisfied at being left off the list he can go direct to the county judge and get a decision?

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend objects to a man swearing himseluf on at election day. I am told that under the Nova Scotia Act one man can swear on 500 names.

Mr. McGREGOR: That has been done in New Glasgow.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not know what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That I can go to some court or tribunal there and on my affidavit I can swear to the qualifications of as long a list of names as I like, and those names will be accepted.

Mr. FIELDING: In the making up of the list.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The only man who can change that is the sheriff. That is a pretty easy way of getting on. That was permitted

under the Franchise Act of 1885 and was condemned as the most unholy thing in it. I think that the method adopted by this Bill is much better.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend ignores the most material fact, that he can swear that list only if he can satisfy the tribunal that it is right.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And that tribunal is the sheriff.

Mr. FIELDING: He cannot by his own affidavit put men on the list unless he gives good grounds to the revisers, and if the revisers are not satisfied they will not put those men on.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If it is possible for one man to do that, can there be any objection to three men swearing to one vote? That is the proposal of this Bill.

Mr. FIELDING: I want tribunals established by law, not some individual to swear men on the list. The tribunals established in Nova Scotia as far as I know are fair and try to be just, although there are exceptions I have no doubt on one side or the other, human nature being what it is. But I come back to the point. I want to avoid trouble, and if a man is not on the list he should have an opportunity of being put on. My hon. friend can devise any machinery he thinks best to allow a person to go direct from the sheriff to the county judge without the intervention of a partisan registrar.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This Bill permits that.

Mr. FIELDING: It does at a later stage.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No. If your provincial list is less than a year old we accept it. Suppose you are not on that list, and suppose you do not go near the registrar, you can go to the county judge. That is provided here. You can go with notice or without notice; you can go without any certificate. That is absolutely provided in the Bill.

Mr. FIELDING: The registrar certainly has the power to add and strike off names.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Suppose he will not do it for you?

Mr. FIELDING: That is another cog in the machine,—that you can go to the county judge. I see no need of that additional piece of machinery.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not want to overload the courts, you know.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I intervene to make a suggestion? The Ontario Government is introducing a Bill which will affect this proposed legislation so far as the preparation of lists is concerned. That circumstance has altered very materially the significance of this section. What the minister said this evening about the willingness of himself and his colleagues to accept as a basis the provincial lists also goes a very considerable way toward removing some of the very serious doubts so many of us entertained about the purpose of the Government in the section as drafted. Now, we have before the Committee different suggestions, one from the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), which the minister is prepared to accept in part and to consider further; one from the member for Middlesex West (Mr. Ross) which also the minister has expressed his approval of in part and his willingness to consider further. I suggest that before we pass this clause the minister might be agreeable to having a short conference with the member for Shelburne and Queen's, the member for Middlesex West, the member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee), with a view to seeing just how far—

An hon. MEMBER: Don't do it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hear my hon. friend say: "Don't do it." I ask him if that is the spirit in which we ought to try to work out a Franchise Act?

Mr. CURRIE: You would not be satisfied anyway.

Mr. BUREAU: What do you know about it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We should all approach a matter of such great consequence as this in the spirit of trying to get an Act which will appeal to the people as being fair and just. A conference might help to remove a great deal of doubt and establish a wider ground of certitude; more could be accomplished in that way than by hours of debate here. What we have heard to-day suggests the possibility of our getting very much closer together on this particular section than I thought was possible when the discussion started. Let me illustrate just what I have to say, because I have Ontario more particularly in mind. When this Bill was introduced we had before us only the Ontario lists as prepared under the late Hearst Government. They were prepared on the system of enumeration, and as this section read at that time

it meant that if a general election took place within a year, the lists which we would have to use so far as Ontario was concerned would be the lists that the Hearst Government had prepared for the last election. If it did not take place within a year, or at any time up to November of this year, then we would have no alternative than that of the appointment by the Government of its army of enumerators to prepare the lists in accordance with the machinery provided by this Act. That, we all felt, would be dangerous and anything but satisfactory. Now, what has happened since this Bill was introduced. The Drury Government have come into office; they have thrown the old Hearst legislation to the winds, and are drafting a new law and providing for the preparation of annual lists. The minister tells us to-night that if that law is in force, then these annual lists will be used by the federal Government for the purposes of elections. That is an entirely different situation from that with which we were confronted when the Bill was first brought into the House; and, as I say, for that reason we are very much closer together than I saw any possibility of our being in the early stages of the discussion. In view of the attitude of the minister toward the suggestions that have been made from this side I feel that if he is agreeable to a conference of this kind, simply to smooth out the differences as between the different provinces, we should probably be much closer together at the end of an hour's conference of that kind than we would be at the conclusion of a prolonged discussion here.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No matter which way we decide that point, the clause has to go, because if no lists are made within twelve months by the province, we shall have to prepare new ones. In some provinces they have no lists any way, so we have to go on and consider the clause. But as it affects particularly, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario I quite agree with my hon. friend; we would let that aspect of it stand.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the aspect of it that I would like to have stand. In order to make clear the effect of the law as it would be if we passed this section, let me put a question to the minister. Assuming that an election were to take place in Canada within a year of the time the Drury Government was formed, that is, before November of this year, then that election would be held on the lists used in the last provincial election?

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: If they were not more than twelve months old.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If an election came before November of this year, the lists used for federal purposes so far as Ontario is concerned would be the lists that were used in the last provincial election. Now if the general election came in December, before the law now being drafted in Ontario was put into motion, then the lists would be prepared by enumerators in accordance with the provisions of this Act. without any reference whatever to the law that the Ontario Government is putting through at the present time.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, unless lists were prepared under that law.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Assuming that the Ontario law were now passed and that lists were prepared under it by November or December of this year then those lists would be used?

Mr. GUTHRIE: They would be valid for twelve months.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But if they were not prepared until say March or April of next year and a general election took place before then, lists would be prepared under the provisions of this Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, I understand that the proposal is that the Ontario Bill shall be passed and that the provincial lists for this year shall be prepared under it. I understand that they have to be prepared for municipal purposes in any case.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I simply wanted to make the point clear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think that the Ontario law will be in force by December next, anyway. There might be a month or two after November and before the new provincial lists come during which, if a general election were held, we might have to prepare new lists.

Mr. CURRIE: Do I understand that there is no appeal from the lists as prepared by Ontario.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Oh yes, there is.

Mr. CURRIE: Because I would very much object to that. Hon. members know that in the old days it used to cost us anything from $100 to $1,000 a year to look after our lists. Why should members of the federal House have to provide the machinery for the revision of lists for Ontario? When hon. gentlemen opposite were in office and had charge virtually of all the clerks and

all the printing shops, when we had our lists revised and fixed up they would go to the printer, and then, when they were there they would be hocus-pocussed and a lot of old Conservatives would find themselves without votes. I would not agree to any such proposal as that there should be a constant revision of lists by members of this House. There must be revision before a general election; that is sufficient. Now hon. gentlemen opposite are asking for a conference. Of course, it is all right enough to ask for a conference; it is all right to compromise.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not asking; I am making a suggestion.

Mr. CURRIE: I have the floor for the moment, if you please. Hon. gentlemen opposite would have a conference and then they would go before the country and say that they forced the minister to give them this fine election law. For it is a fine law. I do not agree with any hon. member who wants to have a special law for his own province. The law should be the same for all provinces. There should be no difference; no distinction. An appeal should be provided for a man at the last moment who has been, by some means, deprived of his vote. I am not going to put confidence in the Government of Ontario. The gentleman who leads it has been looking after voters' lists in my riding, and I know how difficult it is to keep track of him; he is a past master in the art of dropping names from the voters' lists. It may work out to the advantage of the public that there shall be an annual list for which the municipalities pay. The fact of the matter is that the Government at Toronto is unloading the expense of preparing its lists. I cannot see that there is anything to be gained by going into any conference, if this Bill is satisfactory and if hon. gentlemen opposite can bring forward no valid reasons or grounds for complaint. I have listened for hours to hon. gentlemen opposite discussing the matter, and I do not see any valid objection that can be raised. In particular, I see no objection to the way in which the list is handled in Nova Scotia, and I cannot see any reason why the list there should be handled differently from the way in which lists are handled in the other provinces. Moreover, I cannot see why my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) is so anxious that the sheriff should have all the say in regard to this matter; there is something wrong, there is something suspicious in all that clamour to have the sheriff do this work. For that reason I would object to that, and if I were the minister, I would not concede that point. If hon. gentlemen opposite are determined to fight the matter out, let them do so; but as regards holding a conference, the conference might not last five minutes; my hon. friends might say: Change one or two words here and there and then the clause will be all right; and then they would go broadcast over the country and say that they forced the Government to give them this law. The Government is responsible, and if there is anything wrong in this measure, I would say: Let the onus rest upon the Government and let the Opposition assume no responsibility for it.

Mr. BUREAU: It is refreshing to listen to my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) and to size him up by his own opinion of others and how he views questions of this kind in the House. He is responsible for his actions, so let him take the responsibility for it.

Mr. CURRIE: We have responsible Government.

Mr. BUREAU: What I rose to ask is this: The Acting Solicitor General has spoken about every province except Quebec. I asked him why the one-year limitation was inserted, and he replied that the lists might get stale, and there is something in that contention. But this is the position. I understand the first object of the law is to facilitate the franchise to people. In Quebec, we have this condition, that the lists in the large cities are revised only every even-numbered year. Every year in rural municipalities and in towns and villages the lists are made by municipal councils, and the question of plugging could not come up with us, because the lists are made from the assessment roll, and the assessor has to indicate on the assessment roll who is a resident and who is a non-resident. A man who is a non-resident under the Quebec Election Act has no right to vote.

Mr. CURRIE: When did that change take place?

Mr. BUREAU: I think the change was made two years ago.

Mr. DENIS: Four years.

Mr. CURRIE: In every other province dual voting has been abolished for the last twenty years.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the difference?

Mr. CURRIE: This shows how far you are ahead of us.

Mr. BUREAU: Do not think you are virtuous Ontario as against Quebec when you come before the House and accuse one another of plugging and stealing elections and stealing ballot boxes and having to pay money. Why, my hon. friend is a self-confessed man who has to spend money to make his lists.

Mr. CURRIE: I do.

Mr. BUREAU: Why?

Mr. CURRIE: My hon. friend is a lawyer and can look after his lists. I have to hire an attorney to look after mine.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not have to hire an attorney or anything else. The list is passed and the man who finds his name is not on the list goes to the revising officer and asks that his name be put on. In rural municipalities the council sits as a court of revision, if you like, and people appear before that court. I am not put to any expense in the matter except as regards postage for writing to some fellows telling them to look up the lists and see if their names are on. But be that as it may, if you want to facilitate the franchise, you must have something to start on in large cities because, if you have no names on the lists to start with, and you post up notices and tell the people to register, names are going to be left off.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In London, England, in New York and similar places, that is the way in which the lists are made up, namely by personal registration.

Mr. BUREAU: That may be. If you accept the last list in the rural municipalities, why not accept the last list used in a provincial election in the larger cities?

Mr. GUTHRIE: How old might the list be?

Mr. BUREAU: It would not be over two years old. In Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers, Sherbrooke, St. Hyacinthe and Hull, the lists are revised in March or April of every even-numbered year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then you would have to see to it that an election took place every odd-numbered year, and in that case 1923 would be all right because then the list would be only one year old.

Mr. BUREAU: The matter all depends on the month. If you had an election in July, my list would be no good.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: Make it September.

Mr. BUREAU: If you have it in February, 1922, I would be in the same position, because the revision is in the even-numbered years. Last year the lists were revised in March or April, I forget which. If you have an election in June, 1921, my list is no good and you have to start with absolutely nothing. It is only fair to make an exception in these cases that the last lists in large cities which have a revision every even-numbered year shall be the list to be used. Then you will have something to start on and names can be added or struck off. I am not objecting to the appeals at all, but I want something to start on; and if you do not accept these lists, you would start without a single name and you would have to bring the people to the registrar and have them register. That is a new departure; we have had no election under that system except the one in Quebec East; and a great many people would lose their votes. I would not ask the minister to accept lists two years old when lists one year old or less than that can be had, but we could make the exception in the case of large cities by adding after the words: "for the purposes of provincial elections" the words "except in such cities where revision of lists is biennial." That would cover Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers, Sherbrooke, St. Hyacinthe and Hull.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Are those the only places?

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, in our province.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The hon. member's suggestion is that in those places the last list should be the one to be used with power to add to and strike off as in this clause.

Mr. CURRIE: In Ontario, in a number of cities and towns, as a matter of fact, the list is nearly a year old. The list is prepared from the assessment roll, and the list that is prepared from the assessment roll in Toronto is a year old before it appears before the public. The same thing is true of one of the towns in my riding, and I think the same is true of Guelph, but these lists just form the basis and they are pretty nearly within the year. If we are going to have exceptions made for everywhere we shall never get anywhere. We must have a general law applicable all over the Dominion. As a matter of fact, if I were appointed an enumerator in Montreal I would certainly start with the old list.

Mr. BUREAU: It is easier to start with the old list than to get voters to register.

Mr. CURRIE: You would know the voters who lived in the wards.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think this is an exception. It is kind of general. Here is a class of cities—

Mr. GUTHRIE: It may be a broad exception, but it is an exception.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR (Queen's): In discussing the question of accepting provincial lists the minister referred to Prince Edward Island and said we had to make a list for that province as there was no list there. I cannot see why the minister comes to that conclusion. I was rather amused at the controversy between the hon. members (Mr. Currie) and (Mr. Bureau), each claiming that his province was ahead of the other. I think the province of Prince Edward Island is further advanced than any other province, because we did away with lists entirely over twenty years ago. We have, of course, qualifications for voters. I can see no reason why there should not be uniform qualifications all over Canada, but I would ask the minister to follow at Dominion elections the method of voting in force in the different provinces. In Prince Edward Island the voters know their qualifications. They are posted up in the proclamation, and the voters go to the poll and vote. It is true that we have very few of an alien population. About 95 per cent of our electors are residents of many years standing and they are well known. To make a list for Prince Edward Island would simply be doubling or trebling the cost of holding the election there. There are only four constituencies, and I cannot see any purpose in going to an expenditure of $20,000 or $25,000 in making a list that is absolutely of no use so far as the pronvince of Prince Edward Island is concerned. If the minister would look at the qualifications required for the local legislature, and the method of holding provincial elections in the province, I think he would see that nothing could be gained by making a list for our province.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Are there no property qualifications in your franchise?

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: I hope the minister has caught my point, which is that the qualifications of voters should be the same all over the Dominion, but that the method of holding the election should be that followed in each of the provinces, so the qualification of voters does not apply to the point I am making. The qualifications are as follows:

> Every person shall be entitled to vote at an election to be held for the election of an Assemblyman to represent in the Legislative Assembly of this province, any Electoral District: If such person
>
> (a) Is of the full age of twenty-one years on the day of the election, and is not by this Act or any law of the province disqualified or prevented from voting; and
>
> (b) Is a male British subject; and—

Then follow further qualifications, for instance, if the man has paid his poll tax for the year preceding he is entitled to vote, or if he is the owner of a freehold estate.

Mr. MORPHY: How much is the poll tax?

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Two dollars. He must have his receipt for that poll tax. If he has that, and is a British subject twenty-one years of age, he is entitled to vote.

Mr. MORPHY: Are there any property qualifications?

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: That does not matter if he has paid his poll tax. If he is above the age when the poll tax is payable, there are other qualifications. In Prince Edward Island, for instance, where the people are not mixed with aliens, and where everybody is well known, I see no reason why the minister should not follow the method of holding the poll that is to be adopted in the provincial elections. I think the expense of making these lists is not justified so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned. You could have the same qualifications of voters all over Canada, but the method of holding the election should be one used in the different provinces at provincial elections.

Mr. MORPHY: Is there any residence qualification?

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: They must reside in the province twelve months and in the district one month.

Mr. MORPHY: There is no list made of those who are entitled to vote?

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: None whatever.

Mr. MORPHY: What protection is there against people from other districts coming in to vote?

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: The candidate's agents are at the polls and it is their duty to see that nobody votes who is not entitled to vote in that division.

Mr. MORPHY: There are no lists in a city of 20,000?

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: We have no cities of that size.

Mr. MORPHY: Has not Charlottetown a population of about 15,000?

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: Only 12,000.

Mr. MORPHY: And there is no trouble?

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: None whatever. There was more trouble with the lists in 1917, the people not being acquainted with registering themselves, than we had in all previous elections over a number of years.

Mr. MARTIN: What is the time allowed previous to an election for paying the poll tax?

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR: It must be paid the year previous to the election. The poll tax for the year is not due until December, so if an election was held in September they would have to show the receipt for the year previous.

Mr. McISAAC: There is what I might call a double franchise in Prince Edward Island. One half the members of the legislature are called councillors, and the other half are called assemblymen. That arose in this way: We had a legislative council there at one time, and it was a very difficult thing to abolish, because the councillors naturally were reluctant to abolish themselves. The Prime Minister, however of that day, introduced a Bill, and we must assume that he talked nicely to these gentlemen of the legislative council, twelve in number, and told them: You will be councillors still after you have abolished your chamber; you will be elected to the assembly. In that way he managed to persuade these councillors to abolish themselves, and from that day to this we have the peculiar condition of having councillor electors and assemblymen electors. The councillor electors require a property qualification amounting to $325, and those who vote for the assemblymen must have paid their poll tax; it is practically manhood suffrage in their case. When these two classes of members elected to the legislature come into the chamber and take their seat, no one can tell which of them is councillor and which an assemblyman. There are fifteen electoral districts in the province, and each district sends one councillor and one assemblyman to the legislature. A not very strong party man might be disposed to attempt to cross his votes, but he cannot do it very successfully in this case. He has to vote for councillor and for an assemblyman if he polls two votes. He is not allowed to vote for two councillors or two assemblymen, but for one of each. That is the peculiar condition we have in the province so far as elections to the legislature are concerned.

As to the manner of holding the elections and the preparations therefor, there are no lists. The districts are mostly rural and everybody is supposed to know everybody else. Charlottetown has a population of 12,000 and there are incorporated towns and villages, but generally speaking the people know one another pretty well, and the candidate's agents are supposed to know who are entitled to vote. For my part I think it is rather a chaotic and precarious way of carrying on an election and I am in favour of having lists of some description. Every one who is qualified to vote for an assemblyman—that is to say, every one who is twenty-one years of age and has the other necessary qualifications as to residence, poll tax, etc.,—is qualified to vote for members of the House of Commons. As regards women voters, I may say that, so far, women have not been allowed to vote for members of the provincial legislature. In the Dominion elections in 1917, of course, it is well known, certain women were given the vote. Under this Act they will be given the franchise, and that fact of itself, in my opinion, should be a cogent reason why we should have voters' lists. I should not like to see elections carried on in that province, especially for members of the House of Commons, in the rather antiquated way in which they have been conducted for the legislature, without lists. I do not think it is a proper way, and for my part I am quite satisfied to have this clause go through as it is. The Bill generally, I think will meet conditions in Prince Edward Island, so far as I am able to judge; and I think I am safe in saying that it will be generally acceptable to the people of that province. I do not think it would be well to continue, in the election of members for the House of Commons, the practice in vogue in Prince Edward Island in connection with the election of assemblymen, for I think it is very much behind the times.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I think the minister is putting a little too much stress on the question of residence so far as the province of Nova Scotia is concerned. It is not so rigid as he seems to think. In the first place, the assessment roll is the basis of the revision, and every man whose name

appears on the roll for $150 of real estate or $300 of personal estate goes on the list automatically, and no question is asked about his residence. He is a voter because he has this property, although he may not live in the district at all. He may live in some other part of the province or in some other province. He may live in New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island, and if he owns property to this extent in the district his name goes on the list automatically, and no question can be raised as to his residence. Now, that provides for the largest number of men and women in the province. Then there is a further provision.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Do I understand that you retain the names of non-residents on your list?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is objectionable.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The reviser is instructed to put every man and woman on the reviser's list, if he finds that they are qualified by the assessment roll to the extent of $150 real estate and $300 personal estate. In the case of fishermen it is $150, which represents boats, nets, etc. So that every class of person in the province who has anything in the way of property is covered. There is a provision that absence up to four months in the case of an income voter does not interfere with his qualification. Under our law a student who is in college is regarded as living at home, and provision is made for sailors. When you come to deal with all these cases, therefore, the question of residence does not amount to much.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have been informed that under the system whereby voters' lists in Nova Scotia are prepared, a resident in that province can go to the reviser and by his own affidavit swear on the names of, say, 100 men, and the reviser has no option. He must accept that oath and put those names on. There is an appeal against that to the sheriff, but the difficulty is to find the men. Where they have to be notified and have personally to appear you cannot prosecute an appeal because you 11 p.m. cannot find these men to give them notice. That has been represented to me as one great objection to the system in Nova Scotia and I should like some information.

Mr. J .H. SINCLAIR: Does the minister say that the men must come personally and apply for themselves in every case? If so, it is going to be very difficult to comply with the law.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I asked the question about your law; I do not know anything about it.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: It is true that one person who knows the facts can apply for another person in the province of Nova Scotia. But when my hon. friend talks about one hundred persons, I must say that I do not know of any such case as that. I might know the qualifications of my brother, say, or any man who works for me, and if he were not able to apply personally I could apply for him. That is reasonable, and there may be cases where one man would be better qualified than any one else to make application for a number of men. Take such a man as the cashier of a coal company, or some man who keeps the books of a company and who knows the incomes of the men and their qualifications. the qualifications for income voters, I may remark, is $250. I see no reason why a man who is, let us say, a paymaster and knows all the facts, should not be allowed to make an affidavit. There may be such cases where one man would apply for a number of other men, but it is only in an exceptional case that a man will not be able to go himself and make application.

Mr. McGREGOR: I would ask the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr Sinclair) if he thinks that any one man would have sufficient knowledge of five hundred individuals to be able to swear to their qualifications? Yet under such affidavit five hundred names would be added to the list, as was done in the towns of New Glasgow and Trenton.

An hon. MEMBER: Five hundred?

Mr. McGREGOR: Yes between the two towns.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the difference between a man swearing for one or for fifty or a hundred, if he has the knowledge? It is admitted all around that it is convenient that one man who has a knowledge of the qualifications of another should make an application for him. We know very well that lots of people are very indifferent as to whether their names are on the list at all, so the poor politician has to look out for himself and see that the names of those perons are put on the list. Our law in Nova Scotia at one time was that each individual had to make application for himself. It was found, however, that the law was not lived up to, that people would not comply with it and it had to be changed. Under the change made one person can

make affidavit as to the qualifications of another. But that is not the last word in the matter. All that enables one to do is to give the names to a reviser.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And he is bound to accept them.

Mr. McKENZIE: In the province of Nova Scotia the reviser is not bound to accept the affidavit at all unless it is handed in to him before the twentieth day of January. Very well supposing the names are put in before the twentieth day of January—which very seldom happens because people are not so much on the alert as they should be—the reviser is bound to put those names on his preliminary list. That preliminary list goes through a great many evolutions before it reaches the sheriff. It has to go before a court of three revisers who sit on a certain day and hear evidence as to whether the parties are qualified or not. If I object to anybody who is on the list I can notify him. I am not bound to notify the fellow who made the application for him. I can either notify the man who made the application for him or the man himself by sending him a letter, posted prepaid, to his last known address. Then I can go to the revisers' court and say, "There is a man on the list who should not be on;" and if I can show by evidence that that man is not qualified his name goes off. Now that list which is prepared by the revisers' court must be signed by the three revisers. The three of them sign it and put a certificatae on it that such is their decision as to that list. One-half of those who were on the preliminary list may have been struck off, but if there is anybody dissatisfied with the decision of that board he has the right to appeal to the sheriff. The three revisers are seldom of one political complexion. I do not remember ever seeing a board with three Liberals or three Tories except for the fourteen years I was in our town council when we had a Tory board. But there was never any trouble; they were honest men and they did the right thing. It is a mistake to think that because a man hands in a name to one of the revisers that is the end of it; there are three or four sittings before the list is signed by the three revisers. All three, honest and capable men sitting in that way must be satisfied that the list is all right before they sign it.

Mr. McGREGOR: What would you do in a case where you could not find the man who made the affidavit, where in fact there was no such man in existence? In the case I have referred to the name was John Smith and there was no John Smith.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. McKENZIE: I would not care a button about the man who made the application if I could find the man whose name was on the list—that is all that is necessary for me.

Mr. McGREGOR: Suppose you could not find him either??

Mr. McKENZIE: I could make application to the board and prove that the man's address is unknown—I put my evidence before the board, and if they are honest and capable men they will strike the name off. I can say, "There is no such man in existence, this thing is a bogus application, this man should go off the list.," and surely if I could satisfy a board of three capable, honest men—such as I have no doubt you would find on the board in New Glasgow—that would be all that would be necessary. I cannot conceive of having a revising board, for example in the town of New Glasgow, that would not do the square thing about the voters' list. I appeal to my hon. friend (Mr. McGregor) who comes from New Glasgow as to whether that is not the case? I do not know of any town in Nova Scotia, Pictou or anywhere else, where we could get three honest men who would solemnly take their oath and sit down and revise the list, who would do anything that was crooked in the performance of their duty. I put it up to my hon. friend (Mr. Mcgregor) whether he thinks for one moment that Sheriff Harris of the town of Pictou would be party to anything crooked about the list. Now I put it up to him to say whether Sheriff Harris is not square in his dealings?

Mr. McGREGOR: I want to say to the hon. member that the revisers of the town have no option in the matter whatever: they have to take the affidavit. Nobody knows that better than the hon. member who has just taken his seat. As to the sheriff he can only deal with these cases when the men are brought before him. You cannot bring the men before him because in many cases they do not exist. But they turn up at election day, and that is the reason their names are added.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member need not put supposititious cases to me. As to putting on the list the name of a man who was sworn to as having the qualifications and being qualified in every respect, and then not being able to find him, I never heard of such a case. If there is such a case in New Glasgow it stands solitary and alone as far as I have heard.

Mr. CURRIE: For the benefit of the hon. member, let me tell him that the system

referred to is a very old form of political corruption that used to have much vogue in the province of Ontario. In so stating I am sorry the member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) is not here—with apologies to him, I may say. What has been complained of is what is known as the colonizing of voters. We have done away with the property qualification. When we had the property qualification in the case of a man who owned a large number of town lots, the system was to put names down as being the owners. Those names would be handed in and would be put on the voters' list the same as they are in Nova Scotia, but that difficulty does not exist and such names will be struck off the list. In the old days a lot of names could be put on the list but you could never find the men although they always turned up on election day. There were a lot of those chaps and they would vote according to the way the man who paid them wished. That is an old form of corruption. Where you have dual voting and property qualifications you are almost sure to have colonization of voters.

Mr. BUREAU: An Ontario virtue.

Mr. CURRIE: Take the city of Montreal. A friend of the hon. gentleman told me the other day that in the good old days he could give as many votes as he wanted in this way for members of Parliament.

Mr. BUREAU: He was boasting.

Mr. CURRIE: He did not have to do much boasting to do that. He could just ride around and if there was property in each riding he could vote in respect of it. That is what we call colonizing. The names of foreigners used to be used for the purpose, and when the foreigners were brought in why, "All coons look alike",—you could not tell whether they were qualified or not.

Mr. BUREAU: Well, the coons are going to get the vote this time.

Mr. CURRIE: Now, in Ontario we have one man one vote, and the individual must be pretty well identified before he can vote for a member of the House of Commons. There is no merit whatever in the claim of the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) because what he has reference to is an old form that used to be followed in the preparation of the list many years ago, and it was characterized by the most rampant form of corruption that this country had ever seen. What we call the colonizing of voters is not possible under this Bill. That the hon. member should make any such proposition is to my mind very surprising. It shows that he is not familiar with what has been done in various parts of the country if he insists on having such a provision in this legislation.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not understand what the hon. member means, when he suggests that I have any knowledge of any such corrupt system. I never heard of it in the province of Nova Scotia, it does not exist. If there are such things carried on in the province of Ontario I am very sorry for the old, well-settled and reputable province if that is the fruit of their Christianity and civilization. We have no records of such corruption in Nova Scotia. I was simply pointing out the way by which honest men get their names on the list. If my hon friend doubts my word, I challenge him or any other hon. member to produce any statement of mine in this House that was not well founded on fact, for I am too sensitive of my honour to make any statement except what is absolutely true.

Mr. CURRIE: I do not dispute the statement of the hon. member that he is justified in his remarks; but to have a gentleman of his standing propose the insertion of a clause in this Bill that would permit the commonest form of corruption that is known all over the United States and England as "colonizing voters" is to me very surprising. That system has been abolished in every decent community. Why, twenty years ago that is how Tammany Hall used to carry New York.

Mr. BUREAU: Is that where you got your schooling?

Mr. McKENZIE: I know of no corruption. In the town immediately adjoining where I live, Sydney Mines, there are 5,000 or 6,000 men employed, and every dollar of wages paid to those men passes through the hands of a paymaster. He has the list of their earnings and knows what their income is. Those men go down into the mines at seven o'clock in the morning and do not come up until late in the afternoon and probably they would not have time to go before the registrar and make personal application to be put on the list. Supposing they said to their paymaster: You know our qualifications, and the law allows you to make this application for us. Go and make the application. I can see no corruption in that being done; it is only a mere matter of convenience which the statute has allowed for very many years. In Nova Scotia we

have a very vigorous and capable opposition, but I never heard any of its members demand that that law should be repealed.

Mr. BUREAU: I would suggest an amendment to the clause by inserting after the word "elections" in the twenty-fifth line the words "in the case of cities where the revision is biennial the last revised list shall be the voters' list." The object, as I was stating just now, is to facilitate voting. In Montreal, Quebec, Sherbrooke, St. Hyacinthe and Hull the revision is only by-annually. Therefore if an election takes place, say, in the month of July, we would have no lists whatever under the Act. This would make it just the same as our provincial law. Unless something like this is incorporated in the Bill I think we shall have confusion in our province, because large numbers of people seeing their names on the list made from the assessment rolls would not think of going near the registrar to be registered. This list, although more than one year old, could be utilized in such a case.

Mr. GUTHRIE: As we will have to pass the clause anyway to apply to all the other provinces, and as there is no objection to the wording of the clause in general, I would suggest that we pass it and to-morrow confer on the proposals that have been made to see if we can arrange anything satisfactory with regard to the suggestions from Ontario, Quebec, and Nova Scotia.

Mr. McKENZIE: Under the Act as it stands and as the minister understands it now, how long before election day will the lists be completed as far as they can be completed?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Candidates should have the unrevised list not later than nomination day. The next five days are taken up with revision. It is provided that the candidates shall get the revised list with the final corrections on the ninth day before polling day.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the reason for granting an appeal to a man who lives in an incorporated town and not to a man who lives in a country district? For instance, a man who lives in North Sydney has the right of appeal to the county court judge if he is dissatisfied with the work of the registrar; but the man who is immediately beyond the town limits has no appeal at all from the action of the registrar in the county. I cannot understand why a man who is in the municipal district if he lives beyond the city or town should not have the same right of appeal as the other man.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is a reason founded very largely in convenience. In Saskatchewan, where the system has been tried and found very satisfactory and where the ridings are very large, it is impossible within any reasonable time to provide machinery to permit the hearing of appeals between the time the lists are made and the election. That is the foundation of the difference between the procedure for the rural and the urban polls. If we had more judges, more judicial officers, and disregarded expense, perhaps we could apply the appellate system in all districts. But the argument was taken up in the Saskatchewan legislature—I get my information on this point from the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder)—and it was well discussed there. But the actual experience is what we base our judgment on; it has worked out to the satisfaction of everybody. Then, in the country districts throughout Ontario I am satisfied that as a rule each elector knows every other elector in the rural division—not absolutely, but as a rule. There are not nearly so many appeals in the country; there are not such difficult points to decide. A man who has been excluded can completely assert his right on polling day. But the making of a distinction was found an inconvenience and an expense, as I understand my colleague the Minister of Immigration.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why not leave it optional with the man to appeal if he wants to? If persons in rural districts which are close to cities and towns want to have that right, why should it not be given them? Of course, a man living twenty-five or thirty miles away might not wish to do this, and the only thing to do is swear him. But if a man chooses to appeal, that is his own look-out. If it is difficult; if it is expensive, he need not do it, but if he is willing to go to the trouble of appearing before a judge, why not give him the privilege of doing so?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I see a great number of difficulties in imposing territorial limitations. I see the difficulty of complexity. We have tried to have one system for the rural and one for the urban division, and to make for greater certainty we are going to put in an amendment that the Chief Electoral Officer shall at the outset decide what is an urban division and what is a rural division and what parts thereof are

such. Then, there is a simple system for the one and a simple system for the other. If you make a dual system for the rural division I do not see where you are going to get any finality. The judge who hears the rural appeals would have to prepare a special list of those appeals. The urban lists are printed at printing offices but the rural lists are not printed, so that the matter might not be concluded before election day. It might be a convenience to people living near a judge to have the advantage of the dual system, but on the whole I think that it cannot work any inconvenience or any injustice to have the provision as it is set forth in the present section.

Mr. FIELDING: Perhaps the point has already been discussed, but I make the suggestion in consequence of what my hon. friend has said; what directions are to be given to the Chief Electoral Officer by which he is to be guided in determining what is urban and what is not?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Just the interpretation of the section of the Act. Then, under another section he is the absolute judge. I assume that he will communicate with the Provincial Governments and have the latest returns; he will find out from the Governments what are the incorporated towns, cities and villages in the various provinces. He will also have if he wishes to avail himself of them, the latest census returns—because we have annual returns in Ontario made up from the assessment rolls. He is at liberty to form his judgment on any data he sees fit. I have no doubt that his first duty will be to gather together that information and decide, and his discretion is absolute. A place which has a thousand people and is incorporated as a city, town or village is an urban division. But these conditions must both exist—the number of people and the incorporation.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the clause carry?

Mr. BUREAU: No. If it is carried, and we want to introduce amendments, we shall have to go back to it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not insist upon it, if it is a bona fide effort we are making.

Mr. BUREAU: This clause embraces ten pages of printing.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not mean the schedules. We must understand this. I do not propose to consider the amendment of the clause as a general principle for the Dominion of Canada; what we are discussing is the amendment in so far as it pertains to Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. As I have suggested, we must have the clause, no matter what we specially provide for these four places, because there are five other provinces in respect of which the clause must operate.

Mr. BUREAU: My grievance is the biennial revision.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My suggestion was that the clause without the schedules be allowed to carry.

Mr. BUREAU: My amendment would come in the body of the clause.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Not necessarily.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: You could put it in the schedule; you can amend the schedule just as much as the clause. However, I am not going to insist on the point. I wanted to make some progress, that is all.

Mr. BUREAU: We have made a lot of progress. That clause will go through in five minutes next time.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, we have your undertaking to that effect; why not do it now?

Mr. BUREAU: I am not an undertaker.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is impossible to carry the clause without carrying it all, and the clause includes the schedules.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I understood not.

The CHAIRMAN: The clause does not include the schedule unless the schedule contains an agreement ratified by the clause. If the clause is carried, the next item of business before the committee will be the consideration of the schedules to clause 32.

Mr. BUREAU: If we desire to propose amendments to the clause after it has been adopted we shall have to obtain unanimous consent to open it up again.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) is quite right in that. If any change is to be made in the clause the clause will have to be reconsidered.

Mr. BUREAU: My amendment comes in the clause. There is no place to work it into the schedule. Let it stand.

The CHAIRMAN: That is for the committee to decide. Is the committee ready for the question?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Two amendments are suggested. It may be that at a conference we can reach an understanding. If we can reach an understanding to-morrow, as to-night seems to be probable, we will not bring in these amendments. But if we cannot, we want to bring in the amendments and vote on them.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My fear is that our labour is all going to be in vain. It happens that on Friday we cannot take up consideration of this Bill. Monday will be well taken up, I understand, with a special order, and on Tuesday there is the Budget. I assume that the Budget will continue until it is finished; so I am sure we shall have forgotten most of the Franchise Act in the interval.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, no; we shall have our amendments written down and agreed upon and it will be all right.

Mr. GUTHRIE: On that understanding I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Friday, May 14, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

CORRESPONDENCE TABLED.

Correspondence between the Department of Justice and the Civil Service Commission with reference to the promotion of the secretary.—Rt. Hon. A. L. Sifton.

MAPLE PRODUCTS ADULTERATION.

SENATE AMENDMENTS NOT CONCURRED IN.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (Minister of Health) moved:

That the House do not concur in the amendments made to Bill 28, an Act Respecting Maple Products, for the following reasons:—

1. Striking out clause 3 of the Bill removes the penalty for the violation of the provisions of subsection 1 of section 2 of the Bill.

2. The amendment of section 4, which purports to provide a penalty for the violation of subsection 1 of section 2 of the Bill, is not effective to accomplish the purpose.

He said: The Senate has amended the Bill by striking out section 3 which makes specific provision for a penalty for the violation of subsection 1 of section 2, and they have amended section 4 of the Bill with the intention apparently of making its provisions applicable to violations of the provisions of subsection (1) of section 2, but they are not applicable. The penal provisions provided in section 4 are those contained in section 16 of the Food and Drugs Act. That section provides penalties for three classes of offences: (1) adulteration injurious to health, (2) adulteration not deemed injurious to health and mis-branding, and (3) wilful adulteration. As violations of the provisions of subsection (1) of section 2 do not fall within any of those classes, section 16 of the Food and Drugs Act cannot be made to apply, and if it was desired to institute a prosecution for violation of those provisions one would not know which of the offences to charge or what the penalty would be. It is quite clear that the Senate made the amendments under a misapprehension, and I therefore move non-concurrence.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: I now beg to move:

That a message be sent by this House to the Senate to acquaint their Honours with the non-concurrence in the amendments made to Bill 28, an Act respecting Maple Products.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—REVIEW BY THE MINISTER OF THE AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY IN CANADA.

House again in committee of Supply.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Department of Agriculture—Experimental Farms—Maintenance of Central Farm and maintaining of additional branch stations, $1,200,000.

Mr. FIELDING: According to the custom the Speaker automatically leaves the Chair on Friday, but as the Estimates of the Agricultural Department have not yet been considered, my hon. friend (Mr. Tolmie) could not, strictly speaking, proceed to-day. However, we quite understand his good object, and I have no objection to his proceeding on the understanding that at a later stage abundant opportunity shall be afforded for the discussion of these items. Therefore I am very glad to concur so that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) may at once have an opportunity of making a statement.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, before taking up the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, I deem it advisable to outline briefly our agricultural development, the improvements that may be made in the in-

dustry, the prospects for the future, and the great importance of the development in meeting our financial obligations.

In making a brief survey of the situation, I find that we have invested in agriculture $7,379,299,000; the land under field crop in 1919 was 53,049,640 acres; the value of agricultural products in the same year amounted to $1,975,841,000.

In 1918 the mineral wealth amounted to $396,917,732; timber, $182,254,740; fisheries, $60,221,863. The total manufactures in 1917, which was an exceedingly heavy year, amounted to $2,786,649,727.

In looking over the figures in respect to wheat production, I find that while there has been a marked increase in acreage in the average year there has been a decrease in the yield per acre. In 1911 the average yield per acre was 20.80 bushels; in 1912, 20.38; in 1913, 21.04; in 1914, 15.67; in 1916, 17.10; in 1917, 15.75; in 1918, 11.00; in 1919, 10.25. In 1915, which was an exceptional year and in which the conditions were just about ideal, the average yield per acre was 26.05 bushels. We should not fail to give attention to the gradual reduction of yield in the average year, because this is exactly what has occurred in wheat growing countries which have followed the single crop system.

One of the greatest responsibilities of the Dominion Department of Agriculture as well as of similar departments in all the provinces is to conserve the fertility of our virgin soils to the very best of our ability. If we can do this we will ensure the prosperity of this great country. The best method to follow to bring about this result is that of carrying on mixed farming with livestock as a basis. As a splendid example of what can be done along these lines, let me point to Great Britain, a country very small in area compared with Canada, in which they have created and maintained in a state of perfection more breeds of horses, cattle, sheep and swine than all the rest of the world combined. While breeders from many other parts of the world have gone to Great Britain and made importations of some of their best stock, and on their return have actually taken a Scotchman along so as to ensure good care of them, after a few years they have found it necessary to return to the Old Land and secure new blood to maintain the standard of perfection.

There is great need in this country for a vigorous and continuous campaign of agricultural education, education along the lines of better methods of farming, better livestock, better seeds and better marketing. I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, the possible results that may be achieved through the employing of better methods of agriculture, without turning over a single fresh acre of land. All hon. members who have had experience in farming will agree that an increase of three bushels per acre of wheat is not an extraordinary expectation as the result of better methods. We may assume, therefore, that this is a reasonable figure. In 1919 we had 672,793 acres in fall wheat, giving an average yield of 23.75 bushels per acre, valued at $31,521,000. If we had an increase of three bushels per acre as the result of better methods, the value of that increase in cash would have been $3,976,206. In the same year we had 18,453,175 acres in spring wheat, with an average yield of 9.50 bushels per acre valued at $333,336,000. An increase of three bushels per acre would have given us an increased return of not less than $104,075,907. In the same connection it is fair to assume that we might secure from better cultural methods six additional bushels per acre of oats, four of barley and fifty of potatoes. In 1919 we had 14,952,114 acres in oats with an average yield of 26.25 bushels per acre, valued at $317,097,000. An increase of six bushels per acre would have given us an extra yield worth $71,770,147. In barley we had 2,645,509 acres with a yield of 21.25 bushels per acre, valued at $77,462,700. An increase of four bushels only per acre would have increased the cash value of that crop by $14,497,389. In potatoes we had 818,767 acres with a yield of 153.5 bushels per acre, worth $118,894,200. An increased yield of 50 bushels per acre would have given us an increased cash value of $38,891,433. This makes an estimated annual increase from grain and potatoes alone, as a result of improved methods of agriculture, of $233,211,082 per year.

Now, remember that this is an estimate made on the basis of not turning over one fresh acre of land. Some hon. gentlemen may think that these estimates are unreasonable. But let me point out what the results have been of experiments on our Government farms. It has been shown that as a result of using good seed, that is, of changing from an unsuitable variety to a variety that will suit the location, an increase of not less than from fifty to eighty per cent has been secured. For instance, a variety that is too long in maturing in a certain district where it is liable to frost may be entirely destroyed. Other varieties, again, may mature too quickly in certain

districts without filling out and without giving a proper yield. The use of pedigree seed instead of seed of a nondescript variety has given an increase on our Government farms of ten per cent and upwards. The use of clean seed, free from weeds and foreign grain, has given an increase of ten per cent and upwards. Disease-free seed, particularly potatoes, has given most excellent results, in some cases producing an increase of from fifty to one hundred per cent. Rotation of crops—that is, the arrangement of the crops in rotation over periods of three, four or five years so as to retain the fertility of the soil—has given an increase of seven per cent and upwards. Thorough cultivation has given an increase of five per cent and upwards, and, in some dry areas, there was the difference between a fair crop and no crop at all. By the use of commercial and ordinary farm fertilizers, very largely increased production can be secured. These figures, as I have pointed out, are not guess work; they are the result of experiments carried on by the experimental farms from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This indicates, not only the value of the experimental farms, but the results that may be obtained by better farming methods.

I have been pointing out to the committee simply what may be done by a better method of cultivation. There is still another very large field that is practically untouched, and that is in the immense areas of virgin soil in Canada. This can be reached by encouraging agricultural immigration of the right class to take up these lands, and if this be done, satisfactory and immediate results will be obtained. We should not, however, make any of the mistakes we have made in the past in allowing every one to immigrate to this country and giving him the privilege of Canadian citizenship. We should be a little more discriminating and select a better class, bringing in the kind of men who are willing to work and settle on our farms and keeping out the soap-box orator and the man who would rather talk than work.

Agriculture has not escaped entirely from the unrest experienced in other lines of industry. We find our farmers going into certain lines of production for a year or two and then getting out of them in a hurry and leaving the market short. An excellent illustration of that is the hog industry, which requires stabilization to a certain extent. We find that hogs are being brought all the way from the city of Winnipeg to the Pacific coast merely to meet the local requirements, and in addition to that hundreds of carcasses are being imported from the American side. This should not be, and it is largely due to the high price of grain and to the lack of faith on the part of the farmer in present market conditions.

We find that the farming industry has been very slow to go into sheep rearing. In Australia, there are no less than 80,000,000 sheep; in the United States, 40,000,000; in Great Britain, 27,000,000, and in Canada, only 3,500,000. If you ask a farmer why he does not go into these industries, he will tell you that it does not pay; but by actual experiments at our experimental farms, it is clearly shown that in almost every year these two lines, hog raising and sheep raising, have shown a satisfactory profit. This again indicates the need of more education along the line of better farming and better livestock.

Let us look for a moment at what can be done by the use of better animals and by better feeding and finishing of our livestock. Canada has to-day 3,543,600 dairy cows which have an estimated average production of less than 4,000 pounds of milk per year. Any dairyman farmer, who has any ambition, should aim to have his cows average a production of at least 7,000 pounds a year, and some of the herds of this country average over 14,000 pounds per cow. Supposing that we were able to obtain this increase, and we valued the increase at only $2 per hundred pounds, that would mean an increase in the yield of $60 per cow, which would bring us a total increase annually of no less than $212,616,000.

The total number of beef cattle marketed through our inspected abattoirs—and these are not by any means all the beef cattle killed in the country—amounted in 1919 to 1,026,141 head. Many of these were of poor quality and in very poor condition. I visited an abattoir in Toronto, went over the killing floors, where they were putting through some 700 head that day, and some of our western representatives will be surprised to learn that these cattle were passing through with a weight of from 250 to 350 pounds per carcass. Had the animals been in condition and properly grown, they would have weighed at least twice that, and would have sold for a much higher price. It is safe to say that, by better feeding and by keeping our cattle better, we could secure an increase of weight of 300 pounds per head which would mean an increase of $36 in cash per head, or an annual increase of $36,941,076.

The hogs slaughtered at our inspected establishments, that is the packing houses where they kill hogs for export and for interprovincial trade and where we maintain a staff of inspectors, number 2,373,810 head with an average weight of 189 pounds in 1919. They should have averaged, had they been in proper condition and fully grown, 220 pounds per head. Of this number, 158,254 were what are known as light hogs or "lights." These should have weighed 80 pounds or more, or an increase of 12,666,320 pounds; with an increase of thirty pounds on the balance of the hogs, an increase of 66,466,680 pounds could have been secured, or a total gain, had all these hogs been up to standard, of 79,127,000 pounds which, at 17 cents per pound, would have amounted to $13,451,590.

Let us consider for a moment the innocent little Canadian hen, of which we have 41,000,000 flying on and off the nest in Canada. The average yield of the Canadian hen is only from 5½ to 6 dozen eggs a year. By better breeding and selection, very much better results can be obtained, because some of the hens in high-class flocks are yielding from twenty to twenty-five dozen eggs a year. An increase of only one dozen eggs a year by better selection and breeding would result in an increase in our poultry wealth of $12,300,000 at 30 cents a dozen, to say nothing of the results that can be obtained in bettering the quality of our fowl which are disposed of for the table.

The results I have referred to will give us an increase in our field crops of $233,211,082, an increase in our livestock of $275,308,666 as a result of improved methods, making a total of $508,519,748, or more than one-quarter of our total national debt per year, and this, without turning over a single fresh acre. I would ask if it is not reasonable that we should make every effort to attain this end?

These are just a few striking illustrations of the possibilities of a better system of agriculture, and the figures that I have given show, without any doubt, the necessity of more agricultural education. We are disseminating this education to-day through the medium of our experimental farms, agricultural colleges, agricultural exhibitions, agricultural press, county agents, the Livestock Branch, the Seed Branch, the Fruit Branch, the Entomological Branch, Dairy Branch, and the Health of Animals Branch. While we are accomplishing a great deal of good work, our work would be vastly increased if more money were available for the purpose.

To show the results of agricultural education in the livestock business and the benefits to be obtained from campaigns of education, let me point out that when we in Canada first began to become interested in the big market for our hogs in Great Britain, our hogs were on the whole of a more or less nondescript variety. We had the American thick-fat hog, the scrub hog, and a few of the bacon type. We soon learned that the Danes and the Irish were supplying the British market with what is known as the bacon-type hog. An attempt was immediately made in this country to induce our farmers to rear that type so as to meet the requirements of that market, and to show you the excellent results obtained, I might say that during the past year in our inspected abattoirs no less than 85 per cent of the hogs that passed through these establishments were of the bacon type. That shows the results of agricultural propaganda of the right kind. I am quite confident that if this had been left to individual effort, not nearly as good results would have been obtained.

Let me give another example to show what can be accomplished by improved methods of caring for livestock. On a one hundred acre farm on Vancouver Island are two brothers, neither of whom has ever had any training in an agricultural college. They are shrewd business men, anxious to improve their opportunities and willing to work. They maintain on this farm 3,000 head of high class poultry. They carefully trap nest their hens, and have registered some of the best of them with the result that to-day for their best hatching eggs they are securing no less than $7 per dozen. On the same farm a Jersey herd was established about ten years ago, and to-day that herd averages more than 550 pounds of butter fat per cow, while the average scrub or nondescript cow is satisfied with 125 pounds. This is another example of what can be done by improving one's methods and a willingness to work. Let me give another example. Last year in British Columbia a single cow yielded within twelve months 32,000 pounds of milk, which is just eighty pounds less than the world's record, and which is eight times as much as the yield of the average Canadian cow. This one cow required only one-eighth of the room in the stable that was required for eight average cows, needed only one-eighth the care, and consumed a little more than one-eight of the feed required by eight scrub cows. The farmer that kept eight average cows to yield as much milk

was at a loss at the prevailing price of feed and found that at the end of the year he had been farming in a circle and had not got anywhere. After balancing his receipts and expenditures he found that he had got nothing from his year's work but the fresh air and the exercise, whereas the man with the 32,000 pound cow was able to sell that milk for $1,280 and he sold the cow with a heifer calf for $15,000 to be shipped all the way to Pennsylvania. The heifer calf brought $1,000. The value of knowing how to do things was worth in this particular case at least $14,000.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: If these methods were followed by the average farmer does the minister think there is a market for very many $15,000 cows?

Mr. TOLMIE: There is a market at the present time for every cow of that kind that we can produce. Anybody who would come all the way from Pennsylvania to British Columbia to get one of that kind must have needed it pretty badly. Some one may say that this was a rich man's cow, and that a poor man could not afford to keep her. Let us look at her history. She was bred near Syracuse, New York, and as a calf was sold for $150, a price within the reach of any half prosperous farmer. Had she fallen into the hands of a scrub farmer, who had wintered her on the sunny side of a straw stack and kept her on a sheep pasture in the summer she would still be worth about that price, but she fell into the hands of an intelligent man who knew how to handle her, and under his methods she gave these records, and at ten years of age he was able to dispose of her for the price noted.

Let us take another case which will perhaps appeal to some of our friends a little more strongly because it is the case of a cattle ranch. In this case while good methods of farming were followed better methods secured very much better results. In a valley in British Columbia east of the Cascade Mountains is a cattle ranch, where several thousand head are kept. It was managed by an old cowman who had come over the Texas trail, and who knew that good sires would produce good results. He purchased good sires for use on the ranch, and his cattle were a little better than any other cattle in the neighbourhood. Some time ago the ranch was taken over by another man and under the new management the sires were improved and the poor females carefully culled out. The result was that the beef turned off from this ranch averaged in a few years 150 pounds more per head than they had under former conditions. That shows what may be accomplished by good feeding and good breeding. Good breeding alone will not put the live stock business on a sound basis. We must learn to feed more liberally, and as an illustration let me give the result of an experiment at Nappan Experimental Farm in Nova Scotia, where a number of heifer calves were secured from farmers in the district who maintained scrub herds. By careful feeding all these heifers in their first lactation period produced 50 per cent more milk than their dams under ordinary management, and the offspring of these heifers from a pure-bred sire yielded twice as much as the scrub grand dam. This is a striking illustration of the results obtained first by good feeding, and secondly by good breeding. We need to feed and keep our cattle better all over Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. On the average they are not well enough fed during the winter months. We are too much inclined to gamble on the weather, particularly in some of our ranching areas, where if we have good luck we win out, but if we have a severe winter we lose heavily. What we require is more haystack insurance, that is, we want to make provision for the severe winter. In many of the semi-arid sections lying east of the mountains I think we can obtain no better results than by following out a system of irrigation wherever the water is available and the soil suitable for the purpose. This will bring us excellent results. I have seen wonderful results in British Columbia, Oregon, Washington and Idaho where I have seen lands that would yield nothing but rattlesnakes and sage brush turned into a veritable garden. Alfalfa and many other crops could be produced in Alberta under irrigation, and in some of our non-irrigable areas very much better results could be obtained by sowing these crops that will grow under semi-arid conditions; brome grass, for instance, western rye grass, and a plant that is coming into vogue nowadays and attracting a great deal of attention, namely, sweet clover. At Scott, Saskatchewan, with a rainfall of less than eight inches during the growing season sweet clover produced a considerably heavier yield than alfalfa under the same conditions.

There is another line that has been overlooked to a great extent, but which where it has been adopted has yielded excellent

results, and that is the silo system. It costs $3 or $4 per ton capacity to build a wooden silo with iron hoops. Corn has perhaps been given the most prominence among silo plants, but in those areas which are liable to frost it is not so good as sunflowers, which are now being used for the same purpose. They will stand a temperature of 27 degrees, or 5 degrees of frost. Experiments carried on in Montana have shown that 2½ tons of sunflowers ensilage is equal in feeding value to a ton of alfalfa hay, and as you will remember a ton of alfalfa hay is equal in feeding value to nearly one ton of bran. At Strathmore farm in Alberta, owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company it was found that the cows gave more milk, and of a much better quality and maintained their weight better on sunflowers than on corn. At Scott, Saskatchewan, with a precipitation of only 7.45 inches of rain in the year a yield of from 5 to 7 tons of sunflowers per acre was obtained, and in a steer feeding experiment carried on there the sunflowers gave a feeding value of $13.81 per ton, which is very high, yielding in cash value, from $69.05 to $97.67 per acre. At Kapuskasing in Northern Ontario the yield of sunflowers was 25 tons per acre; at Strathmore on the Canadian Pacific farm in Alberta, under irrigation conditions 34.06 tons; at an experimental farm in Montana, no less than 44.01 tons per acre, a tremendous contrast to the average yield of "prairie wool," which is a half-ton to three-quarters of a ton per acre."

This opens up a vast field for the production of cheap feed for the maintenance of our livestock. Better feeding will save our cattle in severe winters. It will produce larger and better cattle all round and we shall be able to send better finished cattle to market, securing very much more satisfactory prices. If the livestock business of this country is to be put on a sound basis we must feed more liberally, and in this connection I may say that the branches of this department are keenly alive to the importance of this subject as is evidenced by the fact that they are conducting experiments with these fodder plants on twenty of their farms from the Atlantic to the Pacific. All the information that is obtained as a result of these experiments is absolutely free to the farmer who is desirous to get it.

Realizing that many of our cattle are sent to market in an unfinished condition and at great consequent loss to the country, the department last winter introduced a system by which they are giving special prizes for car lots and groups of cattle at the livestock shows. At Brandon this year no fewer than 300 head of cattle were on exhibition, and an American judge who was present pronounced the calves he saw there to be the best collection he had so far seen on the continent this year. At Chicago the International show has accomplished wonders for the American livestock business by encouraging production of finished animals; and realizing this, we were glad to contribute to the Royal Agricultural Winter Fair Association of Canada a sum to assist them in carrying on a show there every year. While at the outset that show will not be on as large a scale as that which is held at Chicago, I am quite sure that in a few years the Toronto Exhibition will compete with the Chicago show, and will render very great assistance to the livestock industry of this country.

Since the war another problem has been worrying agriculturalists all over the country, and that is the problem of keeping the boy and girl on the farm. All the literature that I have seen on the subject shows quite plainly that no panacea has been discovered to meet the difficulty in connection with the exodus of the boys and girls from the farms. I think that hon. gentlemen will all agree that we can go a long way towards solving the problem by adopting better farm methods; by making the home more attractive; by keeping better livestock; by making more profit on the farm, which will make possible more comfortable conditions such as will be conducive to happiness and contentment; by making conditions tolerable for the farmer's wife; and generally by doing everything we can to make life on the farm attractive. In addition to this, I think that good roads and cheap automobiles should play a very great part in helping to keep the young people on the farms by rendering very valuable assistance to the farmer in different ways in connection with his work and by enabling him and his family to move around and mix with the neighbours, thus obtaining some social pleasure out of life. In this regard the women's institutes of the country have been performing a worthy service and one that has been of great value. We have women's institutes scattered throughout the country from coast to coast, and recently a Federation of Women's institutes was formed. These organizations are an excellent medium through which to improve farm life. They do a great deal of splendid work in spreading social propa-

ganda. They have instituted household science work, giving instruction in the domestic arts, in home nursing, sanitation, improvement in social conditions, and they are exercising a very wide-spread influence which cannot but make for the enlightenment and advancement of all those who live on the farm. These women have worked very generously during the war, and the organization referred to being non-sectarian and non-partisan they have been capable of rendering highly valuable service to the country.

There is something else that will improve agriculture and business generally, and that is a better understanding between the city man and the farmer. When the city man gets his quart of milk in the morning and has to pay 15 cents for it, he is rather inclined to designate the farmer a profiteer; but he probably does not know the history of that quart of milk. He does not realize that the cow from which it was obtained cost possibly twice as much as she would in 1914; he does not know that all the fodder used for that cow is just about double in price what it was four or five years ago; he does not realize the fact that labour is scarce and that the farmer has to stay at home and milk his cows twice a day 365 days of the year, including holidays, birthdays and all. On the other hand, the farmer should realize that 80 per cent of the goods he turns off his farm are either manufactured or consumed in Canada, so that the home market is easily his biggest market; and that every time a new sawmill is put up, or a new logging camp, a new mining camp, a new factory, or any other new industry established, all this increases his big home market.

I am not personally in favour of any policy which proposes to tear down one industry in order to build up another; I feel that there is room for all of our industries in this great country. What we need is more national thought and more business co-operation between city man and country man. I may remark that very excellent results have been obtained in the United States in certain sections where bankers and business men have established amicable social relations with the farmers in their surrounding agricultural districts In many cases the city men have backed the farmers, enabled them to increase their capital, to establish their dairy industry on a sounder and better basis, to go in more extensively for hog raising, etc., with the result that while the agricultural industry in these districts formerly just dragged along, many have now become prosperous and the business men find an excellent market right at their door.

The war and its inevitable after effects, not to mention the debts that have been incurred, have brought us face to face with the great necessity of production, and we must realize the importance of the man who produces, whether agriculturally or industrially, as compared with the man who heretofore has thrived on the efforts of others. In our present situation we cannot hope to free ourselves from the incubus of our debts without great national effort. This is the time for energetic action; this is the time for thrift and sound commonsense. Our markets are receiving careful attention. We realize that the surest way to stabilize our agricultural industry is to furnish the farmer with an absolutely reliable market, or one as nearly approximating that standard as possible, so that he can be always sure of getting reasonable prices for his produce when he is ready to sell it. The home market is receiving close attention, and any one who is unable to-day to obtain an article in his own town should endeavour to get it in the neighbouring town rather than send to a foreign country for it.

What we need is more home buying. We have to the south of us a very good market for our agricultural produce, particularly for our livestock and many other articles which the farmers produce. It is very convenient and within easy reach, but I think we would be rather short-sighted if we did not give some attention to the development of the great market overseas, and especially the market of Great Britain. I believe in building up a bond of sympathy between the old Mother Country and this one, one of her most important Dominions. In addition to the bond of sympathy between us, we can find in the Old Land a business that is a very profitable and satisfactory one to this country. On the continent of Europe there is also a most excellent market.

Realizing the opportunities on the continent of Europe, the Department of Agriculture secured, immediately after the winter fairs were held, two first-class Canadian steers, which were exhibited in France, Belgium and Switzerland, with most excellent results. One firm alone has shipped to the continent of Eurpoe no less than 20,000 head of cattle, and many others are shiping very largely whenever shipping space is obtainable. We have had some very favour-

4 p.m.

able comments from the European papers regarding these cattle, in the first place alluding particularly to the quality and condition of the animals, and in the second place to the enterprise of the country which adopted that practical method of displaying her goods. Another strong feature in connection with our cattle is the reputation they have made on account of their good health. We have no foot and mouth disease in this country. One of our greatest competitors on the continent of Europe is the Argentine Republic and some other South American countries, where foot and mouth disease prevails most of the time. Looking to the West, there is also a market springing up on the Pacific ocean.

Mr. MORPHY: In regard to these cattle from Canada which you have shipped to Great Britain, is there any restriction upon their entry as there was formerly?

M. TOLMIE: Those cattle that I spoke of were shipped to the continent of Europe. I will touch upon the British embargo a little later.

Mr. MORPHY: Are they admitted free to the continent of Europe?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: But not into England?

Mr. TOLMIE: Not into England. On the Pacific we have at the present time a market that is worth to the United States and Canada something over $1,000,000,000. You will be surprised to learn that China is one of the chief consumers of Canadian condensed milk and that Japan also takes many other lines of goods. To Australia, New Zealand and the Hawaiian Islands, we have recently been sending consignments of our pure-bred stock. These markets are not yet very large for livestock, but they will gradually increase. There is also the chance for a market on the east and west coasts of South America for pure-bred animals. We are keenly alive to the situation, we are keeping in close touch with it, and we give the producer in Canada the benefit of any information which may be of use to him just as soon as we obtain it. In addition to what I have just mentioned in connection with our markets, we are building up strong marketing organizations. We have control now of our stockyards to ensure the seller fair treatment when he ships his cattle to those yards. We encourage the co-operative marketing of livestock and ordinary farm produce. As an illustration of the good results that may come from effort in this direction I may say that in consequence of the system of grading and inspecting our eggs shipped to the Old Country, we secured from 19 to 20 cents more per dozen than was received for eggs sent from the United States. We cannot expect to compete in foreign markets unless we keep our produce up to the highest standard, which standard must be carefully maintained.

In this connection, and recognizing this fact, we adopted some time ago a system of distributing pure-bred sires throughout the country so as to raise the quality of our stock. Recently we have entered into an agreement with the province of Ontario whereby we are trying out a scheme known as the scrub sire campaign. In this campaign representatives are sent to farms where scrub animals are kept, information is given as to the better results that can be secured from better breeding and feeding, and an effort is made to induce the farmers to use better sires. Canada is also doing a very good business in pure-bred animals. There is a stiff demand in the United States for pure-bred cattle, and high prices are being offered. As an illustration of this, I might mention the fact that an Ontario calf, only seven months ago sold for $106,000.

Great Britain still maintains an embargo against Canadian cattle. We have been making continuous efforts for thirty years to have that embargo lifted, but so far without success. I can assure the House that as long as I am in this position, and as long as there is any possibility of success, I will continue those efforts to have that embargo removed.

Our meat inspection service is carried on in the abattoirs that slaughter animals for export and interprovincial trade. This meat inspection is very close and strict and on every carcase that is passed as being fit for food you will find a little blue stamp bearing the words "Canada Approved." Some of these carcasses are shipped out of the country but you can secure inspected meat in many butcher shops in this country by insisting upon getting meat bearing the "Canada Approved" mark. Cattle that are slaughtered and sold in small butcher shops and not passing through the abattoirs are inspected either by the Provincial Government or the municipalities where inspection is enforced. The Dominion Government does not undertake this local inspection.

The Health of Animals Branch is charged with the care of the health of the live stock of this country. We have established

what are known as "accredited herds" in an effort on our part to eliminate tuberculosis from our pure-bred herds. We hope that by creating little nuclei of pure-bred herds we will soon start on the road towards getting rid of tuberculosis in this country, a disease which is causing serious losses in all the countries of the world. We also deal with hog cholera and comparing our work with that of the United States we find that we have made very much better progress in dealing with that disease. According to the latest figures hog cholera in this country amounted to only one-half of one per cent. Dourine is another disease that has caused great loss among horses in Alberta and this disease has been practically wiped out as a result of our efforts. The success of this work is largely due to Dr. Watson who was in the employ of the department and who was able to isolate the organism which was responsible for the disease and to develop a serum which was very useful in reducing and controlling it. In Alberta we have also what is known as mange; and this area has been under quarantine for some time on account of the cattle having mange, which is a skin disease. We expect to be able to get rid of this disease during the coming summer. We have an organization and equipment for dealing with the matter and hon. gentlemen will appreciate the magnitude of the undertaking when I mention that we will require baths to give a lime and sulphur bath to over 200,000 head of cattle.

We have also raised the standard of veterinary teaching in this country. That is very important because we have over a billion dollars invested in the livestock industry. Within the last few years there have been serious outbreaks of foot and mouth disease on the American side and had we been at all careless we would have had this disease in Canada and we would have lost many millions of dollars. Thanks however, to the vigilance of our Health of Animals Branch, the disease was kept out.

Animals are subject to other diseases which, while not included in our Contagious Diseases Act, cause serious losses. For instance, our losses per year on poultry alone amount to over $7,000,000. Contagious abortion and sterility in cattle, and internal parasites require very careful investigation, so that in that way we secure information of great value to the farmer.

Now, while the importance of pure-bred sires and the better breeding of livestock cannot be overestimated, the production of pure seed is just as important. We have in connection with the Department of Agriculture a Seed Branch, whose business it is to encourage the use of new and improved varieties of seed, and to disseminate propaganda on the value of using improved seed. We have a system of stimulating the interest of farmers in this work by distributing to them good varieties to be grown under certain conditions, and many farmers become seed-growing specialists. In this way a great deal of valuable seed is turned out every year. Then we have a system under which seed grown under certain restrictions is eligible for registration, and last year we produced 100,000 bushels of registered seed. We also encourage the use of improved seed through field crop competitions, seed fairs, and provincial seed exhibitions, by which means several million bushels of high quality seed is produced annually, and this registered seed is doled out to the seed men throughout the country, so that our work affects the whole Dominion.

What are the actual results obtained? There has been a great increase in the production of timothy seed in Alberta. A few years ago only a small quantity was grown, but last year no less than 20,000 bushels were produced. Our Canadian market can consume 300,000 bushels of this seed annually, and the export market would take 2,000,000 bushels if we had it to sell. In 1918 the clover seed of the country was valued at no less than $10,000,000. Clover seed has been produced of excellent quality, particularly on the clay lands of Northern Ontario. Before the war practically all our field and vegetable seed was imported from Germany and other European countries, but owing to the excellent work performed by our Seed Branch we are now able not only to supply our domestic demand but to export in considerable quantities.

Much has been done too in creating seed potato centres for the production of disease-free seed. This has made a tremendous difference in some sections. The lower St. Lawrence valley has established an excellent reputation for producing high-class potato seed, and northern grown Canadian seed of all kinds is gaining a very good reputation throughout the continent.

During the war the Seed Branch took up emergency seed distribution to meet the prevailing war conditions, and they established a Seed Purchasing Commission, which did very effective work in maintaining a supply of seed during the whole war period in spite of very heavy handicaps. This Commission had a turn-over of $12,000,000, every cent of which has been returned to the Receiver

General, and in addition they were able to pay all operating expenses.

I may point out for the benefit of hon. members from the West that it is not the intention of the department to withdraw the Seed Purchasing Commission from the western provinces until normal conditions are reached in that section.

The Fruit Branch has also been rendering very excellent service by enforcing the Inspection and Sale Act, inspecting and grading fruit and the filling of packages, and by giving practical demonstrations in orchard cultivation, pruning, spraying, grading and so forth. They also carry on inspection at the point of shipment. In this way they protect our trade by ensuring that the fruit is sent to market in first-class condition, and where found satisfactory, certificates are given on carload lots, which assist the sale of the fruit at destination.

Crop reports are issued by telegraph during the growing season, and when the sales are proceeding in Great Britain we receive market reports which are sent all over the country so as to place the grower on a perfectly sound footing in marketing his produce. Attention is also given to railway and express tariffs and the handling of fruit in transit.

It is a matter of more than passing interest in this connection that Great Britain is proving to be our one big market of importance. Another matter of interest is that box fruit is becoming much more popular. In addition to our export business with Great Britain, we also ship to the United States, Australia and New Zealand in their off seasons when they have no fruit to sell.

Our Experimental Farm system is rendering a very valuable service to the country, but unfortunately it is not perhaps as well appreciated as it might be. Our stations are situated in all the provinces, and particular care is taken in carrying on experiments in regard to adaptability of the soil for production, climatic conditions, and so forth in new sections. All this information is made immediately available for the farmers in those districts. For instance, a settler going in can immediately secure full information on the best means of growing crops in that section by applying to the Experimental Farm. It is estimated that this service is worth $60,000,000 a year to the country. Frequently we hear people complaining that our Experimental Farms do not pay. This is rather an unreasonable attitude when we take into consideration the very small plots of ground that are used for carrying on experimental work, in some cases not more than one-fortieth of an acre, which it is necessary to cultivate by hand—the most expensive kind of work. In the event of something of value being discovered, it is not given to the public right away, but further experiments are conducted in control plots, and the experiments may run over four or five years to make sure of the correctness of the results obtained before the information is passed on to the farmers. After all, the real harvest and profit from an experimental plot is not the small amount of grain, roots or seed that may be obtained from it, it is the information that is filed away in the office for the use of our farmers.

The Entomological Branch is also rendering good service, but it is very little known. The work has to do with the destruction of parasites injurious to crops. Hon. members will perhaps be surprised to learn that our losses from injurious parasites amount to $125,000,000 a year. In some parts of the West, in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and also in Alberta, we are now threatened with a grass-hopper plague. We are combatting these grass-hoppers by treating them with a mixture consisting of arsenic, bran and molasses. To give an idea of the extent of our operations in co-operation with the Provincial Governments, I may say that the work will require 100,000 pounds of arsenic, 2,000 tons of bran and 50,000 gallons of molasses for the purpose. When we take into consideration the fact that from 2 to 4 grains of arsenic are sufficient to kill a human being, I think we may reasonably expect that 50 tons of arsenic will take the hop out of a considerable number of those grass-hoppers. It has been suggested that we try poisonous gases for this purpose. There are many difficulties in the way, but we are carrying on a quiet investigation and if there is any promise of success we may go further with the matter. The brown-tail moth is another parasite that has caused a lot of trouble to our orchards in the East, but luckily that pest is now almost under control. In British Columbia we have what is known as pear thrips, which have done some damage to orchards out there. As an illustration of what has been done by the Entomological Branch, I may say that in one particular orchard that I know of the yield in one year was only 700 boxes of pears. That year work was commenced by the Entomological Branch and in the next year the harvest amounted to 7,000 boxes.

The Entomological Branch has been brought to a high state of efficiency by the

late Dr. C. Gordon Hewitt, a gentleman of high scientific attainment and of very large calibre. We were unfortunate enough to lose him through death some weeks ago. He possessed great executive ability, and his loss will be a serious one to agriculture and to science, not only in Canada, but all over the world; for he was becoming widely known on account of his scientific attainments. I wish to pay this tribute to Dr. Hewitt's ability and to the very great work that he performed in this country.

Another new line of industry that is doing well and making good progress is the tobacco industry. The crop last year amounted to over 20,000,000 pounds, worth about $8,000,000. But this industry is only in its early stages; there is a great deal to be done in securing co-operation so as to facilitate the putting up of curing plants and the improvement of marketing facilities. The Department of Agriculture has been interesting itself in this industry. We have a man overseas who is looking into the possibilities of the British market and trying to make arrangements for the selling of Canadian tobacco. When he returns we expect that he will bring with him a great deal of valuable information which will help us to attain this end.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have taken up a great deal of the time of the committee, but I thought it advisable to outline rather briefly the possibilities of agriculture in this country. I have also directed attention to the important part that agriculture can play in meeting our present financial situation. The prospects for development, I think you will agree, are practically unlimited. In briefly summarizing the situation, I may say that it will be the object of the department to facilitate and encourage production and better methods of farming by the medium of education, demonstration and illustration; to encourage a system of mixed farming with live stock as a basis; to increase and encourage better feeding, finishing and marketing of live stock; to develop our export trade in agricultural products; to expand our marketing policy in every posible way and to have our goods, when they are placed on the market, of such quality and in such condition as to enable us to meet successfully any competition that may offer; to improve and extend our facilities for handling perishable products; to conserve carefully the health of our live stock and to maintain the high reputation we now possess in this connection; to assist in the development of special lines of production which have not yet become thoroughly established; to encourage co-operation and co-operative selling; to improve transportation facilities for handling our products; to investigate the possibilities of securing cheaper money for our farmers so as to enable them to increase their production; to use our best efforts to rigidly apply such legislation as is on the statute book for the protection of the farmer.

I feel that a policy of this kind is an absolutely safe one and can bring about nothing but the best results. Of course, our efforts in this connection will be limited to the amount of expenditure that we shall be able to make. After travelling all over Canada I find myself to be more than ever a thorough believer in this country. I am more strongly than ever impressed with the extent of our wonderful resources. There should really be no pessimism at this time on the part of our Canadian people, if they will only consider the tremendous wealth of this country and its possibilities. While it is necessary to apply taxation to meet our immediate requirements, it should be but a temporary burden and but a side line to a big progressive movement for more business and the development of our wonderful opportunities in agricultural and natural resources. All that is required is an intelligent handling of the situation, and I feel that with the spirit of the Canadian people behind it no safer plan of action can be adopted and nothing is surer of success than the policy which I have indicated.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria): Without presuming to be the agricultural critic on this side, I may say that although I agree with nearly everything the minister has said, particularly with his remarks respecting the improvement of stock by breeding and feeding, it is possible that some of the minister's figures may be misleading. If I understood him aright, he said, speaking of the loss that Canadian producers had sustained in the matter of hogs, that the weight of these animals might have been increased with advantage to the producer. Well, it is possible that if the weight had been increased there would have been a greater loss to the producer. Not every one may know that there are certain limitations as to size and weight. Hogs in our country weighing from 175 to 225 pounds are worth four, five, sometimes six cents a pound more than those which go above that weight. So that the statements given out by the min-

ister might mislead some who have not much practical knowledge or who are beginners, and who might sustain a loss rather than make a profit if this suggestion of the minister was adopted. A few years ago a young man who had invested a considerable amount of money in live stock in my part of the country was trying to follow the directions issued by the Central Experimental Farm. He was feeding the hogs on rations as laid down by that branch of the Department, but he was feeding them under different circumstances. In the Experimental Farm the hogs had the benefit of steam coils to keep them warm, but this young man was feeding them in a stable in which the temperature was not very well regulated; consequently he lost his stock by following that advice.

The minister gave us examples of what can be done by breeding. He told us of a certain cow that was sold for $15,000 and about large production of milk being obtained under certain circumstances. Well, very often these large productions of milk cost more than the milk itself is really worth. A few years ago I saw at the Winter Fair in Ottawa a cow that was making a record by producing 100 or 108 pounds of milk a day. But the fact of the matter was that they were giving her that milk to drink, after adding some other foods to it, and it was costing more to get that increased production than the production was worth. I simply point to these facts in case people might be carried away by the minister's statement that everybody should go into the raising of expensive stock and that if they did they would find a ready market for it.

We know that high prices are paid for the winners in all classes of animals. For instance, a few years ago in Chicago a rancher from my province bought a pure-bred Hereford bull for $27,000. It took a judge two days to decide which was the better of the two, this bull and another one, and the one that was placed next to this one in the prize list, sold for $3,010. This is simply a case of the top price being given for the one which became famous owing to the fact that he was a prize winner. Some time ago a Boston terrier sold for $15,000. The animal was, of course, not worth that; he was not, for utility purposes, worth more than any cur running about the streets; but he was a prize winner at the show, and somebody wanted him and was willing to pay this price.

As regards the record cow of which the minister spoke, if he had given us figures to show how many cows were used for dairy purposes, and what was the average production and its value, per cow, the people of the country would know what there was in dairying. As regards prizes and encouragement given by the Government to carloads of steers and other things, in many cases the expense is greater than the value of the prize.

The minister has stated that we do not feed our animals enough, but I think the average farmer throughout the country feeds in the most profitable way. When hay is worth $60 a ton, as it was this year in the western country, and a man was induced to put three or four tons of hay into an animal during the six months of feeding there was this winter, he would not find that profitable advice when he discovered that he had put $250 worth of feed into a steer that would not sell for $120. Circumstances alter cases, and the average farmer may be trusted to know pretty nearly what pays him and what does not. Although we are all in favour of improving stock and the breeding of cattle, and we have every confidence that the minister, as an old showman and a man who has handled a great deal of stock, will give the stock breeders all the encouragement they can possibly expect from the present Minister of Agriculture, I was just pointing out these facts, because I am afraid he looks at the stock business more with the eye of a showman than as a practical man who is making a living out of the business. I have always used pure-bred sires in all classes of animals, and I have always had a herd of pure-bred cattle; but the man who makes the money makes it, not out of his pure-bred herd, but out of his grade herd, and the bigger the grade herd, the more money he makes. In the western country, every stock man who looks after his business well makes money out of his grade herd, but I do not know of any who have made money by going into the high-class, pure-bred stock. The reason for that is that there is room for only one or two at the top of this kind of breeding, and if many went into the business, the result would be disastrous.

While I appreciate what the minister has said, I do not take his figures altogether seriously when he says that we should continue feeding our hogs and cattle when it is not profitable to do so. If the average man carried his hogs over until they obtained a weight of four or five or six hundred pounds, he would find he was losing money. After a hog gets over the

select weight of, say 175 to 225 pounds, the extra expense of making it heavier would mean only less profit to the producer. Perhaps those who were turning their cattle off at lighter weights, found that paid them better than to carry them over until they reached a heavier weight. Many ranchers in Alberta made a great mistake last year in not selling because prices were a little lower than usual. They could have got eight or nine cents a pound for their stock, but they would not sell as they had been accustomed to higher prices. Now they find that they have added to the cost of their steers possibly $120 to $150; in many cases they have not as many as they had before, and they find that steers have cost them more to carry over than they are really worth. Therefore, there is no fixed rule. That is the only difference I have with the minister who says that we should carry these animals over until they reach a certain weight. Sometimes that would be a very expensive experiment. The average stock breeder knows when he should sell and when he should not, and my experience is that they never lose very much money through not knowing what to do when the proper time comes. Sometimes, on paper, statements are made apparently showing an enormous waste; but if people knew the circumstances of the matter, they would find that the average stockman, no matter what kind of stock he is handling, is getting out of that stock practically all the money there is in it.

Mr. TOLMIE: I appreciate what the hon. member, who is recognized as one of our prominent stockmen in Alberta, has said, but I should like to correct one or two of the statements he has made. In the first place, I did not advocate the production of the thick-fat, heavy hog to a weight of six or seven hundred pounds. I said that these hogs should average 220 pounds, which is the ideal bacon hog. As regards the high producing cows, perhaps I am wrong, but I have had experience in this line; I have maintained a dairy herd, and the best paying cow I ever had was one that gave 112 pounds in a day or 25,560 pounds in 11½ months.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: I qualified my statement by saying that I did not know anything about the dairy business, but I had watched one particular cow that was making a record at the winter fair, and I know that everything that she produced was turned back into her with something added to keep up the production. I do not pretend to be a dairyman; I never had a dairy cow in my life.

Mr. TOLMIE: In British Columbia we have plenty of grass and fodder, and it is unnecessary to feed a cow her own milk.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: They do not make records.

Mr. TOLMIE: The milk is usually worth much more. The particular cow I have mentioned with a record of 32,000 pounds, is one I have watched and known ever since she was landed as a heifer in British Columbia, and she has been most profitable in every way. As regards the high price of hay in Alberta, my hon. friend will agree with me that this is a most exceptional year, and the department has spent nearly a million dollars in assisting farmers in the matter of hay alone.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: And more light cattle were sold.

Mr. TOLMIE: My experience as regards the pure-bred stock versus the grade in the average herd is that under ordinary conditions, particularly in dairying, the pure-bred animal is worth more than the grade. In the first place she will produce more milk as a rule; she has just as good a constitution as the grade when she is properly kept, and her calf is worth often ten times as much money as the calf of the grade cow. As regards the light cattle I mentioned in Toronto, these were not ranch cattle but cattle that had come largely from Ontario and Quebec. If the hon. member had seen them, I am sure he would have agreed with me that the country was suffering a tremendous loss that might have been avoided by turning these cattle off during the grazing season or by making better provision for food.

RAILWAY ESTIMATES.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): An arrangement was made with the leader of the Opposition that we should take up the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture this afternoon in order that the minister might make a statement. But for that arrangement we could not have proceeded with the Estimates this afternoon, under the rules of the House. I understand that an hon. member on the other side wishes to address the House in connection with the Department of Railways and Canals, and in order to meet the convenience of the leader of the Opposition in that respect, I would suggest that we take up a

non-contentious item in the Estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals, which we can pass after the hon. member has made his statement, and then return to the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture. I therefore move that further discussion of the item before the House be postponed for the present and that we take up item No. 337, reading as follows:

Railways and Canals—Miscellaneous—compassionate allowance to the widow and children of the late J. L. A. Frobe, who was killed while in discharge of his duty as brakeman on Canadian Government railways at Ashton Junction, Que., on Sept. 11, 1918.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): There is a despatch in the Ottawa Journal of April 27, 1920, as follows:

Hanna Starts Suit Against F. S. Cahill.
President of Canadian National Sues Member for Pontiac.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nesbitt): Is it unanimously understood that the hon. member need not confine his remarks to the item before the committee?

Mr. J. D. REID: I would ask the committee to allow the hon. member to discuss on this particular item the matter which he wishes to bring before the House. If we took an item to which the matter he is going to discuss would be more relevant, I would not expect the committee to pass it to-day.

The CHAIRMAN: I just wished to have it thoroughly understood, so that there will be no misunderstanding afterwards.

Mr. CAHILL: The despatch reads:

TORONTO, Ont., April 26.—D. B. Hanna, president of the Canadian National railways, has brought suit against F. S. Cahill, Liberal M.P. for Pontiac, for statements alleged to have been made at the Montreal Reform Club two weeks ago in regard to Mr. Hanna. Mr. Hanna declared to-day in an interview with the Star he was not out to get money out of Mr. Cahill, but to "clear his character."

"I am too old a man to have anything like that stand against my name," said Mr. Hanna, who denied that he ever bought a lot in a western townsite, or even thought of buying one.

Mr. Hanna declared that the whole thing was a political game, and an attack on the non-political administration of the National railway.

I may say that I have had no notice nor information yet of this writ having been issued. I am not at all afraid of it when it comes. I have here Poor's Manual of Railroads for 1919, at page 1715 of which I find the following:

Canadian Northern Town Properties Co., Ltd. —Inc. Oct. 22, 1913, in Canada, to acquire land and develop towns on the Canadian Northern Railway system. Except for portions that have already been sold, company has acquired the whole of the sites of about 300 towns and villages, aggregating approximately 68,700 acres. Company has also acquired valuable property in 172 other towns and villages.

I went to the office of the Secretary of State to ascertain who the directors of the Canadian Northern Town Properties Company, Limited, were, as this company was not among the list of assets which were acquired by the Dominion Government. It is not in either the first or the second schedule to the Act taking over the Canadian Northern railway. I found that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1919, Mr. D. B. Hanna was president of the Canadian Northern Town Properties Company, Limited; Messrs. A. J. Mitchell, R. C. Vaughan and R. G. O. Thomson, directors; and Mr. L. C. Groom, secretary. The three first named are directors or officials of the Canadian Northern or the Canadian National Railway Company, while the last two are not among the officials of the Canadian National Railway Company. The Canadian Northern Town Properties Company, Limited, is not the property of the Canadian people, as I understand it, but the private property of Mr. Hanna and, I suppose, Sir William Mackenzie and his other friends. I understand that this is a company that owns the townsites along the Canadian Northern railway. When I made the statement in this House last year that I had been informed that the management of the railway was moving engines and equipment of other terminals to the town of Hanna in order to promote the real estate business of that town, I was told that Mr. Hanna did not own any of the property there. Mr. Hanna's statement at that time, as I recollect it, was that he had never bought a lot in Hanna or any place else in the West. He makes practically the same statement in this newspaper report which I have read to-day. I have never said that he bought lots. I said he was interested in the company, which acquired lands and turned them into lots and sold them. My information was that they moved some twenty engines from Calgary to Hanna, and when I asked the railway employees why it was done they told me they could not see any reason for it from an operating standpoint, and they said that two trains had to be employed to haul water to supply the engines at the town of Hanna, to which the terminals had been moved. The only reason for it that could be given by the people who informed me of this matter was that it was in order to promote the townsite of Hanna. For

the benefit of whom? Apparently for the benefit of the Canadian Northern Town Properties Company, Limited, of which Mr. Hanna is given as president.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in looking over Poor's Manual, I find that the Canadian Government did not take over the Inverness Railway and Coal Company when taking over the Canadian Northern, and you will find in the Auditor General's Report for the year ended March 31, 1919, Volume 3, page W-171, the following:

> Inverness Railway & Coal Co.: run of mine, 83,304.35 net tons at $5.25.

On the same page you will find the following:

> Dominion Coal Co., Glace Bay, Springhill, St. John and Sydney: run of mine, 153.1 net tons at $3.79.

Now, if you turn to Poor's Manual of Railroads for 1919 and look up the Inverness Railway and Coal Company you will find that the corporate officers are Sir William Mackenzie, Sir Donald Mann, R. E. Macleod, and so on. It is quite apparent from that, that the company of which Mr. Hanna is president is buying coal from the company of which Sir William Mackenzie is president. It is also quite apparent that the Canadian National Railway Company, of which Mr. Hanna is president, is in a position to bring business to the towns that may be benefited, which are the property of the Canadian Northern Town Properties Company, Limited.

Mr. Hanna can go on with his suit if he so desires. As far as I am concerned, I have absolutely no fear of it. He has the whole force of the Dominion Government back of him; he has the whole force of the finances of Canada back of him; he has the whole force of the legal luminaries of Canada back of him; and if that is not enough he has in the Act, Chapter 13, Statutes of Canada, 1919, section 6, the following:

> No director of the company shall be under any personal responsibility to any shareholder, director, officer or employee of the company, nor to any other person, nor, except with the approval of the Governor in Council, shall be subject to any pecuniary penalty under the provisions of any statute, in respect of his office, or any act done or omitted to be done by him in the execution thereof.

So that Mr. Hanna is exceedingly well hedged about by everything that can possibly tend to make him safe. He is in a position that makes it possible for him to go just as far as he likes, for he has behind him the Treasury of Canada, and is backed by the legal advice of his department. He has the whole Government of Canada behind him and furthermore he is immune by reason of an Act of Parliament. Now, I have given these circumstances to the committee, and if Mr. Hanna can refute them he is welcome to do so; and, it is the duty of the Government to satisfy us in the matter. When we come to the Estimates on Railways and Canals I shall be prepared to take up with the Minister of Railways several other items in regard to which I desire information, but I merely make this statement now to show that Mr. Hanna is very far from being correct when he says that he is not interested in the town sites along the Canadian Northern railway and is not buying coal from the Mackenzie and Mann interests. In the Senate Debates of the session of 1919, June 25, at page 745, there appears the following extract from a letter written by G. J. Hammon, President of the Basque Chemical Production Co., Ltd.:

> Without any desire to be unreasonably critical in regard to this delay, but wishing to determine what service we might expect from the Canadian Northern, we have been investigating and have recently discovered that there have been very frequent delays to trains on account of the poor quality of coal used in the engines on the Canadian Northern line. It seems that this coal is being used on account of a contract made by the Canadian Northern with a mine near Brule Lake, Alberta, (of which we are informed Mr. R. J. Mackenzie is the principal owner) before the Government took over its operation. This contract was made at a price approximately $1.00 per ton higher than was paid by the Grand Trunk Pacific at the same time for better coal.

I want to bring this matter to the attention of the committee simply because there is a widespread opinion in this country that the Canadian National railways are not getting a square deal under the management of Mr. Hanna and Mackenzie and Mann, and if the Government are in a position to clear up the matter and to show that there is nothing between these people we shall be glad to have a statement. We on this side, however, insist on having everything laid on the table clearly and distinctly, and above board.

Mr. J. D. REID: The action which the hon. member says Mr. Hanna has taken against him, as reported in the press, is of course a personal matter of which neither the Government nor I have any knowledge. We have had nothing to do with that matter and must of course leave it to Mr. Hanna and the hon. member to settle. The hon. member still persists in the statement that Mr. Hanna

has an interest in connection with Mackenzie and Mann, and I gather from his remarks that he stands by his position in this matter. If this suit should go on it will undoubtedly be well to have all these statements cleared up, and I am sure that every step should be taken, if the matter goes before the courts, to see that the situation is made absolutely plain. In order to prove his case my hon. friend has referred to a particular instance, namely, the Inverness Coal Company, and he argues that the very fact of the Government having purchased coal from the Inverness Coal Company shows that they are doing business with the Mackenzie and Mann interests.

Mr. CAHILL: The price is $1.25 higher.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member says that the price is $1.25 higher. Well, I have not with me the information that would enable me to state the facts as they are, but the prices of coal in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and at the several mines were fixed by the Fuel Controller, Mr. Magrath, and if I remember rightly they were based on the cost of production. I remember that in the case of the Inverness Coal Company the cost of production was exceedingly high. I shall be glad to bring down the report of the Fuel Controller and have it laid on the Table for the information of all hon. members and of the hon. member (Mr. Cahill) in particular; but speaking from memory I can say that the cost of production in the case of the Inverness Coal Company was very much higher than almost that of any other company in the province of Nova Scotia. There is also another point to be considered in connection with the Inverness Coal Company. It is true that it shows a higher price than the Dominion Coal Company, but if the hon. member will read the report, I think he will see that there are other companies that are much higher than the Dominion Coal Company.

Mr. CAHILL: Not that I can find.

Mr. J. D. REID: Perhaps not. As I say, I am only trusting to my memory without having had an opportunity to look very carefully into the matter. Now, the Inverness Coal Company is situated, I believe, some sixty miles away from the Intercolonial railway, and the Inverness railway, which has to carry the coal from the place of production, charges $1.00 or $1.25 a ton for conveying it to the Intercolonial railway at Point Tupper. It costs us, say, $5.50 right where it is there, whereas if we had to purchase it from the Dominion Coal Company, there would be the freight to Point Tupper, which would practically make it the same. The price as mentioned by the hon. member of, say, $5.25 for the coal that was purchased for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1919, in my opinion, would not have been the price that was fixed by the Canadian National railways because it is generally arranged in the spring before. It must have been arranged about March 1918. The Intercolonial railway was not taken over by the Canadian National railways until about the end of 1918. That contract had been arranged before. If so the prices were arranged by the fuel controller and those who were associated with him. I remember at the time seeing a discussion with the fuel controller as to the prices of coal in Nova Scotia. The prices at some of the mines being more than at others, they had to decide where the coal should be bought if the men were to be kept employed.

5 p.m.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The cost of production differed at different mines?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes. At the Dominion Iron and Steel Company the coal they produce is not only the best but the cost of production is very much less than in any other mine in the district. I would like to satisfy the House as to the correctness of what I say from the report of Mr. Magrath. I am sure I can satisfy the House and the country that the prices that were paid for coal in the lower provinces during the years of the war were fair and just and in the public interest, that they were fixed by the commission and that Mr. Hanna or any of the officers of the Canadian National railways had nothing to do with them at that particular time. The Inverness Coal Company was not originally started by Sir William Mackenzie. If I remember rightly, the Intercolonial railway had been purchasing coal from that company for many years and Sir William Mackenzie and his associates were not in possesion of the coal company at that time. They are not in possession of it at the present time for the reason that it went into liquidation. The liquidator, Mr. McGillivray, has been operating the company for six or seven years. He has absolute control of the coal mine and Sir William Mackenzie, Mr. Hanna, or any of Mr. Hanna's associates, had nothing to do with the prices of coal purchased for the Intercolonial railway. When my Estimates are brought down I will have all this information here and I will be glad to give it to the

hon. member. If it will assist him in any way by throwing any light on the purchase of coal or any other supplies he will have it and he will be able to see that not all of the statements made by him are correct. Mr. Hanna has assured me that he has never had anything to do with any of these townsites, and that he does not own any lots and I must rely on his statement until the hon. member or any other person can give me any evidence that the statement is not correct.

Mr. CAHILL: He signs the statement.

ESTIMATES—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE RESUMED.

Experimental Farms—maintenance of Centra Farm and maintaining of additional branch stations, $1,200,000.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, I rise only for the purpose of joining with my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) in the tribute he has paid to the memory of the late Dr. Gordon Hewitt, Dominion Entomologist. It was my privilege to know Dr. Hewitt personally and I am sure that all who shared his acquaintance will agree with the statement that in his death this country has lost not only one of its ablest scientists, but also one of its most public spirited citizens. There was no activity of a public nature in this community in which a private citizen could share that Dr. Hewitt was not ever ready to play his part. In the work upon which he was engaged for the Government he will be remembered as one of the most faithful and efficient public servants, as well as one of the most distinguished. Though comparatively young, I think he was not more than thirty-five at the time of his death—the record of his scientific work has not been surpassed in the branches with which he was associated by any other member of the public service. I believe the tribute paid by the minister is one in which every hon. member of this House will be glad to share.

Mr. PARDEE: How many experimental farms are there?

Mr. TOLMIE: Twenty.

Mr. PARDEE: How are they distributed amongst the different provinces?

Mr. TOLMIE: Two in Nova Scotia, one in New Brunswick, one in Prince Edward Island, five in Quebec, three in Ontario, two in Manitoba, three in Saskatchewan, two in Alberta, and four in British Columbia.

Mr. PROULX: Where are they located in Ontario outside of the one at Ottawa?

Mr. TOLMIE: One at Kapuskasing in the north and one at Harrow in Essex county.

Mr. PELLETIER: Is it the intention of the Government to increase the number of demonstration farms? I have been asking for one in my riding for six or seven years but I have been unable to get a definite answer yet. My predecessor, Mr. Boulay, pressed for the establishment of a demonstration farm until 1917, and I have been asking for it ever since I have been here. We have no experimental farm below Ste. Anne's and that is 180 miles above Matane. If we had a demonstration farm it would greatly help the farmers whom I represent. My riding is divided by the Causapscal mountains and we really need two farms. If we had one at Amqui or Causapscal and one at Matane I am sure that it would be a great advantage to agriculture in my riding and the surrounding country. I would like to know if it is the intention of the Government to grant our request and to continue the work which was started a few years ago.

Mr. TOLMIE: The department very fully realizes the importance of these farms and the very excellent work they are doing in many parts of Canada. We have requisitions from the Atlantic to the Pacific for the establishment of such farms, and it is our intention to establish more of them just as soon as we can get the finances necessary for the purpose.

Mr. TURGEON: A couple of years ago I asked for the establishment of an Experimental Farm in the county of Gloucester where the location of the district is admirably adapted for the purpose. At the time my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) was Minister of Agriculture, but as he left office not long afterwards I cannot attribute to him any neglect in not attending to my request. The deputy Minister of Agriculture,—whom I see with the minister, —knows the country very well. He knows that the situation all along the north shore of New Brunswick when you cross the Restigouche is one of the finest in any part of the Dominion, and it would certainly be a very appropriate and useful site for an experimental station. I again draw the attention of the present minister to my request, and I hope that before another year has passed he will have given it his favourable consideration.

Mr. W. C. KENNEDY (North Essex): Has the minister under consideration increasing the acreage of the farm at Harrow?

Mr. TOLMIE: That matter is under consideration.

Mr. DENIS: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great pleasure to the pronouncement made by the Minister of Agriculture with regard to the different branches of his department, but I did not hear him make any statement about our tobacco-growing industry. As I am particularly interested, and as I consider it of vital interest to this country, I propose to make a few remarks on the subject and to ask the hon. minister to be kind enough to answer a question which I shall put to him.

Our people generally perhaps are not fully aware of the significance of our tobacco industry. If we look at the statistics we shall find that last year we grew approximately 26,000,000 pounds of tobacco, and we imported, almost wholly from the United States, in the neighbourhood of 25,000,000 pounds. So that our tobacco consumption in round figures is about 50,000,000 pounds a year, of which we are producing only 50 per cent. The tobacco crop yields our farmers an annual revenue of many million dollars, and as the industry is practically unlimited, the export demand never being met, it seems to me that the industry should receive the greatest consideration on the part of the Government.

If we increased our tobacco production, we could, in the first instance, supply practically the whole of our domestic needs; that is to say, I think that about 45,000,000 pounds of the 50,000,000 pounds we consume could be supplied by our tobacco growers. Of course, there will always be certain brands of tobacco in demand which cannot be produced in Canada. Then if our production should exceed our consumption, we have unlimited markets abroad. For instance, England is importing from the United States, if I am not mistaken, in the neighbourhood of 300,000,000 pounds of tobacco annually. Now, with our preferential tariff we can secure an advantage on the English market, so that no matter what our production might be we should always have an open market for our surplus crop.

I do not intend to make a fuller statement until the Budget debate. But for the time being I deem it my duty in the interest of the country generally, as well as in the particular interest of the district of Joliette which I have the honour to represent—a district which is producing many million pounds of tobacco each year—to bring to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, of whose goodwill and sincerity I am well aware, the very great importance of our tobacco-growing industry, and to ask him what the Government is doing to encourage our growers.

Mr. TOLMIE: The Government is very much alive to the situation. A short time ago the tobacco seed used was of many varieties, some quite unsuitable for this country. The Government took the matter up and last year distributed 904 ounces of free seed, and sold 1,940 ounces, a sufficient amount to plant, on a conservative estimate, 17,064 acres. In addition to taking that step, we have had conferences with our tobacco growers, and have carried on experiments at our various experimental farms for their benefit; and realizing that one of the best methods of putting the business on a sound footing is to insure the producer a good market, we have sent a man overseas to make a careful study of the whole situation with a view to establishing a selling connection between the growers of this country and the consumers of Great Britain. We expect he will return in a short time and will have very valuable information to impart to our tobacco growers.

Mr. DEVLIN: Who is the man who was sent across?

Mr. TOLMIE: Mr. Félix Charlan, chief of the tobacco division.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: How many demonstration farms are there in the province of Quebec, and where are they situated?

Mr. TOLMIE: Experimental farms?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Demonstration farms.

Mr. TOLMIE: Aubrey, Lachute, Paspebiac West, Stanbridge East, Cap Chat, Drummondville, Lac à la Fortune, L'Assomption, Little Cascapedia, Rimouski, St. Clet, St. Julie, St. Gédéon, St. Jules and St. Etienne des Grès.

Mr. PARDEE: Are these all maintained by the Dominion Government?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes.

Mr. PARDEE: How many are there in Ontario?

Mr. TOLMIE: None.

Mr. PARDEE: What is the reason for the distinction? Are there no illustration stations in Ontario aside from the experimental farms?

Mr. TOLMIE: We are just commencing this system of illustration farms and we have selected districts where we think they are most needed. In Ontario agriculture is established in a pretty sound way; there is more pure-bred stock, and in some respects the farming sections are more advanced in Ontario than, perhaps, in any other part of Canada. The system will be followed up, however; we have several sites under consideration in Ontario and elsewhere.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I congratulate the minister on the most excellent statement he has made in connection with experimental farms. Some years ago I directed the attention of the Department of Agriculture to the need of an illustration farm in the western peninsula. A variety of products are grown there, and I do not need to emyphasize the necessity for the establishment in that district of an illustration farm at the earliest possible day. I hope the minister will see to it that this is done.

Mr. TOLMIE: The western peninsula has been receiving very careful consideration in that direction since I have been in office.

Mr. LEGER: I wanted to know if there were any illustration farms in New Brunswick.

Mr. TOLMIE: Ten are planned for this year. The sites have been selected.

Mr. W. C. KENNEDY (Essex North): How much of this vote is to be spent at Harrow, and how does the amount provided this year compare with the amount spent last year?

Mr. TOLMIE: $7,175, the same as last year.

Mr. J. E. S. E. d'ANJOU (Rimouski) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, while we were dealing, earlier in the session, with a resolution advocating the establishment of further experimental farms in Canada, I took occasion to ask for the establishment of such a farm in the county of Rimouski, and I shall improve this further opportunity, since we are now voting sums for the experimental farms to broach the subject once more. Of course, my honourable friend cannot follow me, but the deputy minister is, I believe, familiar with the French language and will convey my meaning to the honourable minister.

The county of Rimouski is surely one of the most beautiful and flourishing counties in the province of Quebec; it is by all means a banner county; the farmers who live there are progressive people who are solicitous for the extension of the farming industry in this country.

I am easier to please than my honourable friend from Matane (Mr. Pelletier) and shall not ask for the establishment of two experimental farms in the county of Rimouski. I shall be content with an experimental farm in the town of Rimouski itself:

Mr. F. J. PELLETIER (Matane) (Translation): I am not asking for two experimental farms; I want two illustration stations.

Mr. d'ANJOU (Translation): I beg my honourable friend's pardon if I misconstrued his remarks. I understood that he was asking for an experimental farm at Amqui and another one at Matane.

At all events, it seems to me the Government should leave no stone unturned towards establishing such farms almost all over the country. True it is that the financial affairs of Canada are in a bad way, but after all, money can always be found and money spent in the furtherance of these objects would be spent in the best interests of the country.

Therefore, I am confident that the honourable minister will take my request into earnest consideration and that, ere long, the county of Rimouski will have a fine and important experimental farm.

Mr. TOLMIE: We have a farm at Ste. Anne, and it would be hardly practicable to establish another at the place to which my hon. friend refers. As things develop we may consider that.

Mr. McKENZIE: I must commend the minister on the very able and exhaustive address he delivered in connection with this item. His speech contained a great deal of very valuable information, some of it highly scientific. I suggest that that speech be published in pamphlet form, with any direct suggestions that might be made by the minister or his officials in connection with it, and put in the hands of every farmer in Canada. A good deal of it, of course, cannot be lived up to, but it is well to aim high, even if the high standard which is set up cannot always be attained. May I ask where the illustration farms in Nova Scotia are located?

Mr. TOLMIE: One at Nappan and one at Kentville.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think it would be a splendid thing if at least one of these farms could be brought in touch with the Agricultural College at Truro. It is an ambitious little institution. It is not very old, having been established, I believe, in 1904 or 1905.

Mr. FIELDING: Earlier than that.

Mr. McKENZIE: I see that my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) claims this college as a product of the time when he was Premier of Nova Scotia. I was in the local legislature for five years from 1900 to 1905 and I remember we had arguments in regard to this matter, but I shall not doubt the statement of my hon. friend that it had its beginnings in his days. This college has made very good progress, and while the Dominion department may be helping it as regards demonstration on farms and showing in a general way what can be done by proper experiments, I should be pleased to see that co-operation carried on more extensively. In the island from which I come, with its large population and its vast industrial interests and developments, there are no agricultural stations at all, either provincial or Dominion. I need not tell the minister that, with the great population that we have, steel workers and coal miners, lumbermen and fishermen, all of them good in their way, but none of them producing anything from the soil, it is highly desirable that the farmers should be given every encouragement to produce as much as is necessary for the upkeep of our local population. There is nothing like seeing what can be done; scientific lectures and all that sort of thing are very good; but the real thing that comes home to the farmer is to have a demonstration on a piece of land which is like his own so that he may see that, if he takes the proper steps, whatever results can be obtained on the demonstration farm, may be obtained by him. If there were two or three demonstration farms in the whole island, say near such centres as Sydney, North Sydney or Sydney Mines, where there are large populations and good soil, but where it is hard to get farmers as the people are mostly coal miners or steel workers, such demonstration farms would be highly beneficial. In the island there are large numbers of Scotch people, who are naturally farmers, working in those mines, and if it were shown to them what could be done on Cape Breton soil, many of them might be induced to leave the steel works and the coal mines and to take up farming. I trust the minister will take this phase of the work of his department into his serious consideration.

Mr. TOLMIE: I am glad to hear the remarks of the hon. member. I may say that I visited the Truro farm and was very much impressed with it. The acreage there is large; I was shown some excellent cattle, both dairy and beef breeds, and I think I saw one of the best standard-bred stallions I had seen for many years. The farm, under the management of Mr. Cumming, seems to be very good. Many of these large provincial establishments have farms in connection with them, the same as at Guelph and other places; but the Dominion officials keep in close co-operation with them in all provinces, all working towards the one end.

As regards Cape Breton, we are at present planning to have an illustration station situated somewhere in that section of the country. These illustration farms are doing excellent work. An illustration station is operated under the management of an ordinary farmer who is selected on account of his ability and the suitability of his farm for the purpose. He works under the direction of our Experimental Farm Branch; he carries on the best system of rotation; he uses nothing but the best seed, and the farmers of his neighbourhood have an opportunity of profiting by the work that is being carried on. We trust that the illustration station we hope to establish in that section will render valuable service.

Mr. FIELDING: We know what an experimental farm is, but how does the minister define a demonstration farm, which, I understand, is something on a smaller scale than an experimental farm?

Mr. TOLMIE: We have in the Department of Agriculture no demonstration farms, and I do not know of the term being used anywhere in Canada except in Alberta. The Hon. Duncan Marshall, Minister of Agriculture of that province, has farms with schools in connection with them where the young farmers are given a short six months' course during the winter, being taught the handling of machinery, breeding of livestock, blacksmithing, harness making and many other things that might be useful to them on the farm during the coming summer. In the summer they work on their fathers' farms. This is a plan that has been adopted on the continent of Europe for some time, and in Alberta these places have produced excellent results.

Mr. FIELDING: I desire to associate myself with my hon. friends on this side who have congratulated the minister on the full and interesting statement he has made. I am glad to hear him saying a good word of the College of Agriculture at Truro, which began in a small way about 1885 or 1886. I remember the beginning of it very well; it began as an attachment to the provincial normal school. At first it was a sort of agricultural department in the normal school. Later on buildings were erected; a farm was purchased, and my successors in office have developed it in a large way and I am glad to know that the college is doing excellent work. I am pleased to learn that an illustration farm will be located in Cape Breton. Even in a comparatively small province like Nova Scotia, we speak of East and West, and when the time came for the location of the School of Agriculture a little difficulty arose in connection with the location of it. The most attractive farm land in the province from some viewpoints was the Annapolis valley, and there was a strong desire to locate the institution there. It was, however, felt that an experimental farm should not be located at the most attractive point, but that a location should be selected where the soil was of average quality, similar to that of the farms of the people it was intended to reach. Since the location of the provincial farm at Truro, the Dominion Government have located one at Kentville in the West. If the minister is able to increase the number of illustration stations, they would be very welcome. Did he mention where these were in Nova Scotia, other than the Kentville one?

Mr. TOLMIE: There is one at Nappan.

Mr. FIELDING: That is a branch of the Ottawa institution.

Mr. TOLMIE: So is Kentville.

Mr. FIELDING: I understand the Kentville farm is quite a small farm.

Mr. TOLMIE: It is quite a large farm; I was there last fall.

Mr. FIELDING: Are there any more besides those at Nappan and Kentville?

Mr. TOLMIE: In Nova Scotia ten illustration stations are being planned for at the present time.

Mr. FIELDING: I should like to make a suggestion to my hon. friend. If these illustration stations mean only comparatively small expenditures, although most of my constituents are not farmers, a large number being fishermen and lumbermen, there is a large agricultural section in North Queen's country, adjoining the county of Annapolis. This is an excellent agricultural district, and I should be glad if the minister, in selecting the locations of these illustration stations, would bear in mind the attractions and claims of that section.

Mr. CRERAR: I regret I was not in the Chamber when the minister was making his statement preliminary to the introduction of these Estimates. It is possible that the minister may have referred to the suggestion which I shall now offer to the committee and to the minister for what it is worth. It is well known that, under the Act of Confederation, the powers of the provinces and the Dominion in matters of agricultural administration are equal. This has led to a considerable amount of duplication in the work that is carried on by the Dominion Department of Agriculture and the various provincial departments. For instance, I know it is a fact that many of the provincial Departments of Agriculture are carrying on work similar to that done by the Federal Government through its demonstration farms. Manitoba and Alberta, I know, have illustration farms. This means a very considerable increase in the total expenditure on this class of work. If my memory serves me right, the total amount spent by the Departments of Agriculture in Canada, both federal and provincial, runs to about $7,500,000 annually, and it has occurred to me that if a better understanding could be reached with the provinces in respect to the various fields of endeavour, probably a great deal more in the way of results might be achieved from this expenditure. This duplication applies not only to demonstration and illustration farms, but to other fields of activity in agriculture. Almost all the provinces, if not all of them, have departments dealing with livestock, as well as with dairying, beekeeping, poultry raising, in all of which fields the federal department is working. The Federal Government has its officials at the experimental farms in the provinces, and there is also another set of officials under provincial control, doing similar work. I think that possibly greater efficiency, without additional expenditure, could be secured if a better understanding could be reached between the provinces and the Federal Department of Agriculture in respect to their respective fields of inquiry and endeavour. That par-

ticularly presses upon our attention at the present time because of the great burden of taxation which this country is facing. It is a case of making our dollars go just as far as we can and if the minister by co-operation with the provinces can promote a better understanding in this regard, he will be doing a real and genuine service to agriculture in this country. I know it is perhaps difficult to do. Unfortunately in the field of agriculture, as in some other departments of our governmental service, the provinces desire to carry on their own particular inquiries, and it is often a little difficult to adjust the differences and, shall I say, perhaps the jealousies, that may exist. Nevertheless, the task is one that I think should be undertaken, and I know of no time in our history that was more opportune to undertake it than now. I offer this suggestion to the minister and the Government for what it is worth. I think if they examine it closely they will find some merit in it.

Mr. TOLMIE: I greatly appreciate the suggestion of the hon. member for Marquette. We realized that there was considerable duplication between the federal and provincial Departments of Agriculture, and we called a meeting of deputy ministers about two months ago in the city of Ottawa, when the matter was very fully discussed. We have made a certain amount of progress along the line of having the different fields of endeavour more clearly defined.

Mr. CRERAR: I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. WILSON (Saskatoon): I was very much interested in the statement made by the minister, and as to its educative value I wish to endorse the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) that the statement should be printed and distributed as widely as possible throughout Canada. There is probably no business in Canada to-day to which the application of science brings greater results than agriculture. It is a case of knowing cause and effect. There has been great care exercised in the production of livestock, and in the selection of animals for breeding purposes, but it is only in recent years that it has been impressed on our farmers that the same care in the selection and improvement of seed brings equally good results. We know what a great benefit to the country the improvement in our wheat seed has been, and in this connection I wish to bring to the minister's attention a matter to which I referred a year ago, and that is the good work that a citizen of Saskatchewan is carrying on in the improvement of wheat seed, and the great benefit it has been to agriculture in this country. This man up to the present has not been recognized by the Government for the work he has done, although I was pleased to see a few days ago that Queens University had conferred a degree upon him in recognition of the work he has done in the breeding of seed. I refer to Mr. S. Wheeler, a man who has brought credit to Canada in the breeding of seed wheat. I understand that at the present time he is working on a new seed wheat which he has developed to quite an extent, and which he names "Bobs." He is endeavouring to produce a seed that will be rust proof. It is about fifteen or sixteen years ago that rust first made its appearance in Western Canada, and since then there has been more or less rust every season. If Mr. Wheeler succeeds in producing a seed that will resist rust, it will mean a saving of millions and millions of dollars to the country. I think the Department of Agriculture should recognize to some extent the great work this man is doing for agriculture, and should put him at all events beyond the necessity of worrying about financial matters so far as his experiments are concerned. I thought it proper that I should again bring this matter to the attention of the minister.

Mr. KENNEDY (North Essex): The minister was kind enough to say this afternoon that he would take into serious consideration the question of providing for an increased acreage in the Experimental Farm in South Essex, at Harrow. I think the minister was there recently, and I am sure the people gathered the impression that something was going to be done. I do not know whether the minister said so, but that is the impression the people have. The amount of $7,000 in the Estimates is very small for the upkeep of a farm in such an excellent agricultural county as Essex, and I trust the minister will see his way clear to be a little more generous in his expenditure there.

Mr. TOLMIE: I was not able to get down to Essex county, but the deputy minister was there. The Harrow farm, like nearly all the tobacco farms, shows a profit, so there will be that profit to expend, in addition to the $7,000. So far as the extension of work is concerned, I of course appreciate the situation that exists, and I am anxious to do everything that is at all possible. The department is anxious to expand the experimental farm system everywhere, but

present financial conditions must be borne in mind.

Mr. KNOX: May I ask the minister what provision is being made in order to meet the changing conditions that are now arising in the West, where districts which were largely, and in some cases wholly, wheat-producing are now turning their attention to stock raising and dairying? I have in mind particularly the district of Rosthern, where is situated one of the Saskatchewan farms. In this district one man is using the sunflower ensilage about which the Minister of Agriculture has spoken to-day, and I may inform the minister—for I think the fact is of some importance—that the people in that district are of the opinion that it will be wise for the Government farms to lead the way along these lines. I should therefore like to know what steps are being taken to meet the changing conditions.

Mr. TOLMIE: In such sections as Rosthern we are establishing dairy herd systems. In that section we are starting this system, and for the farm we have already purchased some pure-bred Holstein cattle. We shall have a barn built there as soon as possible.

Mr. PELLETIER: My hon. friend's answer to my question a few moments ago in regard to demonstration farms is rather indefinite. He said that he had had many requests from all over Canada. May I ask if he will take my request into serious consideration and see if he cannot do something for my riding?

Mr. TOLMIE: I promise the hon. gentleman to take his request into serious consideration.

Mr. PARDEE: The minister said a moment ago that certain work would be done at Harrow, and I may be permitted to remark that whether or not experimental farms return a pecuniary profit they are entirely necessary and their establishment is perfectly justifiable. I should think that the last thing we would want to do would be to curtail the expansion of experimental farm work. I do not want any lengthy list, but can the minister inform the committee whether the principal farms are self-sustaining? The statement has been made that so far as Western Ontario is concerned conditions are so good that nothing more is required in the way of demonstration farms. Admitting that to be true, yet, in my opinion, a place can never be so good as not to need further development. Farming of every description is carried on in that locality and I think that demonstration farms should be established there as soon as possible. I should like to know—and I think it is a matter of some interest to the people throughout the country — what percentage of the experimental farms of Canada are self-sustaining and if any revenue which may be derived from them is put back into the farms in the form of further expansion.

Mr. TOLMIE: I was mistaken when I said that the returns went back into the farms; they are turned into the Receiver-General. The experimental farms on the whole are not profitable. From the nature of the work they carry on it is impossible that they should be profitable. For instance, many of the plots contain only one-fortieth of an acre, and every bit of work done on such a plot is done by hand. After some information of value is secured it is not immediately released. Further experimental work along the particular line is carried on for four or five years, and when we have proved beyond doubt that our information so secured is of real value then we distribute it. The mere seed or grain or roots that may be obtained from any experimental plot of such a size is not of any real profit. The real profit that is derived from such a plot consists in the information that is filed away for dissemination among the farmers of the country.

Mr. PARDEE: Quite so.

Mr. TOLMIE: From a rough estimate, it is calculated that the potential value of the experimental farm system of Canada is no less than $60,000,000 a year.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am sure that the minister must have overlooked the statement made by the hon. member for Saskatoon. I think that the work of the distinguished scientist to whom reference has been made was spoken of last year, when there was a good deal of talk about it. We find now that the same scientist is endeavouring to produce wheat which will be rust-proof. I rather think that the minister forgot to make some reference to the observations of the hon. member for Saskatoon, and it would be a pity to let the subject go by unnoticed.

Mr. TOLMIE: I thank the hon. member for bringing the matter to my attention. I quite recognize the ability of Mr. Seager Wheeler, and his work is just another illustration of what energy, knowledge, and application can do. Other farmers around the

district are, I think, in a position to obtain good results if they will take advantage of the opportunities at hand. Mr. Seager Wheeler is working in co-operation with our Seed Branch and all the information that can be obtained is being made use of. I am glad to receive the suggestion of the hon. member for Saskatoon that the department should recognize what Mr. Wheeler has done, and I can assure him that this matter will receive attention.

Mr. ARGUE: I cannot let this opportunity pass without making a plea for that part of the country from which I come, namely, the southwestern part of Saskatchewan, which is an arid district. If farming conditions in Ontario are said to be so good that they do not need experimental farms, I can assure the minister that conditions in our part of the country are the reverse and are such as to make the establishment of a farm there imperative. The district around there is 150 miles square and it is settled by as good farmers as can be found anywhere in Canada. Every dollar of our money is staked in the land and we have either to make that land profitable or walk out and leave it. If we had an experimental farm in that part of the country it would be possible, by demonstrating to the farmers the benefits to be derived from different kinds of tilling, development along various lines, etc., then to make the land pay, and I would ask the Government to make a start this year. I do not ask them to spend a lot of money but I would request that they make a start on an experimental farm in that district to see if they cannot help the farmers there. I know those men, for I have been with them for the last sixteen years, and I can safely say that no better class of men can be found anywhere in this Dominion. When we went out there in the Victory Loan campaign in 1918 Swift Current was the first place in Saskatchewan to win the flag. I think it was a remarkable achievement, and it is but right that such men who have the sand to labour under disadvantages and carry on so well should be helped as much as possible. I trust therefore that the minister will take the matter into earnest consideration and try to make a start there this year.

Progress reported.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Rt. Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved the third reading of Bill No. 109 to amend the Supreme Court Act.

Mr. DENIS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I was not in the House when this Bill was read a second time. I only rise to bring to the attention of the minister the fact that according to this Bill the Privy Council will have jurisdiction in some cases in which the Supreme Court of Canada will not have jurisdiction. I had my whole argument prepared for the second reading and I was ready to quote the articles bearing upon the matter but I will not take the time now it would be absolutely useless. But it seems to me to be irrational that in some cases the Privy Council should have a wider jurisdiction than the Supreme Court of Canada. It appears to me that in every case where the Privy Council has jurisdiction the Supreme Court of Canada should also have jurisdiction by right and not as a privilege.

Mr. DOHERTY: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must ask the unanimous consent of the House that the hon. member may have the right to speak because when the right hon. gentleman moved the third reading of the Bill he exhausted his right.

Mr. DOHERTY: I want to point out to the hon. member that this is under the control of the Provincial Legislatures. It is for the Provincial Legislatures to say what right of appeal there shall be from the ultimate courts of provincial authority to the Privy Council, and we cannot control that. But it is the duty of the Parliament of Canada to determine what shall be the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Canada. If the Provincial Legislatures desire to preserve an appeal to the Privy Council we cannot withdraw the jurisdiction for appeals from their courts direct to the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 95 (from the Senate), for the relief of William George Mackness.—Mr. Fraser.

Bill No. 96 (from the Senate), for the relief of Charles Elias Vardon.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 97 (from the Senate), for the relief of John Hamilton Harvey.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 98 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Goddard.—Mr. MacNutt.

Bill No. 99 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick Stephen Hartmann.—Mr. MacNutt.

Bill No. 100 (from the Senate), for the relief of William George McBride.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 101 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Stinson.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 102 (from the Senate), for the relief of John James Davis.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 106 (from the Senate), for the relief of Arthur Jones.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 107 (from the Senate), for the relief of Eva Mary Moss.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 110 (from the Senate), for the relief of Nellie Adeline Wallace.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 111 (from the Senate), for the relief of Marion Olive Booth.—Mr. Blake.

Bill No. 114 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Edward Vinall.—Mr. MacNutt.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 113 (from the Senate), for the relief of Jessie Elizabeth Hudgin.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 115 (from the Senate), for the relief of Caroline Ewing Gudewill.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 116 (from the Senate), to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting The Western Assurance Company.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 117 (from the Senate), for the relief of Charles Lindsay Keys.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 122 (from the Senate), to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting The British America Assurance Company.—Mr. Cronyn.

Bill No. 125 (from the Senate), for the relief of Irene Martin Chapman.—Mr. Hocken.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I desire, with the assent of the House, to lay on the Table the fourth volume of the report of the Auditor General.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply—Minister of Finance—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Experimental farms, $1,200,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Just before recess my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) succeeded in getting an assurance from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) that an illustration farm would be established in Cape Breton Island, and I must express my great satisfaction at the decision of the minister. However, when he sends his officer down there to determine the site of that farm, I would ask him not to forget to have that officer go over the most important part of the Island—from an agricultural standpoint at least—that is, the western part. If the officer is a competent man, as I have no doubt he is, I am satisfied where the site will be.

Mr. SEXSMITH: During the afternoon we learned that the department has established a number of demonstration farms at various points throughout the greater part of Canada, but I did not hear any reference made to the district of Central Ontario. There is no agricultural college or agricultural farm between Ottawa and Guelph. The whole of that Central Ontario district is a splendid farming section, and I am sure that all that it is necessary for me to do is to direct the attention of the minister to the need for the establishment of one of these demonstration farms in the county of Peterborough.

Mr. COWAN: Just before six o'clock the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Argue) had directed the attention of the minister to the need of an experimental farm in that dried-out area, as they call it, in the southwest portion of Saskatchewan and southern Alberta. I wish to emphasize as strongly as I can the need of that experimental farm. It is not a matter of local concern; a national obligation is involved. For this reason: some years ago when Hon. Frank Oliver was Minister of the Interior, the Federal Government attempted to change from a ranching district into a farming district an enormous area in that western country—as large I should say, as the whole of the settled portion of Ontario. The Federal Department of the Interior threw thousands of farmers into that district, a district which had never been recognized as suited for farming. The result was that thousands of farmers have had to gain experience of the conditions there—conditions entirely different from those to which they had been accustomed. They have not succeeded. The country is a good country. The land is good; it is not an arid but a semi-arid district. They have almost enough rainfall to make farming a success every year, but in the absence of more than "almost enough," they have failed, in many years, all over

that district. The farmers out there are not able to do the experimenting themselves. You cannot expect a lot of pioneers to do the necessary experimenting; they have not the money. I consider it the duty of the Federal Government, therefore, who have drawn hundreds of thousands of people there, to do the experimenting which will supply these people with the information necessary to make farming a success. If a farm is established there it will undoubtedly cost a few thousand dollars, but if you thereby enable these people to carry on their operations successfully; if you can get them to grow the kind of grain which is suited to a semi-arid district—and I understand that can be done—you will make for this country millions of dollars every year. Last year, by reason of the fact that they had not this source of direction and knowledge, Canada lost millions of dollars. Can we reasonably, then, hesitate to make the necessary expenditure? I urge upon the minister that he give the proposal of the hon. member for Swift Current that attention which it deserves.

Mr. BURNHAM: I would like to add a word or two to what the member for East Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith) has just said about the distribution of demonstration farms. It is true that the experimental farm at Guelph, for example, has been of the greatest possible benefit to our district,—not the county of Peterborough only, but to the whole district. But Guelph is a long way from Peterborough—it is considerably more than two hundred miles —and while the more energetic farmer goes there sometimes, or the more curious, it is not always possible for farmers to do themselves justice in this respect. The only place where they can obtain the necessary information, therefore, is the Experimental Farm at Ottawa. It is altogether out of reason that experimental farms should not be more generously distributed than that. Although I am not, like my confrere, a practical farmer, I am nevertheless a theoretical farmer and a very interested farmer. I really take an intense interest in the cultivation of the land,—perhaps by other people. However, I know farmers and farming conditions fairly well, and I am convinced that nothing could be done of greater benefit to the farming community and therefore to the people generally than the placing of demonstration farms—I would say model farms—in each county. An inspected and superintended farm that is, a farm as it ought to be, with all the equipment of a modern farm for intensive farming—because intensive farming has to come sooner or later if farming is to be made profitable and we are to hold our own with the rest of the world—such a farm, I say, should in my humble opinion be established, or at least assisted, subsidized if you like, in each county, so that the farmers in the immediate vicinity could profit by them, and those who want to go into agricultural life might have some place close at hand where they could learn how these things should be done. Many men do not know the remedy for evil conditions which arise on their farms. They cannot afford to incur great expense in connection with them, and if there were a centre—not necessarily an expensive centre—close at hand where they might go and learn the condition of agriculture in the county in question would be improved not less than fifty per cent, I am sure, and the production accordingly. The Government cannot pay too much attention to agriculture in this respect. If my position be correct, that it is not unreasonable that there should be a local centre in each county, how really absurd is the condition when, as I say, there is no demonstration farm of any kind within a radius of two hundred miles. I hope, therefore, that the minister will note that we are practically destitute of an agricultural centre of this kind, and that that need is one which ought to be met.

Mr. PEDLOW: I wish to say a word on this subject, representing, as I do, one of the largest agricultural and dairying constituencies in the Dominion, and perhaps one of the best. My good friend from the constituency of Beauce (Mr. Béland) may dispute that point—he has done so on several occasions—but he has not visited South Renfrew in recent years. It will be comforting to the minister to know that I am not going to press a claim upon him for a model farm, an experimental farm or a demonstration farm for South Renfrew. The majority of the farms in South Renfrew are, I can assure you, Sir, model farms already, so that they require very little assistance along that line. The hon. members for East and West Peterborough have my sympathy, nevertheless, and I sincerely trust, in view of the fact that the need is pressing there, the minister will listen to their request and grant it as quickly as possible. I said that I came from one of the largest and best agricultural and dairying constituencies in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. BELAND: After Beauce.

Mr. PEDLOW: I say that advisedly, notwithstanding the objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Béland). That is a habit of his, but nevertheless the fact remains. I wish to direct the attention of the committee, and particularly of my hon. friend (Mr. Béland), to the fact that in the South Riding of Renfrew we have one of the best-watered agriculture districts in Canada. It is watered by the river Bonnechere, which rises in Golden lake; we have also in that constituency, you will be pleased to know, in addition to all the other beauties that exist there, the Garden of Eden on one side of the town of Renfrew and the land of Goshen on the other.

Mr. BELAND: Do you make maple sugar there?

Mr. PEDLOW: We make maple sugar of the best quality, a quality that will pass the most rigid inspection of the inspectors of the Health Department. In addition to a superior brand of maple sugar, seeing that we have such desirable spots there as the Garden of Eden and the land of Goshen, we have a land flowing practically with milk and honey. The hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) wants to know if there is any whiskey in the South Riding of Renfrew. I am not an expert in matters of that kind, but I would not be surprised at all if there is some of that delectable nectar also in that constituency. Speaking personally, while I have not been a farmer in recent years, most of the members in the Chamber at the present time will be surprised to learn that a man who has spent forty-five years in the business of merchandising claims that he is a farmer. The earliest years of my life were spent on a farm. I have done everything on the farm a man, even of my size, could possibly do. I have ploughed and sowed and reaped and mowed; I have done all these things in turn, even in the old days when the reaping hook was the favoured mowing machine and the spade was the favoured plough. Therefore, I can speak with authority even on matters of that kind.

I have listened with great attention and deep interest to the excellent review of the agricultural situation as given this afternoon by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie). He made special reference to the development, by those under him in his department, of seeds and stock and farm products generally. Reference was made recently by an eminent scientist in this city —I refer to Sir Oliver Lodge—to the unique position held by Canada in the production of wheat. That eminent student, although up in the air sometimes in some of his ideas on life and the hereafter, occasionally takes time to investigate passing events. He had taken notice of the fact that Canada had produced the best wheat in the world, and that wheat was produced by a Canadian, a professor of the experimental farm I refer to the Marquis wheat produced by Prof. Saunders. He referred to a later development in wheat of a still better quality, now, I understand, passing under the name of "Bobs," and produced by a man named Seager Wheeler, also a Canadian. I congratulate the department on these developments and the progress made along these lines.

I was interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), on one point particularly, and I should like to refer to that point again, because I believe it is one worthy of special attention of the Minister of Agriculture, namely, the danger of overlapping. Joking aside, it is all very well for each county to ask for an experimental or model farm and all that sort of thing, but there are limits to the possibilities along that line, and it will be well for the minister to confer with the agricultural departments of the different provinces so that there may be no overlapping. I think the Minister of Agriculture of the Dominion Government should develop the higher part of his work and leave the other departments to the provinces to deal with, and he should so co-operate with them as to avoid overlapping in the work attempted.

It would be interesting to make a passing reference at least to a few of the points in contrast between farm conditions in this country in the past and farm conditions as these obtain at the present moment. I trust I shall not be trespassing too much on the time of the committee by making just a passing reference to these features, and then I will give some reasons for certain suggestions I purpose making as regards the disbursement of the vote under consideration. Pioneer life in this country, as we all know, was most strenuous. The pioneers arrived here from the Old Country; they were dumped in the forest, and their first efforts would be to build a log house for a place to live in. In those days they were not surrounded by such luxuries as obtain at the present time. They were accustomed to the use of primitive instruments such as the spade, the scythe, the reaping hook, the ox-wagon, with oxen for ploughing

instead of horses. Their stock was not the class that we have to-day, it was scrub stock, and, instead of having modern machinery to separate the milk, that had all to be done by hand. The isolation, too, must have been almost intolerable in those days, almost desperate. And yet this hardy race of people made the wilderness blossom as the rose. What a difference there is in the surroundings of to-day! In almost every home in rural Ontario at least there are telephones; there are a daily rural mail service, motor cars, tractors, and in Western Ontario, electricity, which has developed more largely in the western part of Ontario than it has in the eastern part, but of course improvements will follow there also. The people have modern machinery for both their homes and their farms. In the olden days, as I have already indicated, there was first the log house and then the clapboard house, but now most modern farms have brick residence with large modern barns, thoroughbred stock and all kinds of labour saving machinery for both the home and the farm.

As to what is being done by the Agricultural Department to assist in the further development of all this, I will refer to just some features that I have gathered from a publication issued by the Ontario Department of Agriculture. I refer to crop bulletin 142, which gives a great deal of general information. In spite of all this improvement, in spite of all the work that is being done by the Department of Agriculture, and in spite of the call back to the farms, that call remains unheeded, as we can easily see by reading the daily press and other reports.

One man from Pembroke, North Renfrew, writes to the Department of Agriculture, Ontario:

> There have been more sales of farms and stock and machinery this spring than in twenty years. Few people now appear to want to work on the farm.

The point I wish to make in that connection is this. The labour problem is one of the most important that confronts the farmers at the present time, and I appeal to the Minister of Agriculture to devote part of this appropriation towards assisting the farmer along these lines and try to improve conditions. Another writes:

> This "back to the land" that is being preached by men that you could not drive back to the land with a club is all rot. There is no coming back to the land observable; it is all the other way.

Another farmer from Vespra, Simcoe county, writes:

> Celibacy and childless marriages are sadly too common. How it all will end time alone can tell. I fear that the foreign element will ultimately dominate our country, and that the Canadians of the future will be of an entirely new cast.

That is his opinion why the farmers have difficulty in getting help. I am sorry the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is not in his seat. I would also like the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) to be here to take notice of that view expressed from Simcoe county.

Another farmer writes from Cornwall, Stormont county:

> A number of farms have changed hands recently in this vicinity, mostly to Quebec people, who seem to stick to the soil.

That is another statement that would have been of very great interest, I am sure, to the hon. member from Frontenac, indicating trouble possibly for him to attend to.

There are other problems of the farm besides the labour problem. I think that a large part of the appropriation we are being asked to vote should be used expressly to relieve the labour situation and to give assistance in other directions. For instance large implements which cannot be purchased by individuals and which are great labour-saving devices, should be loaned by the department to farmers throughout the country, because the saving of labour is so very important at the present time. A farmer writes from Oxford, Grenville county:

> There is nothing that would increase production so much in this county as drainage. If the Government could be induced to put a ditcher for underdraining into each township and let the farmers pay the running expenses it would be a godsend to this country. We have the tile very convenient.

Here is another suggestion which I think is a very important one. It has been adopted in the Old Country to assist farmers there. I would ask the minister to pay particular attention to this, from Whitby township:

> Farmers who have houses for their men have all the assistance they require, but those who do not furnish houses are short of help.

I know from experience in Ireland that they had great difficulty there along the same line in days gone by, but in recent years the Government have given assistance to the farmers in the way of capital to help them build homes for their labour. I think when a farm of moderate size is able to offer the inducement to a married man and his family of a decent home with two or

three acres of land, it is of great benefit to the individual farmer, and ultimately to the whole community. It would help to bring about what we are all preaching from day to day, namely, greater production. This man has a home for his hired help and has no difficulty in obtaining all the help he requires.

The hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Argue) and the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) have referred to the great need there is of assistance of the department to the farmers of the southern part of Saskatchewan. During last fall I had some experience in that province, in the constituency of Assiniboia. I saw most of the southern part of the province during my stay and got quite a lot of information about western lands and conditions generally that was of great value to me personally, and has been of great value to some of my friends in the vicinity of Renfrew who are desirous of moving out West. I found that a lot of lands out there were held by speculators. That is a rotten condition, in my opinion, and I think there should be some method of forcing that land on the market. At present the Canadian Pacific and other people are simply holding these lands for speculative purposes, and this has a tendency to keep settlers far apart, that is, there is a great distance between one settler and his next-door neighbour. That means, of course, that the schools are a considerable distance away from many of the farmers. I found, however, some very pleasant surprises in that desert land, and some very nice homes. One home I visited was that of a man who had gone out there from Tweed, Ontario, fourteen years ago and who had taken up a quarter-section of land. Later on, he acquired another quarter-section. Besides this half-section he owns one of the nicest homes I have ever seen anywhere. It was modern in every respect, with hardwood floors, hot water heating, electric light, and so forth. It was one of the greatest surprises I have ever had. It just shows what thrift and energy on the part of an experienced man from Ontario can do, even in the not auspicious surroundings I found obtaining out there.

I might also refer to the school situation there. I was surprised and pleased to see the provision that had been made for the training and education of youth. It was one of the most pleasant things I observed possibly during my entire trip through that constituency.

[Mr. Pedlow.]

Mr. COWAN: Does the hon. gentleman think we are a lot of barbarians out there?

Mr. PEDLOW: I did not expect to find the people indulge in such extravagance in the matter of schools.

Mr. COWAN: Extravagance! Is that the hon. member's idea of education? Education is not extravagance.

Mr. PEDLOW: The people evidently intended to provide the best equipment possible in the matter of education for the rising generation. In the town of Estevan, with a population of only 2,500, I saw three large public schools and a high school. I queried the necessity for such extravagance in a matter of that kind, and I was informed that most of the residents in that part of the country came out there young people, and they all had large families, which necessitated extra accommodation in the matter of schools.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I would ask the hon. member what large families in southern Saskatchewan have to do with the item before the Chair?

Mr. PEDLOW: I only mentioned that incidentally when I branched into this digression from the main subject. But it has this connection with the matter under discussion: I am desirous that the Department of Agriculture should use some of this $1,200,000 to assist the farmers in these isolated places by establishing model farms to show the farmers how to operate their farms to the best advantage and to relieve the labour situation. It must be remembered that farmers come into competition for labour with manufacturing concerns. They also come into competition with the tobacco growers, who offer higher wages than the farmers can afford to offer. If you make conditions favourable for farm help they will not want to indulge in the extravagances of city life, nor will they seek what the Civil Service has to offer. If you assist the farmers along the lines I suggest you will accomplish much. I find in the bulletin a summary of the situation, and as it is not lengthy I shall read it. It appears under the heading "Labour and Wages." This statement reads as follows:

> Farm labour conditions were never more acute, even during the latter years of the war. The rates of wages have been steadily mounting, and are now regarded as impossible to meet by a number of correspondents. While some farmers are seeking men at any price, others bluntly state that they will have to do with what labour they can muster at home and let the remainder of the work go.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is undeniably a most serious condition of affairs, and in my judgment is requires the earnest, and more than that the immediate, consideration of the minister. I think it is of greater importance now to provide satisfactory labour than even to undertake the further development of stock or the production of seed. Farmers have an abundance of seed at the present time but they need help to sow that seed, and, when the proper time comes, to harvest the crop. To continue:

Many also are "seeding down" to conserve labour.

This is another serious situation in view of the fact that we are anxious to increase production.

Several correspondents point out that it is impossible for the average food producing farmer to successfully compete with manufacturers, shopkeepers, lumbermen, owners of lake vessels and even with such special crop raisers as tobacco growers and truck farmers so far as paying wages is concerned. The alluring call of urban life, with its short hours and entertaining scenes, is also referred to by correspondents. Wages for farm labourers vary greatly according to nearness to manufacturing centres and general location, and also the experience and ability of the worker. From $40 to $80 a month with board—and even higher—are quoted for single men for the summer, and from $70 to $100 a month with house, garden, milk, etc., to married men working the year round. From $3 to $4 a day with board is being offered for short-term workers.

These wages will not compete with the wages offered by manufacturers, lumbermen and others who are able to pay higher rates. This condition of affairs, Mr. Chairman, is causing unrest among the farmers, and a great many farms are being sold in various parts of Ontario. For instance, take the county of Elgin. I find that a farmer, writing to the Department of Agriculture of Ontario, says:

Malahide, Elgin: More farms have been sold in this township during the last six months than for years before, and many of them were sold to persons who were not farmers.

Now, Sir, this is not improving the situation very much, and if we cannot encourage capable men to take charge of valuable farms the results will be far from gratifying. Another farmer writes from Lanark:

Montague, Lanark: A number of farmers in this township say that they are not going to work fourteen or fifteen hours a day to raise provisions to feed the city man who wants an eight-hour day.

This is just the way that the farmers are thinking. From Plantagenet, South Prescott, the following comes:

We do what we can and let the rest go. Half the farms are left to be managed by men and women past their prime.

Another farmer from Elgin writes:

Hired help are asking from $600 to $1,000 a year with house, garden, fuel, milk and what eggs they can use.

Just imagine, Mr. Chairman! "What, eggs they can use," with eggs at present prices. Why, that would mean an enormous addition to the wages asked for. The statement goes on to say:

The farmers are few who can stand that; they might better work for the hired man. The only solution of the problem is pasture more and till less. Many farmers are selling out and moving to town.

Another man writing from Stephen, Huron, says:

Farm labour is scarce. Between $60 and $65 a month is paid to hands and horse kept. Nearly all are leaving for the cities, where they have short hours and high wages.

I will not tire the committee by reading other statements which I have in connection with this matter. The main point I desire to emphasize is that the minister would be well advised if he diverted some of the money which is being voted under this item towards inducing some help to go to the assistance of the farmers who are quite evidently very badly in need of assistance.

Mr. McISAAC: I rise simply for the purpose of expressing my appreciation of the admirable way in which the Minister of Agriculture has presented the facts regarding his department. Certainly his address this afternoon was a splendid one from every point of view. It contained a great deal of valuable information and I sincerely trust that the suggestion which has been made will be carried out, and that his address will find a wider range of publicity than it will receive by being simply recorded on the pages of Hansard. I hope it will be printed in pamphlet form and distributed throughout the Dominion so that farmers in every part of the country may derive some real benefit from the information which it gives in such abundance. I am sure that a careful study of the minister's speech will enable the farmers to employ improved methods in their prosecution of agriculture, and I am inclined to think that the facts contained in it will be a revelation to a very large number—probably the majority—of the farmers of Canada. A perusal of the minister's speech will show them how extensive is the work carried on by the department and what ex-

cellent progress has been made in the development of agriculture. In my province there is an experimental farm, which, so far as I know, is doing good work, and I shall be extremely pleased to hear from the minister some reference to the progress which that farm is making. If it is the hope of the minister to visit the experimental farms in the various provinces I shall be delighted to learn that he will include in his itinerary the Garden of the Gulf and see how things are getting along down there. I do not think I shall trespass upon the time of the House any longer. I might perhaps have been disposed to extend my remarks somewhat farther were it not for the enormous amount of time consumed and the variety of subjects discussed and passed under review by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow).

Mr. TOLMIE: With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for King's, P. E. I., (Mr. McIsaac) I am glad to say that the farm at Charlottetown is making satisfactory progress. A good deal of work has been carried on in connection with crop production, poultry and steer feeding experiments. We are increasing our livestock at that farm, we are taking up dairying, hog raising and so on, and the farm is making good progress under present conditions.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I have not heard from the minister whether he intends to consider the great central part of Ontario. I am glad to hear of the splendid progress that is being made in the East and also in the West, but it seems he is overlooking the good old province of Ontario. We have in Peterborough, Victoria, Haliburton, North and South Ontario, Durham, and Hastings counties a district which is not excelled for mixed farming anywhere in Canada. That high-priced calf that the minister spoke of this afternoon in his splendid address was developed in that district. We have developed, I am proud to say, in the county of Peterborough, some of the best dairy and beef herds in Canada. I have been told by the judges sent out from the department to the little agricultural fair that we hold in the village of Norwood in my riding that it is the best agricultural fair between Markham and Sherbrooke, and there is to be seen at it some of the finest dairy and beef cattle to be found anywhere in the country. We have not had any assistance from the department in the way of demonstration or experimental farms. I am not thinking for a minute that it is necessary to establish an experimental farm. I would not advocate or support it. Demonstration farms, as my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) said, might well be established in every county. I would be inclined to favour that. I do not see any reason why a farm of 100 or 200 acres could not be taken in every county. If an expert were put on such a farm it could be made to pay and pay well. It would be a great object lesson to the farmers in the district. I do not wish to ramble all over the Dominion talking about southern Alberta and the conditions there and all the other parts of Canada, I only wish to impress upon the minister the necessity of giving the central district of Ontario some consideration. I would like to know if it is his intention to do so.

9 p.m.

Mr. NESBITT: I would like to suggest to the minister that he do not go to the expense of establishing demonstration farms throughout the counties. Why not hire the men who do the farming already?

Mr. DENIS: The hon. member need not be afraid of that.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Agriculture being the basic industry of this country when anything appertaining to it is under discussion in this House, it should be given full and sympathetic consideration. I am not going to embarrass the minister with an application for an experimental farm.

Mr. NESBITT: Do not be bashful.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am not bashful. My application has been in for a considerable time and I am very glad it is, in view of the fact that so many hon. gentlemen have made application to him at this time. In his splendid address this afternoon the minister spoke about increased production. I am sure if there is one thing that is engaging the attention of the thoughtful people of this country at the present time it is the matter of increased production. The minister divided the topic under two heads. First, he urged that there should be increased production from the land already under cultivation. I am sure that the minister, the officers under him and the staffs that he has upon his experimental farms, are in a position to lead the way in respect to this matter. The other point about increasing production by bringing under cultivation raw or new lands is a mat-

ter that has to be looked at from a different standpoint. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow), there is a shortage of help in this country and if we are going to bring new land under cultivation we need more help. I am sure that the minister must know that there is a real shortage of farm help in the country to-day. Before we can consider bringing any large areas of new land under cultivation it would be well to give consideration to the help problem. The minister spoke about the class of immigrants that he would like to see coming into this country in larger numbers. I am sure every member of the committee will agree that the class that he described would be very desirable immigrants if we were able to get them. But the minister did not enlighten the committee as to where he was going to get this class of immigrants. It is all very well to set up standards but in this connection beggars cannot logically at any rate be choosers. When we take into consideration that we are losing a great many of that class of our people who formerly have done the manual labour of this country I think it is well for us to consider just where to draw the line with regard to immigration.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman mean that he would be in favour of allowing the immigration of cheap labourers into Canada?

Mr. JOHNSTON: I mean just what I said; it would be well for the minister and the Government to give this matter serious consideration. The minister also referred to the importance of good seed and good sires There is no man who has had to do with agriculture, either growing grain or raising livestock, but will know that the advice given the committee this afternoon by the minister was good. In the province of Saskatchewan from which I come the only men who are successful in their work upon the land are those who give particular attention to intensive cultivation. To succeed in farming in Saskatchewan one must give every consideration to the cultivation of the soil. After having done this it is well to use the very best seed, and in breeding livestock to use the best sires that are procurable. The minister also mentioned the cultivation of sunflowers as silage feed. I am sure this is an important matter. We have just come through a very trying winter in the western provinces owing to a great shortage of feed, and if the growing of sunflowers will in any way help in the event of a recurrence of such a shortage it should be given every attention by the department.

I wish to endorse what the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Wilson) said this afternoon respecting the great service rendered this country by Mr. Seager Wheeler, of Rosthern, Saskatchewan. This gentleman has brought honour not only to himself and to the province but to the whole Dominion, having on many occasions won the world's championship for wheat and the coarser grains. As pointed out by the hon. member for Saskatoon, the degree of LL.D. was conferred upon Mr. Wheeler a few days ago by Queen's University. I think the least the Department of Agriculture could do would be to put this gentleman in such a position that he would be relieved from the worry of making a living for himself while carrying on his experimental work. He is doing that work off his own bat, so to speak, having received no assistance from the Provincial or the Federal Government, and I think it is time the department recognized the valuable servcies that Mr. Wheeler has rendered this country.

Mr. TOLMIE: Mr. Chairman, in regard to what the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith) said about the absence of an illustration station in his section of Ontario, I am very glad indeed to hear that such excellent cattle are produced there—this is not the first time I have heard of them—and also to know what a very fine quality of farming is carried on there. That is probably one of the reasons why that section has not yet received an illustration station, because no doubt the department has been careful to select those sections where the farming is not so good and illustration stations are more necessary. However, we are now taking up the matter of establishing illustration stations in Ontario, and when we come to a decision the claims of Peterborough will be given very careful consideration.

With respect to the labour situation, it is pretty bad all over this continent. I do not think we are any worse off on our farms than they are in the United States and some other parts of the world. Being one of the results of the war, it is a very difficult condition to regulate. We have established labour bureaus in various parts of the country in co-operation with the provincial authorities and those in charge are doing the best they can to supply men. In Western Canada, I think, conditions are a great deal better than in Ontario. This department has been in touch with the Department of Immigration, whose business it is

to take care of these matters, and they assure us that they are making a very strong effort to help out as far as they possibly can.

Mr. J. F. REID (Mackenzie): Mr. Chairman, I listened with considerable pleasure to the hon. minister while he was giving us his well-thought out brief. It brought to my mind what I have often heard repeated in the last two or three years,—that we were having too many farmers in Parliament. So far, I think the record of the present Minister of Agriculture will bear out my statement that he, at any rate, is "the right man in the right place."

He has told us of the progressive improvement of our dairy strains of cattle, which, of course, we are all glad to hear. But I think he forgot to say a word on behalf of the beef strains of cattle,—and judging from the appearence of my hon. friend I believe that he enjoys a juicy beefsteak just as much as I do. But he cannot get that delicacy from the dairy cow; it must come from the beef cattle. In that connection let me add, that I have noticed that sires are provided by the department in settlements in the West where the farmers keep only a few cows. In my opinion,—and I speak as a farmer of some experience,—the quality of the sires is not up to the standard that it should be, and I hope the minister will see to it that that standard shall be reached by the sires which are supplied from time to time. It is a good investment, and when a sire is purchased a few hundred dollars extra should not be considered if an animal of the right quality is secured.

I would like the minister to inform the committee what was the net result of a shipment of two carloads of steers sent from the West to the Experimental Farm here. I met a farmer yesterday who is farming within a short distance of the city, and he told me that at the present time it did not pay to stall beef cattle. So perhaps the minister could give us some valuable information along that line.

I was rather amused when the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) told us of his trip out West to the "isolated" constituency of Assiniboia. There can be no doubt that when he left home he had an impression that this constituency was a benighted district, but when he got there and saw that the people could build three public schools and one high school no doubt he came to the conclusion that, after all, they were not so badly "isolated." I do hope that my good friend from South Renfrew will again visit the West on some similar occasion and help us out.

I do not wish to press the minister at this time for an experimental or a demonstration farm in my consistuency; I think there have been too many requests of that sort already. I will wait until a more opportune time. I wish the hon. minister every success in his department and I have great hopes that he will contine to be "the right man in the right place."

Mr. CAHILL: Would the minister advise us what the intention of the Goverment is with regard to the Kapuskasing Experimental Farm?

Mr. TOLMIE: The land was given to the department. The cost of operation last year, including buildings and clearing, was about $60,000. The buildings are nearly completed now, and we intend to operate the farm as the other farms are operated. We feel that this farm can render a valuble service in that clay district where the soil is somewhat different from that of the other farms in Ontario.

Mr. POWER: Will the minister tell us something about Spirit Lake, in the province of Quebec? The experimental farm there also was built by German prisoners.

Mr. TOLMIE: Spirit Lake is another farm that was given to us. The amount spent on it so far is not quite as great as the amount spent on Kapuskasing. We have not erected as many buildings; we have not got as far advanced as we have at Kapuskasing. But it is the intention of the Government to go ahead with the development of that farm, which is in a clay loam district.

Mr. CAHILL: These two farms are on the Transcontinental, in the clay belt in Northern Ontario and Quebec. In the district where the Spirit Lake farm is situated there is a settlement of from fifteen to twenty thousand people. At Spirit Lake considerable farming is under way, it is now a farming territory; but at Kapuskasing not one hundred acres of land are under cultivation, outside of the experimental farm. If my memory serves me well, a report was recently published in the press of a commission which investigated the settlement at Kapuskasing, and from it I understand that most of the settlers have left that territory. How much money has been spent in the Spirit Lake territory?

Mr. TOLMIE: I am sorry that I cannot give the hon. member the information, but I shall be glad to get it for him.

Mr. CAHILL: Before this item is passed?

Mr. TOLMIE: I hardly think that the hon. member would want to hold up the item pending the furnishing of this information.

Mr. CAHILL: Well, this item is more important, perhaps, than the minister thinks. There is a settlement in the Spirit Lake territory, in the province of Quebec; every effort is being made to colonize it. The people there are practical farmers; they are not people who have been brought in by any assistance, they have gone in on their own account; they are clearing the land and cultivating it and making their homes there without assistance from the Government or from any other source. While settlers are being carted back from the Ontario end of the Transcontinental, people are going into this other territory by the hundreds. All they want is good railway facilities and the ordinary encouragement that a Government may give. I am anxious to know what money has been spent at Spirit Lake, because Spirit Lake is much more advantageously situated so far as settlement is concerned than Kapuskasing ever will be, —at least, until there is a different immigration and colonization policy in Ontario.

Mr. TOLMIE: At Spirit Lake we are expending this year $45,000.

Mr. CAHILL: And $60,000 at Kapuskasing?

Mr. TOLMIE: That was last year; it included expenditure on buildings, which will not be necessary this year.

Mr. CAHILL: Have you in the Estimates for this year $45,000 to be spent at Spirit Lake?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: And how much at Kapuskasing?

Mr. TOLMIE: The amount is $56,000. There is a very much larger area of land to be cleared at Kapuskasing.

Mr. CAHILL: Does the minister think that Kapuskasing is the proper place to develop, to the detriment of the Spirit Lake territory? Does he think it is necessary to have two experimental farms in such close proximity to each other in that northern country? Would it not be better to spend all the money in one farm and have that farm do some good?

Mr. TOLMIE: I have never visited Kapuskasing, but I am informed that the land is of good quality and that we can look forward to considerable development there, Spirit Lake is also a promising district.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister is correctly informed. There is nothing wrong with the territory; the land is good enough. If the territory were colonized the Transcontinental railway would serve a good purpose. But until the Ontario Government have some system of colonization, or will allow the only class of people who will ever settle that northern country to go in there, it is absolutely foolish for the Dominion Government to be spending money in a territory where you are not going to get settlers. And I repeat that under the present system of colonization in Ontario you will not get settlers in that country.

Mr. POWER: What has happened since the German prisoners went away? Who has been working the land at Spirit Lake?

Mr. TOLMIE: We have a superintendent there and a number of men.

Mr. POWER: How many men?

Mr. TOLMIE: About twenty.

Mr. BURNHAM: Before the discussion of this interesting subject comes to a close I should like to ask a question that seems to me to be quite pertinent. There are at the present time, when these most important Estimates are being considered, less than thirty members in the Chamber. It has been the same every year while I have been in the House; almost without exception the Farmer members pay no attention at all to the Agriculture Estimates. Look at the Farmers' party over there!

Mr. DENIS: How many are there?

Mr. BURNHAM: The hon. gentleman who is the sole occupant of the cross benches at this moment (Mr. Andrews) is a distinguished soldier; I do not know that he is a distinguished farmer. But every other member of the Farmers' party—except the one who has come in just now, at an opportune moment (Mr. Johnston)—is an absentee. That is the interest that the members of the Farmers' party take in the farming affairs of this country. It is not because they have any criticism to make, because one of their members said a few minutes ago that the Minister of Agriculture was the right man in the right place. They have no criticism to make; they have no suggestions to offer; yet they are a Farmers' party.

Mr. GAUVREAU: That is why they went out; they have no criticism to make.

Mr. BURNHAM: I see that my hon. friend does not know anything about agriculture. Speaking for that large class of people who are more or less ignorant of agriculture, I think that the farmers in this House might do the rest of the population of this country the honour, if they will not do the farming community the justice, of staying on the scene and giving their best thought and consideration to the Estimates of the Minister of Agriculture when they come year after year. I am glad to see that at this moment the distinguished leader of the Farmers' party (Mr. Crerar) has come in. We now have a total of three in the Farmers' party, but the best part of the Agriculture Estimates and the discussion on them is over. After hearing so much about the labour question, I should like to ask the leader of the Farmers' party what he proposes to do about labour. I asked the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) if he proposed to admit cheap labour into this country. He, of course promptly fenced the question and returned me a sharp, but not an explanatory answer. I should like, and we should all like to know how this question of labour is going to be solved. Farmers, I understand, rebel against working fourteen hours a day—as they do in summer, but not in winter—whilst people in towns work eight hours or, perhaps, nine hours a day. The conditions are different. The people who have been on the farm do not want to stay there; they want to leave the farm. What we would like to know is, how the farming community and the leader of the Farmers' party propose to remedy the situation; because we can possibly assist him, and we shall do our best to do so. But is the situation to be remedied by the employment of cheap labour or by simply throwing down the barriers and allowing everything to come in at its cheapest from China and other parts of the world? I know the hon. member (Mr. Cahill) would let anything at all come into this country. He does not care about the farmers of Quebec or the manufacturers; it is cheapness he wants. I believe, however, the leader of the Farmers' party is a different type of man, and I am sure on this matter he would be pleased to give us the benefit of his experience.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I cannot think the hon. member was serious in his criticism of members of this group for non-attendance in this chamber. I am sure every hon. member of the House must know that these benches have been well filled during all the discussion on the Estimates that have been before the committee. He complained because I did not give an answer to his question regarding the class of immigrants to be admitted to this country. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the help problem of this country is one for the Government to consider, not for me.

Mr. CAHILL: I should like to ask the minister again if he would not consider amalgamating those two farms to which I have referred and putting them where they would be useful, instead of spending fifty or sixty thousand dollars at a point where there is no settlement and where there seems to be little possibility of settlement in the near future. It seems that after we start an experiment, we must continue spending money endlessly with apparently no object in view. The minister himself states that he has not visited that section of the country and that he knows nothing about the territory, but that it is reported to him as good territory. The territory is all right, but an experimental farm in a section where there is no settlement and where there is another experimental farm a few miles away with a settlement around it seems unnecessary. It would be better to spend the money where you have a settlement than to spend money in a part of the country where you have no hope of settlement in the near future. Unless you are spending money to some advantage, an item of $50,000 is worthy of consideration. The item seems to keep on growing from year to year, and I think the minister would do well to strike out that appropriation of $50,000 this year. If it is necessary to spend it somewhere else, do so, but I would not ask the minister to spend it at Spirit Lake.

Mr. HAY: How far apart are these two farms?

Mr. CAHILL: Possibly a hundred miles, not more than that. The hon. member will not find one settler between the Quebec boundary and the town of Cochrane. This place is west of Cochrane, it is true, but there are practically no settlers in that territory. If you travel over that line through Northern Quebec, you will find it is settled from Rivière Bell to Lorraine, where fifteen to twenty thousand people, actual farmers, growing wheat, oats, other grain and hay, are settled to make a living. The minute you cross the boundary into Ontario, the country is a wilderness. The settlers who went in there simply went in and

took the timber off. The country is waste; whatever timber is left is burned, and the country is not at present attractive to settlers on account of the timber being taken off. In Quebec the settlers are not allowed to take off the timber except on the land they are going to cultivate the following year. They cut the timber off five acres and clear that up; the next year they cut the timber off another five acres and clear that up, and so on. They are settlers. The unfortunate part of it is that they are unable to get out the products of the forest because they are not furnished with railway cars. The railways are there, the people are there, and soil suitable for production is there. When the hon. member speaks about this being a waste country, I may tell him that there is between the Abittibi and the Nipigon room enough for a larger population than there is in Ontario to-day. The territory is good, but the colonization policy of the Provincial Government is bad; the colonization policy of the Dominion Government is bad; in fact, they have absolutely none. The minister this afternoon spoke of colonization; he was going to have some sort of hand-picked people immigrating into Canada and settling on the land. I do not know where he purposes getting them, but there are only certain classes of people who will go into that northern timber country and settle it. The French Canadian, who understands how to settle timber country, is the best man to settle it; he is the only man on the North American continent who has made a success of settling timber country in our time. People from Scandinavia, Northern Europe, would settle that country; but unless the Government have a policy of getting people on that land, it is absolutely useless to spend money on experimental farms and railways where you will not get a settlement until perhaps the buildings decay. The Government have no policy; the Government of Ontario by their legislation practically prohibit the French-Canadians from going into that country. If that is the policy of the Ontario Government, who own the land, why should the Dominion Government spend money to operate an experimental farm in that territory? Why should the Dominion Government spend money to operate a railway in that territory, if the policy of the Ontario Government is that no people shall go in there except those who are hand-picked? If they go into the Kapuskasing district, they would have to come out again or else starve, just as happened in that district. Unless you have colonization, it is absolutely nonsensical for the Government to be spending money in that northern part of Ontario where they will not allow settlers to go in. Why not spend it somewhere else where it will be of some use or save it to the Canadian people? It may be necessary and good business to operate a farm in the Spirit Lake territory, but it cannot be necessary to have two farms within a short distance of each other in the same climate, with the same class of territory, the same soil, the same conditions, one place where there are settlers struggling to make a living and another where the people went in and went out again because they were suffering on the land. You will never get anywhere until the colonization conditions are changed, so why spend this money?

Mr. TOLMIE: At Kapuskasing we have 400 acres under cultivation and 400 acres are being cleared. We have the buildings and the plant that is necessary to operate the farm. I consider that we should continue to operate the farm, for the present at any rate. We cannot abandon it. The only way to demonstrate that the land is any good is to show that it can be cultivated at a profit. We took the farm over as an internment camp, I understand, it was used for that purpose first. So far as the colonization end of it is concerned, that is something for the Ontario Government to take care of. I am quite willing to confer with them with a view to having that country settled, and to take any steps that we possibly can take to that end. I think it would be foolish to abandon the farm under present conditions.

Mr. CAHILL: Why expend more money there than in other districts where there is settlement?

Mr. TOLMIE: Because we have a very much larger plant there, and necessarily there is a call for more money.

Mr. CAHILL: Why put a larger plant there when there is no settlement?

Mr. TOLMIE: The plant was there before I was here.

Mr. CAHILL: It was not there before the Government of which my hon. friend is a member was here.

Mr. DUFF: It's a war baby.

Mr. TOLMIE: I am informed that it was there before this Government was in power at all.

Branch of Entomology, $18,000.

Mr. POWER: I should like the minister to give some explanation of what entomology is.

Mr. TOLMIE: It is the study of parasites as affecting agriculture. It is a very important work. It is estimated that these parasites cause a loss every year in Canada of $125,000,000. We have a staff of entomologists who make a study of the life history of these parasites and of the various insecticides that can be used to destroy them, and the securing of cheap insecticides. Some of the big problems they are engaged on at the present time are the grasshopper plague on the prairies, the mosquitoes in the raspberry growing section of British Columbia, and the brown-tailed moth.

Mr. POWER: As I understand the minister's explanation, it sounds like the ward heelers attached to the Union Government.

For the administration and enforcement of the Destructive Insect and Pest Act, $150,000.

Mr. CAHILL: What progress is being made with this?

Mr. TOLMIE: We are making some progress with the grasshopper plague out in Western Canada. As I pointed out this afternoon, it will require about 2,000 tons of bran, nearly 100,000 pounds of arsenic, and 50,000 gallons of syrup to make a bait to scatter around the grasshopper districts with a view to destroying them. We are also carrying on a mosquito investigation in the Fraser River valley, where the mosquitoes have been so bad as to drive away the pickers in the raspberry and strawberry districts during the harvesting season. We are also working on the pear thrip, a parasite that attacks the pear orchards. On Vancouver Island a harvest of only 700 boxes was obtained from an orchard one year owing to this parasite, but after the entomologists had studied the problem and their recommendations had been carried out 7,000 boxes were obtained the next year. We are also working on the spruce bud moth, and another parasite affecting the bark of the fir trees in British Columbia, and we expect excellent results from these investigations. We are also working on the brown-tailed moth in the Maritime Provinces and at the present time have just about eliminated it. The life history of these parasites has to be carefully studied to enable us to adopt the proper methods to counteract them. We are also studying how to get cheap tree sprays to be used in the large orchard districts of the Niagara valley, the Annapolis valley and British Columbia. The work the entomologists are doing is a very valuable one.

Mr. BURRELL: My hon. friend (Mr. Power) raised the question as to what the study of entomology was. Perhaps he would pardon me if I gave him a little illustration of its value, which is pretty well known to anybody who has given any study to the subject. Some years ago the citrus fruit industry—the orange, lemon and grape fruit industry—of California, which has an output of probably $100,000,000 a year, was threatened by an invasion of the orchards by an insect called the cottony cushion-scale, belonging to an order of insects which live on the sap of trees. No remedy was found for a long time, and it looked as if the whole industry was threatened with extinction. Then several of the best entomologists were put to work on the problem, and after a long time one of the entomological experts travelling in Australia to try and find out where this particular cottony cushion-scale came from, and what particular insect preyed on it, thereby keeping it in check, discovered that it was indigenous to Australia, and that these insects were kept down in numbers by being lived upon as a food by a particular species of beetle belonging to the so-called lady bird family. When this entomologist discovered that this lady bird or lady beetle fed on the cottony cushion-scale, thereby keeping the pest in check and rendering it non-injurious to vegetation, thousands and thousands of these beetles were imported into California, and they went on breeding there until in the course of three or four years they had bred to such an extent that they had practically wiped out the cottony cushion-scale in California, and saved the citrus industry, which represents an investment of untold millions of dollars. I think that is about as good an illustration as can be given of the economic value of entomology in a hundred different lines.

Before taking my seat I should like to pay my personal tribute, as Minister of Agriculture in the past, occupying the position which my hon. friend (Mr. Tolmie) does now, to the work of a very capable entomologist in the service of the Dominion Government, who, I regret to say lately died. I refer to the late Dr. Gordon C. Hewitt, who by his work in this particular branch of the service conferred enormous benefits not only upon the department but upon the whole country.

For the development of the dairying industry, and the improvement of transportation, sale and trade in food and other products, $165,000.

Mr. DENIS: I think this is one of the fields in which there is duplication by the Provincial and Federal Governments. To my knowledge, work along this line is being done by the province of Quebec. I should be glad if the minister would let us know what is being done along federal lines.

Mr. TOLMIE: The Dominion Government's work in this connection consists in the promoting of dairying generally. We also carry on cow testing associations in co-operation with the Provincial Governments. We carry on improvements in the manufacture of butter and cheese through instruction; provide plans for dairy buildings; and make investigations of special problems in dairying. We operate a station at Finch, Ontario, for demonstration purposes. The Dominion Government also carry out the oleomargarine regulations, and cargo inspection at Candian and United Kingdom ports. We have several inspectors overseas who inspect cargoes on their arrival in order to keep us fully informed concerning their condition when they reach the other side, and enable us to provide that the goods may reach the consumer in the best possible shape. We also handle a refrigerator car service for both butter and cheese; we attend to cold storage and pre-cooling of fruit, and carry on fruit storage investigations. We are conducting some interesting investigations this year in connection with the storage of fruit and the shipping of fruit in refrigerator cars, and we expect from these investigations to obtain some very valuable information. We carry out the administration of the Cold Storage Act and the Cold Storage Warehouse Act, as well as the regulations in regard to creameries. We issue monthly a dairy news letter, and weekly a dairy produce market report; and in connection with the proposed new work we intend to take up scientific dairy research, which is something that has not hitherto been done in this country. We also deal with cheese factory and creamery economics. The Provincial Government do a great deal of educational work but there is no real clashing between the two departments. We co-operate with the provincial dairy departments wherever it is possible to do so and we render every assistance we can, feeling that our objective is the same as that of the provinces.

Mr. DENIS: The minister's statement would tend to confirm the assertion of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) this afternoon that improvement is possible in the way of avoiding duplication in the work done by the Federal and the Provincial Governments. Item 45 is divided into two parts, the first referring to development of the dairying industry and the second providing for the improvement of transportation, sale and trade in food and other products. I understand that the latter belongs to the Federal Government. But the first part of the item in regard to the development of the dairying industry seems to me to appertain more particularly to the Provincial Governments, and I asked the question which I did because it appeared to me that there was useless duplication in the work accomplished by the Dominion Government on the one hand and the Provincial Governments on the other.

Mr. TOLMIE: There is no serious duplication at all.

Mr. DENIS: I am glad to learn that fact.

Mr. MORPHY: What method is employed by the Government to bring to the attention of the individual farmer the information obtained from the dairy records? Is there any special method that enables the department to have that information completely disseminated? I quite appreciate the fact that there are many farmers who are alive to the value of dairy records and cow testing and who seek information because they are interested. But that is the class of farmer who needs information least; he is alive and up-to-date. There is the other man, however, who probably lives alongside the energetic farmer, and it is of him that I am speaking. What is done to buoy him up and to induce him to take a keener interest in the improvement of his own herd?

Mr. TOLMIE: We reach the public through the Agricultural Gazette and bulletins issued by the department, and we have in every dairy centre a man who disseminates all the information that is at his disposal. He imparts this information as best he can in the immediate district, and then much of this material is also sent away to the agricultural press and receives publicity in that way. The information also reaches the public through the medium of the farmers' institutes.

Mr. MORPHY: How many copies of the Agricultural Gazette would reach individuals in the riding which I have the honour

to represent, for instance? Is there a list on which the names of persons who might need the Agricultural Gazette or the dairy news letter could be enrolled?

Mr. TOLMIE: This information is sent to those people who apply for it. It is an expensive matter to distribute material of this kind indiscriminately throughout the country because in many cases it is only thrown aside. It is not deemed wise to send it to those who do not ask for it. In all cases in which the bulletins are asked for they are sent, because the very fact that there is a demand for them shows that the farmers to whom they are sent are interested. In all such cases we are glad to send all the information we have.

Mr. MORPHY: Do I understand that all the names that might be sent in by a member of the House would be put on a list and that those persons would become regular receivers of the Agricultural Gazette?

Mr. TOLMIE: Not of the Agricultural Gazette, but of the bulletins. We shall be glad to furnish them with those.

Mr. MORPHY: Would that include the dairy news letter?

Mr. TOLMIE: If they wish it.

Mr. CAHILL: What did the transportation which is included in this item amount to last year?

Mr. TOLMIE: I may point out to the hon. member that we do not pay any transportation; we simply supervise the transportation of shipments.

Mr. CAHILL: The item is "improvement of transportation." What does that mean?

Mr. TOLMIE: We are continually seeking methods by which transportation can be improved. For instance, we are carrying on some experiments this year through an arrangement with the railway companies and the fruit men, making a test in regard to the recording of temperatures in refrigerator cars, etc., and we trust that a good deal of valuable information will be secured. Shipments are also pre-cooled before they are put into the refrigerator cars, and the temperature is carefully noted. These experiments are being conducted this summer at the request of a large number of fruit men and we expect that beneficial results will be derived from them. In connection with refrigerator car inspection and market reporting last year the expenditure was $3,570. This covers refrigerator car inspection at Montreal and Toronto.

Mr. MORPHY: In regard to the establishment of a station at Finch for the improvement of the cheese industry, I should like to know exactly what is being done in this direction.

Mr. TOLMIE: We have taken hold of two cheese factories at Finch and are operating them as model factories. Any man who wishes to learn anything about the cheese and butter business can go there and see how things are done in an up-to-date way. It has proved of great value to the cheese makers. We are making cheese and butter and shipping milk, and the station has been showing a profit.

Mr. MORPHY: Where is the station?

Mr. TOLMIE: About fifty miles south between here and Cornwall.

Mr. MORPHY: I suppose it is well recognized that in a district such as I have the honour to represent, and in other districts, this country produces a tremendous lot of what we ordinarily call factory cheese. That is a cheese of 75 or 80 pounds. This cheese is practically all shipped out of the country because Canadians do not appear to be a cheese-consuming people. I fancy it is safe to say that from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 worth of cheese is exported annually. It is a strange thing that the Canadian public will not eat cheese to anything like what may be deemed a reasonable extent. People eat a little cheese but not much. The British consuming public seem to eat more cheese, especially if they can get a glass of beer with it. In the absence of that trade in this country have the Government ever considered the idea that there must be a tremendous quantity of cheese that is imported from other countries such as Roquefort, Gorgonzola, Edam and other varieties that before the war at any rate were brought in here and sold at from 60 cents to 75 cents a pound? I believe that to-day Roquefort will cost $2 a pound. This condition exists while there are a lot of districts in this country with the finest pasturage in the world and cows that stand up equal to those in any other place because the farmers and dairymen have made great strides in developing, through pure-bred sires, valuable herds. Yet there is no incentive apparently given to the people to go in for a finer and smaller package kind of cheese outside of the

factory at Ingersoll. That is about the only place where they put up some small packages of pimento and ordinary cheese. On the general argument that the home market in everything else is the best for the farmer, it ought to be the best for the cheese farmer —the man who develops and uses his farm largely for dairy purposes. I throw it out as a suggestion to the minister that if this factory at Finch is only dealing with and putting forward to the people of Ontario the production of what is called cheddar cheese, or some such name, there might be a great opening for the Government to establish at that factory the manufacture of a small cheese of the richer variety which, if this production were extended to the country districts under proper educational facilities, would induce capital among the farming body to be invested on the co-operative plan, to establish factories in the dairy centres which would supply a cheese that the people of Canada would eat and that also would give a better remuneration. I would ask the minister to look into that.

10 p.m.

Mr. TOLMIE: We have been making a few of the small cheddar cheese at Finch. I shall be very glad indeed to accept the suggestion of the hon. member and look into the matter further.

Mr. CRERAR: This item is perhaps one of the most important in the Estimates we have under consideration. I might say with reference to the point raised by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) that we have several varieties of cheese made in Canada other than the Canadian cheddar which is sold in Great Britain. We have the Oka cheese made by the Trappist, the Experimental Farm cream cheese, and several other varieties of that kind. I believe the hon. gentleman will find quite a sufficient variety to satisfy his taste in that respect. But apart from that, our cheese industry in Canada is undoubtedly one of the important branches of our agricultural industry. Canada has for many years occupied a pre-eminent place in the British market for her cheese products and the total exports have run from 175,000,000 to 200,000,000 pounds per year. I am confident that we can establish a similar pre-eminence in respect to our butter output. In building up this industry, however, the question of transportation and particularly of modern refrigeration as applied to transportation is of the highest importance. I think that any money that is expended in the way of improved transporation facilities and in the way of finding out the best methods of refrigeration and of handling these commodities will certainly be money well spent. We should not overlook the fact that our position in Canada is a very favourable one in respect to the world's markets. We have heard from the minister already about the position which our cheese occupies in the British market. There is no reason why our butter should not occupy an equally favourable position. We have in addition to that a vast and growing market immediately to the south which is bound in the years to come to take large quantities of our dairy products. The fact is sometimes overlooked that more than half of the population of the United States lies east of a line drawn north and south through Chicago. By far the most densely populated portion of the United States, within twelve or fifteen hours by train from one of the finest agricultural parts of this Dominion, namely the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. If we have vision to look into the future we have a splendid prospect ahead of us in respect to the development of our dairy industry. I say again that any assistance we can give in the direction of perfecting the methods of transportation and particularly the development of proper cold storage facilities, so that these commodities that are of a perishable character can be brought to the markets in the best condition, will be money well spent. It is now generally recognized particularly with respect to food products of this class, that quality is of the highest consideration and if we can make cheese and butter of the highest quality and can get proper facilities for taking them to the markets of the world in the best possible shape, the dairy farmers of Eastern Canada particularly—because they are more favourably situated in that regard than the dairy farmers of the rest of Canada—can find a ready and profitable market for everything they can produce.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Has the minister considered adopting a policy whereby fertilizers can be obtained at or as near cost as possible by those engaged in the dairying and other branches of agricultural industry?

Mr. TOLMIE: We fully realize the value of getting fertilizers to the farmers at the very lowest possible cost, but, as the hon. gentleman will understand, railway rates are very high and concessions are very difficult to get.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is because railway rates are so high that I am anxious to know if the Government has any policy on this matter. It is one of the most important considerations, I imagine, in connection with agriculture that fertilizers should be obtainable by our farmers at the minimum cost; and it seems to me that because we have these high transportation charges the Government ought to formulate a policy to deal with the matter.

Mr. TOLMIE: I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought this matter to my attention. I will look into it further.

Mr. LEGER: What instructions are the government milk testers given in regard to their duties and their districts?

Mr. TOLMIE: These cow testers are directly under the control of the Provincial Governments as to their particular districts, but we have certain men who go out among the farmers and interest them in the advantages of cow testing. These tests are of great value to the dairyman, because it is the only method by which he can tell the best cows in his herd, the real test, of course, being the butter-fat content rather than fine looks, and he is thus enabled to eliminate his poor cows. The men we send out arrange with the cheesemaker or buttermaker, as the case may be, connected with the local creamery to test the milk, and we pay the tester.

Mr. LEGER: Is it his duty to test only the milk of the patrons of the factory, or is he instructed to test any cow in the district?

Mr. TOLMIE: He is instructed to test any cow throughout the district.

Mr. LEGER: I have personal knowledge of one case where a farmer, not a patron of the local butter factory, sent his milk to be tested, but a month or two afterwards the testing officer said that he would not test the milk of any farmers outside the patrons of the factory. That is the reason for my question.

Mr. TOLMIE: If the hon. member will be good enough to bring the case to the attention of the department, we will be very glad to get a report on it and take any action that may be necessary.

Mr. MANION: I do not wish to delay the Estimates for more than a minute or two, but I was rather interested in the remarks of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) and the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) regarding cheese. I know very little about cheesemaking, but for some years I have been more or less of an epicure in regard to cheese, and I was struck by the remarks of the hon. member for North Perth when he drew the attention of the committee to our cheese production. I think those remarks are well worthy of careful consideration by the minister, who has given us such a very excellent report this afternoon and has shown such a high quality of management in his department. A short time ago the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) told us that the province of Quebec had the finest record in this country for the quality of its butter, and I think I would be quite safe in saying that the province has an equally fine record both as to the quality and variety of its cheese production, and I was a little surprised that some hon. member from that province did not rise to confirm that statement.

The point I wish to make is that we are to-day producing, especially in the province of Quebec, cheese which is quite equal—and I think I am a fair judge as an eater of cheese—to any of the imported European varieties, such as Roquefort and Camembert. The only trouble is that our fine varieties, such as the Oka, the Trappist and the Beloeil are not made in large quantities, in fact, we cannot begin to supply the demand. The cheese from Beloeil is made by two or three farmers there, it has a most delicious flavour, but so far as I know it has never reached the markets beyond Ottawa. I have purchased it many times in this city, and have taken it to my home a thousand miles west, and every one who has tasted it has passed the most complimentary remarks regarding its quality and flavour.

I think it would be well for the minister and his deputy to consider the advisability of encouraging the making of this delicious cheese which the province of Quebec excels in producing. In the European markets when any one is buying cheese he considers our ordinary Canadian cheese of very superior quality—and we know it has a high food value—but in addition a very well-known cheese is sold as "old" Canadian cheese, and that cheese when properly cured is, to my mind, almost equal to any Roquefort we import. Therefore, I think the production of old Canadian Cheese—which I presume is simply our ordinary cheese aged for a certain time—of Oka, of Trappist and of Beloeil cheese, should be heartily encouraged by the minister and his depart-

ment, for the reason that those varieties might well take the place to a certain extent of the expensive cheeses imported from Europe. I merely wish to offer that suggestion by way of supplementing the remarks of the hon. member for Perth and the hon. member for Marquette.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I thank the minister for his kindness in promising to look further into the question of the transportation of fertilizers. In that connection may I say one word as representing one of the Prince Edward Island constituencies? As the minister is aware, the products of Prince Edward Island are almost exclusively agricultural, and in the province are found very rich deposits of mussel mud which is excellent as a fertilizer, but owing to the high cost of transportation those deposits are very little used. If this form of fertilizer were extensively used the agricultural products of the Island would be very considerably increased, and I would be pleased if the minister would make a point of paying particular attention to the needs of the Island in that regard. That is only one instance. I think the question of supplying fertilizers to farmers at the lowest possible transportation cost is one that might well constitute a policy which the Government should take up for the entire **Dominion.**

Mr. DENIS: A year or two ago I communicated with the Government railways in an effort to secure a reduction in the freight rate on fertilizer that is being used in the district of Joliette in connection with the growing of tobacco. Generally speaking, it seems to me, it should be the policy of the Government to make effective a general reduction of freight rates on fertilizers all over the country. The more production there is on the farm the more freight there will be for the railways; for each carload of fertilizer that the railways transport, they will receive two or three, sometimes more, carloads of agricultural products. It has been said time and again that railroads have been duplicated in Canada; that we have three transcontinental railroads when we should have not more than two, and so on. There is a great deal of truth in all that, and the only possible way for us to make these railroads pay is to feed them. We feed them by bringing about more agricultural production. This is a very important question for the Government to consider. If the freight rates on fertilizers were generally reduced, the result would be a benefit to the farmer, a benefit to the railroads themselves, and a benefit to the country.

Towards the encouragement of cold storage warehouses for the better preservation and handling of perishable food products, $25,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Some weeks ago a delegation came here from Nova Scotia, consisting of the Provincial Secretary of Agriculture and some of his officers, to press upon the Government the importance of providing cold storage facilities for export shipments of agricultural products from the Maritime Provinces. Will the minister say if the matter has been considered, and if so what decision has been reached?

Mr. TOLMIE: At that time a committee was formed to act with the minister in looking into this matter. We have been investigating the matter through our livestock branch with a view to ascertaining just what supply of cattle there would be for such a plant in the Maritime Provinces. It would be necessary of course, for us to have a sufficient supply of cattle before a plant could be built and conducted at a profit, particularly with an abattoir. The report which I have from the Livestock Commissioner does not indicate that sufficient cattle would be available just now to keep such a plant going. But we are developing to the very best of our ability a co-operative selling plant whereby farmers are encouraged to form co-operative selling associations so that their cattle can be shipped in carload lots, both to Montreal and down into the markets to the South. We hope that by following that policy for a while the supply of livestock in my hon. friend's section of the country will be so increased that it will be sufficient to maintain an abattoir. We have also taken the matter up with the Canadian National Railways and they have the whole subject under consideration. I assure the hon. member that we shall do all we possibly can to get such a plant established. It is a necessity for the farmers in his district, because at present they are very much at the mercy of the buyers. It is the same old story of the Western Canada cattle ranches; you have to sell your cattle in the fall when they are fat, whereas if you had cold storage facilities you would be able to put your beef in there and keep it until you could get a satisfactory price.

Mr. CRERAR: A year ago, if I remember correctly, an appropriation was asked for the erection of a cold storage warehouse in

Montreal. Can the minister say what progress has been made, if any?

Mr. TOLMIE: That plant is under construction, under the direction of the Harbour Commission.

Mr. McKENZIE: Would the minister give us some general idea of the purpose of this vote?

Mr. TOLMIE: This vote is in connection with the administration of the Cold Storage Act. Under this Act we have assisted by subsidy the construction of cold storage plants to the extent of about one-third of cost, on condition that they be available for the use of the public. The subsidies paid have amounted to $699,242.41.

Mr. McKENZIE: What I really meant was whether all the cold storage business in Canada comes under my hon. friend's department. For instance, are bait freezers, which is another system of cold storage, under his department?

Mr. TOLMIE: No, under the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think that the Minister of Marine, in his usual way of getting things shoved off on somebody else, told me the other night that he had nothing to do with cold storage establishments; that they come under the Department of Agriculture. Now that both the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Agriculture are here, I wish to state that I want to get a cold storage plant for bait down in Cape Breton; which of the hon. gentlemen it comes from does not make the slightest difference. The people of that part of the country are suffering very much from want of cold storage for bait. I want to make a serious statement to the minister. In the spring of the year large quantities of small fish travel round the coast. They are not much good for food, but they make splendid bait. But the fishermen have no place to put that bait where it can be preserved; the consequence is that when the schools of fish go by, that supply of bait disappears. Then in the fall, in September, October and on until Christmas, there is splendid cod fishing along the shores, but the difficulty is that the fishermen have no bait. The proper policy would be to have cold storage plants at certain convenient points along the shore to store the bait, and sell it. The fishermen do not want this bait for nothing; they are willing to pay for it, but they are not wealthy enough to have cold storage facilities themselves. If cold storage plants were supplied with competent officers in charge of them and enough was charged for the bait to cover the running expenses, that would be satisfactory. In Newfoundland, I understand, they have not only cold storage warehouses, but steamers supplying the fishermen at different points with bait out of cold storage at certain seasons of the year when they could not get it otherwise. Although we perhaps could not put a boat on the service as is done in Newfoundland, at different points, not only Cape Breton, but all along the coast from Yarmouth to Cape North, there is great necessity for facilities of this kind. I, therefore, urge, not only upon the minister, but upon the Government generally, the great necessity for providing the facilities for which I am asking. At this season of the year millions of pounds of that bait could be caught and conserved; but when there is no way of preserving it, the opportunity is lost; and when great profits could be made by fishermen, you find the fishermen sitting on the shore on a beautiful fishing day with the fish in millions around them, but unable to catch the fish because they have no bait. This is the actual condition of things, and I am not exaggerating. When I appealed to the department before, I was told that there was a certain company at Canso which had some bait stored away, but the company said: Our bait is for ourselves; the storage is our own, and we are not going to give our bait to others. The result was that the fishermen had to go without it. Possibly with some exertion those fishermen might manage to get a place for themselves, but that would take a considerable amount of money, more than the fishermen have.

Mr. TOLMIE: This department has no control over any of those bait cold storage plants. I presume if some of the bait was shipped to any of the plants in which we are interested, it would be accepted for storage. I realize the importance of what the hon. member says as regards having a supply of bait on hand, and I shall be glad to look further into the matter. I have not very full information at present beyond what the hon. member has given me.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is it the Government's policy to grant these subsidies only to warehouses that are erected under the control of some municipal or other public body, or are subsidies granted sometimes to private individuals?

Mr. TOLMIE: At the present time, only to municipalities. The subsidies were cancelled about the beginning of the war, and

I understand no subsidies have been given since.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does the minister think that is the wisest course to pursue? Is it not advantageous to encourage these cold storage places to as large an extent as possible?

Mr. TOLMIE: It may be possible to look into this matter again with a view to taking up the subsidizing of cold storage warehouses in the near future, but up to the present I have not had an opportunity of going fully into that aspect of the case.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have had some correspondence with the minister as regards a cold storage warehouse at Ellerslie, P.E.I. If the minister is looking further into the matter, I should be deeply obliged if he would give some consideration to the people of that particular part of the island. In that connection, there is one representation which I should like to bring to the minister's attention from some of the residents of Ellerslie. They point out, in connection with the cold storage warehouse there, that the company have space not only for storing what is necessary for the public needs, but for storing what is necessary for food for the fox industry. The company seem to be under the impression that because they were supplying space for food for the fox industry, they were thereby losing the opportunity of getting the Government subsidy which would go only to concerns that were supplying public needs generally. The company contend that they are endeavouring to meet those needs, and as regards the fox industry they make an interesting representation which I think is important. This is a letter I have received from two electors in Ellerslie:

> We think the fox industry should have some recognition from the Federal Government, because we believe the Government will receive more income tax from the profits of fox farming than from any other source in this province, and without some means of preserving the food, this industry cannot advance as it otherwise would. If the authorities would reconsider this matter I know they would find out the advantage it would be to the Government to encourage the fur farming industry, which they would be doing, as well as giving valuable assistance to the farmers of this and the surrounding sections by giving a reasonable grant to assist the above-named organization in the erection of their chemical freezing plant.

That seems to be a practical, although a somewhat novel suggestion. The minister will realize that an industry such as the fox industry has become in Prince Edward Island is one that it would be well for the Government to help even in this indirect method.

Mr. MORPHY: Is it fish bait they feed the foxes or what?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall have to ask the Minister of Agriculture to answer that question as I am not an expert on the fox industry.

Mr. TOLMIE: I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the hon. member has said regarding the storing of food for foxes, and this is a matter that might perhaps be looked into a little further. We have not neglected the fox industry altogether. We now have an expert in Prince Edward Island making a very careful study of fox diseases, that work being carried on under the Health of Animals Branch. Another department of the Government is looking into the nutrition of foxes. Fox food down there consists very largely of old horses and meat of that kind, any cheap meat the people can get hold of. I just wish to point out that we have not neglected the industry; we are taking a keen interest in it, and we are anxious indeed to assist any of these young industries that are trying to get a footing and that show prospects of succeeding.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: On further reflection, I remember visiting some of the fox ranches, and one of the things that came forcibly to my notice was the quality of the food these little animals were getting. I was told that to get the better classes of furs, they sometimes feed the foxes with the very best class of meat. If that be the case, if the minister can help along the storage of the food that is necessary, he will be furthering an industry that is already one of the most important, certainly on the Island, if not in the Dominion, and one that may become of increasing importance in the whole Dominion.

Mr. CRERAR: Personally, I have not a great deal of use for subsidies of any kind, and I think the subsidising of private cold storage plants in this country can now very well be discontinued. As the minister has stated, we have given in assistance in this direction something like $700,000. In many cases the result was that the government of the country contributed 30 or 33 per cent of the cost of erecting a cold storage plant, and after the subsidy was earned, the cold storage plant was used entirely for the convenience of the company that promoted and built it, and the benefits to the general public were very slight. There are

in this country cases where private cold storage companies operating in perishable commodities have been able, through the control of cold storage, to exercise a very considerable influence on the price at which they sold their commodities. Cold storage is a thing that might very well be municipally developed, and in cases where a cold storage plant is erected in this way and any merchant or dealer can secure his allotment of space, I think the department might very well be warranted in giving assistance; but the giving of assistance for the development of cold storage plants for private companies, who, after they have earned the subsidy utilize the storage entirely for their own benefit, is a different matter, and I do not think the country would be warranted in expending more money in that direction.

The fox industry in Prince Edward Island is a growing industry, and I have no doubt a very profitable one in view of the rising price of furs. If I might offer a suggestion to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) it would be this, that the fox farmers might very well practise and apply the principles of co-operation in respect to supplying themselves with the necessary storage facilities and that sort of thing for the carrying on of their industry, which the farmers of Western Canada have successfully practised in respect to the selling of grain. Self-help is the best kind of help, and if a group of farmers engaged in the fur-producing industry can get together and provide the facilities that are necessary to them in common for the carrying on of the industry, it is infinitely better for them and infinitely better for the country, than if that is done through government assistance. In the development of sound co-operative enterprise in my judgment is found the safest road for the development of an industry, as well as the development of self-reliance and confidence on the part of those engaged in it.

Fruit Branch, $140,000.

Mr. CRERAR: Perhaps the minister would give us an explanation of the increase in this item.

Mr. TOLMIE: The increase is due largely to increased cost of transportation for employees, and partly to the facilities that I have already referred to regarding cold storage and the shipment of fruit under cold storage conditions.

Health of animals, $500,000.

[Mr. Crerar.]

Mr. McKENZIE: Some time ago I was making inquiry about the shipment of cattle from the port of North Sydney to Newfoundland and other points. We have no veterinary inspector at North Sydney, and I understand that before these cattle are permitted to be put on board ship, they must be inspected. There is a veterinary at Sydney, a very competent man, but Sydney is seventeen miles away from us by land and five miles by water. The port of North Sydney is open very much later in the year than Sydney, and open earlier in the spring; so boats come round to North Sydney for loads of cattle. At present the inspector has to come seventeen miles from Sydney to do the inspecting, and that has been found very inconvenient. I do not want to interfere in any way with Dr. Thurston's employment or his salary. He is a returned soldier and a deserving man in every sense, but I think he has enough to do in the great city of Sydney and the town of Glace Bay and other places where he works for the Government, and as we have a veterinary in the town of North Sydney I think it would be better if a man who was right on the spot, and who could immediately inspect these cattle, was appointed. It is very inconvenient to have to wait for this inspection, sometimes the steamers are held up, and at other times they will not wait. I have been trying to get this difficulty remedied for some time by having an inspector located at the port of North Sydney.

Mr. TOLMIE: I am glad my hon. friend has brought that to my attention. I understand, however, that the shipments from there are very small, and that it would hardly pay to maintain a man on a salary at that point, but we might look into the advisability of having a local man do what inspecting is required and pay him by fees. I will make a note of it and see what can be done.

Mr. McKENZIE: The shipments are not so very small. The Railway Department, after a good deal of fighting, have put up very large sheds and provided proper accommodation for the protection of these cattle. I would like to see the man who does this work paid properly, and I am sure it would not cost so very much. I am not asking that he be given a fixed salary, but it could be so arranged that he would be paid for every shipment he examined. The veterinary in North Sydney, Mr. George Coleman, would be able to do this work very well, if the minister would make an arrangement with him. I am speaking

more in the interest of the trade than in the interest of any individual who might be appointed, but I should be very glad to see this young doctor appointed as inspector there. He is a college graduate and he could do the work very well. I am sure the minister could make an arrangement with him that would not be very expensive and that would facilitate shipments very much.

For the administration and enforcement of the Meat and Canned Foods Act, $520,000.

Mr. PEDLOW: Why is this not under the Department of Health? I see on the next page, by item No. 61, that the administration of the Act regarding fertilizers, is under the Department of Health. I think these two items should be transposed.

Mr. TOLMIE: We are expecting to take over the administration of the Act respecting fertilizers at a very early date. With regard to the inspection of meat and canned foods, these are products of the farm. The meats are slaughtered in abattoirs under the inspection of veterinarians by the Health of Animals Branch. This is one of the branches of the Agricultural Department. I think it is quite proper that the inspection should be under the Department of Agriculture, because in the first place we are dealing with agricultural products, and secondly, the work is carried out by a profession that is very closely allied with agricultural matters.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the explanation of the increase in this item?

Mr. TOLMIE: It is explained by the increasing volume of business, and by the fact that we have had to engage more men to carry on this work.

Mr. DENIS: I notice by the Auditor General's Report that the amount spent on this work last year was $360,836.49. An increase to $520,000 appears to me very large.

Mr. TOLMIE: I think my hon. friend is giving the figures for the year before last.

Mr. DENIS: That is correct. Is the Government receiving any return from the enforcement of this Act, or is it all expenditure and no revenue?

Mr. TOLMIE: In carrying on the inspection of these meats we are rendering service to the whole public. We have to meet competition from the United States and the Argentine in the markets of Great Britain. In the United States this inspection is paid for by the Government. In our packing houses the packers pay for the overtime. If they keep an inspector for three or four hours or oblige him to work on a holiday, they pay the extra charge. When this matter was under discussion a little while ago, we came to the conclusion, after an investigation, that it would not be judicious to place the packers in this country at a disadvantage in competing with the United States, the Argentine and Great Britain.

International Institute of Agriculture, to assist in maintenance thereof and to provide for representation thereat, $10,000.

Mr. PARDEE: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. TOLMIE: This is our contribution to the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome. This institute has its headquarters at Rome, and its object is to gather information in regard to agriculture from various parts of the world. By subscribing to it we are able to keep in close touch with the world's agriculture and to apply the information which we receive in that way to the benefit of the farmers in this country.

Mr. MORPHY: Who is in charge of that institute?

Mr. TOLMIE: Mr. Doherty is the Canadian representative.

For the development of the livestock industry, $900,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is understood that the minister would allow two or three items to remain over for discussion on a subsequent occasion. There are only a couple of items of his Estimates left now and I think he might let them stand.

Mr. TOLMIE: If we let one stand it would serve your purpose.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my hon. friend had better hold this one; it is one of the largest.

Mr. TOLMIE: Very well.

To enforce the Seed Act, to test seed for farmers and seed merchants, to encourage the production and use of superior seeds and to encourage the production of farm and garden crops, $225,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is an increase of $25,000 here; perhaps the minister would explain the reason.

Mr. TOLMIE: We have opened a new seed laboratory in Winnipeg, and there are also increased expenses that are affecting all departments this year. This is perhaps one of the most important branches in the whole department. I think I explained

this afternoon that it handled seed during the war through what is known as the Seed Commission created to meet the situation during the war period. It handled over $12,000,000 worth of business, showing a small profit on running expenses.

Mr. CRERAR: There is an item on page 8 which has to do with the Agricultural Department—item 15—and which I think we might dispose of to-night.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That item relates to civil government. We have not yet had the details in regard to civil government, and I might take advantage of this opportunity to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that we expect to get detailed information in regard to the Civil Service classification before going on with civil government Estimates.

Mr. DOHERTY: We hope to be in a position to furnish that information soon.

Mr. TOLMIE: I think we had better take up resolution 139 on page 38:

Experimental Farms—New buildings and improvements, renewals and repairs, etc., in connection with existing buildings, fittings, etc.	$200,000 00
Flags for Dominion public buildings	5,000 00
Dominion public buildings—Generally	30,000 00
Royal Canadian Mounted Police buildings	500,000 00

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This resolution is divided into four items. I think it had better stand; it has reference to the Royal Mounted Police.

Mr. CAHILL: What are the buildings referred to here?

Mr. TOLMIE: As the item says, it is for new buildings, improvements, renewals and repairs to old buildings on all farms.

Mr. CAHILL: Have you the totals for the different farms?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes. They are: Central Farm, $53,235; Charlottetown, $6,450; Kentville, $8,600; Nappan, $6,500; Fredericton, $5,500; St. Anne de la Pocatière, $8,750; Cap Rouge, $15,250; Lennoxville, $9,200; Morden, $9,150; Brandon, $12,900; Indian Head, $3,700; Rosthern, $5,600; Scott, $5,100; Lethbridge, $16,065; Lacombe, $5,400; Summerland, $17,150; Invermere, $1,950; Agassiz, $3,200; and Sydney, $6,300.

First item agreed to, resolution stands.

Resolutions reported.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

[Mr. Tolmie.]

Monday, May 17, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1920.

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting further Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1920, was presented by Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

HONEY BILL.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): On behalf of Hon. Mr. Rowell, I beg to move:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House has agreed to the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 29, an Act respecting Honey, with an amendment to their amendment as adopted by the House on the 12th instant.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT, 1919, AMENDMENT.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 135, to amend the Railway Act, 1919.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. J. D. REID: Mr. Speaker, section 6 of the Act to amend the Railway Act, passed at the last session, provided that any railway under provincial jurisdiction which was leased or operated by another road wholly or partly within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada should be regarded as a work for the general advantage of Canada and therefore subject to the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners. This clause was inserted to cover the case of the Quebec Central Railway which, being part of the Canadian Pacific Railway system, was under provincial as well as Dominion jurisdiction. We found afterwards that that clause had been so worded as to have the effect of taking in street railway lines, electric suburban railways and tramways constructed under the authority of a provincial legislature. This Bill proposes to place these electric lines again under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government. If I read the main clause of the Bill its purpose will be explained:

Section 6 of the Railway Act, 1919, is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

2. The provisions of clause (c) of section 6 of the Railway Act, 1919, shall be deemed not to include or apply to any street railway, elec-

tric suburban railway or tramway constructed under the authority of a provincial legislature and which has not been declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada otherwise than by the provisions of the said clause.

This is merely to place such lines again under provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. BUREAU: Will the minister read the section as it read before?

Mr. J. D. REID: Well, I have not the section before me at the moment.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Is there any provision in this Bill for extending the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission in regard to telephone companies? A provision to that effect was left out of the previous legislation. It was introduced in this House, but defeated in the other.

Mr. J. D. REID: No.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 128 (Letter J3 of the Senate), for the relief of Francis Charles Dean.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 129 (Letter K3 of the Senate), for the relief of John James Garrison.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 130 (Letter L3 of the Senate), for the relief of Dora Lumsden MacLaurin.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 132 (Letter U2 of the Senate), respecting The Army and Navy Veterans in Canada.—Mr. Blake.

Bill No. 133 (Letter H3 of the Senate), for the relief of Edith Sarah Bell.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 134 (Letter I3 of the Senate), for the relief of Albert Graham Elson.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CIVIL SERVICE CLASSIFICATION.

Mr. PREVOST:

1. In the re-classification of the Civil Service, have the so-called American experts and the Civil Service Commission taken into account the actual cost of living in fixing the salaries of the civil servants?

2. If so, have their estimations been verified adequately and justly?

3. If not, is the work done by the so-called experts and the Civil Service Commission to be modified and readjusted as regards the salaries?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. Yes.

2. Yes. The recommendations of the Civil Service Commission have been approved by the Government, thoroughly investigated and endorsed by special committees of the House of Commons and Senate and finally authorized by the Civil Service Amendment Act of 1919, passed 10th November last.

3. The Civil Service Act provides, section 42 (2), that "The Commission shall hereafter, as it may from time to time deem necessary, establish additional classes and grades and classify therein new positions created or established in the said classification, and may divide, combine, alter, or abolish existing classes and grades."

Subsection (1) of the same section provides that the classes of positions shall "include the several rates of compensation." The Civil Service Commission has power, therefore, to "modify and readjust" the salary schedules and submit the same for the approval of the Governor in Council.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

How much does it cost per mile to haul a car on the Canadian National railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: I answered this the other day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood that the minister explained why he could not answer the question, but I thought the question should stand with a view to the hon. member revising it.

Mr. CAHILL: A private car or passenger car?

Hon. Mr. REID: I cannot give any other answer than that which I gave to this question the other day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Answered.

MR. PHILIPPE BOUCHER.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Has Philippe Boucher, of Charny, railway conductor on the Intercolonial railway, who was arrested for theft of merchandise from the Grand Trunk railway in Montreal last fall, and found guilty, been reinstated in his former position?

2. If so, how long after his offence was he reinstated?

3. At whose request was he reinstated?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. He was not arrested for stealing from the Grand Trunk railway, but he was arrested by a Grand Trunk railway police-

man for having in his possession blankets belonging to Canadian Government railways. He has since been reinstated.

2. Twenty-six days.

3. At the request of the General Superintendent after he had thoroughly investigated the matter and found that Boucher was not attempting to steal.

VESSELS UNDER RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton):

1. How many boats are under control of the Railway Commission as regards rates, tolls, tariff agreements and arrangements?

2. What are the names of the vessels, the dead weight tonnage of each and the routes over which they run?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Board of Railway Commissioners has not the definite information that would enable it to reply to this question. The tariffs filed, in conformity with Sections 336 and 358 of the Railway Act, do not show the names of the steamers nor their tonnage, nor does the Act call for this information.

2. See answer to number 1.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION STAFF.

Mr. FRIPP:

1. Are there any male persons of military age employed in the offices of the Civil Service Commission who were eligible for service overseas and who did not enlist for such service?

2. If so, what are their names and date of appointment?

3. Why are they retained?

4. Have any appointments been made to the said department of young men who did not see service, between the ages of twenty and thirty-five years, since the 1st of November, 1918?

5. If so, how many?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. Yes.

2. J. W. Bourbonnas, 15th July, 1918; W. B. Cole, transferred to Civil Service Commission, April 1, 1920; S. J. Daley, 30th September, 1908; C. V. Putman, November 15th, 1918; A Thivierge, transferred to Civil Service Commission, February, 1920.

3. Being all married men with families these were not liable for military service although eligible, and the Civil Service Commission is not aware of any reason why they should not be retained in the public service.

4. Yes.

5. Four.

BANKRUPTCY ACT—TRUSTEES.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Government determined its policy regarding the appointment of trustees under the new Bankruptcy Act, 1919?

2. If so, what is it?

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

MR. PUTMAN.

Mr. COPP:

1. Is there an official connected with the Civil Service Commission named Putman?

2. If so, does he hold a responsible position of an advisory or directory character?

3. What is said position?

4. Beyond an academic examination, has he any qualifications in the nature of practical experience in handling or supervising large bodies of officials?

5. If so, what special qualifications?

6. What is his age?

7. What is his salary?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. Yes.

2. Appointed Assistant Chief, Organization Branch in March, 1920.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. Yes.

5. Graduate civil engineer, eight years' banking experience, six years of engineering experience, during such period had direction of as many as three hundred men, one year and a half with the Civil Service Commission on classification work, one year as acting chief. Obtained highest standing on Civil Service open competitive examination held in October, 1919, for the position of Chief, Organization Branch, with a percentage of 86.3 per cent.

6. 32 years.

7. $255 a month.

PURCHASES BY GREECE AND ROUMANIA.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Were the goods bought from different corporations or commercial firms in Canada, with the credits granted by the Canadian Government to Greece and Roumania, purchased after tenders were called?

2. What person or persons purchased these goods for Greece and Roumania?

3. Has any Government employee taken part in the purchase of these goods? If so, who is or who are these employees, and in what department are they employed?

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The bulk of the purchases made by the Greek Government were surplus stores belonging to the Militia Department. The prices fixed by the War Purchasing Commission were submitted to the Greek Government and the decision to buy was made by their representative.

In the case of the leather, cloth, and other materials bought by the Greeks, tenders were called and submitted to the representatives of the Greek Government who made the final decision to purchase.

With reference to the purchases made by Roumania, these were made direct by the Roumanian representatives from representatives of Canadian firms in London. These orders were passed to the Canadian Trade Commission who gave an opportunity to the whole trade concerned to participate in the order.

2. The respective representatives of the Greek and Roumanian Governments.

3. In all cases the decision to purchase was made by the representative of the Government of Greece and Roumania and not by any Government employee.

ENTERPRISE FOUNDRY COMPANY.

Mr. BUREAU:

1. What amount of money was paid by the Enterprise Foundry Company of Sackville, N.B., for the 95 tons of cast iron which were shipped from the Ross Rifle factory of Quebec, to the said Enterprise Foundry Company?

2. Who was the money paid to, and who fixed the price to be paid?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. $2,543.25.

2. (a) Receiver General; (b) Assistant Commissioner.

CAMPBELLTON-GROSS POINT INTERPROVINCIAL FERRY.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Has the contract for the Interprovincial Ferry over the Restigouche river, between Campbellton, N.B., and Gross Point, Quebec, been awarded?

2. If so, to whom, and on what conditions?

3. Who were the tenderers, and what were their respective tenders?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Awarded but contract not yet signed.

2. (a) To John Quinn, the only tenderer who was qualified to carry out the conditions; (b) Supply a suitable boat propelled by steam. Ferry to run daily (Sundays excepted) from 6 a.m. to 8 p.m. at half hour intervals except for six hours during the day when only one round trip will be required in the hour. Tariff: Two horse cart or conveyance with driver, each way, 40 cents; one horse, cart or conveyance, each way, 30 cents; one automobile, each way, 30 cents; one horse, each way, 10 cents; each head horned cattle, each way, 10 cents; each head sheep or swine, each way, 5 cents; each passenger, each way, 5 cents; every hundred pounds of freight, 4 cents. Ferry to be placed on service by 1st May; license for five years, and license to give two sureties for $500 jointly. The department reserves the right to reject the boat if found unsuitable or unsafe; to modify the maximum tariff if deemed expedient, etc. The licensee also to carry over without fee all militiamen, soldiers or sailors when provided with passports or under charge of their proper officer. Licensee has power to commute passenger rates, and to keep tables of rates and sailings placed in a conspicuous place and on board of boat.

3. Robert L. Sinclair, $350 per annum; Richard K. Murray, $250 per annum; Frank J. Allard, $70 per annum; John Quinn, $10 per annum.

When contract was offered to Mr. Sinclair, he informed the department that he could not provide a boat. The others were asked to operate ferry in accordance with terms of their tender; Mr. Murray did not reply; Mr. Allard would use a scow until he could provide a boat within two months; such arrangement not being satisfactory, the contract was awarded to Mr. Quinn.

CAPTAIN PERCY FLYNN.

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. Has Captain Percy Flynn been officially appointed by the Department of Militia adjutant of the 22nd Regiment of the Permanent Force at Quebec?

2. If so, what was the nature of his services in France with the 22nd, or other unit?

3. If he has not been appointed, is it true that an order of the headquarters of the Expeditionary Force in England, sent to officers commanding the reserves, amongst others to the 10th Reserve where Captain Flynn was adjutant, to the effect that the adjutants of Reserves should have seen service in France in order to be maintained in their position, or to be put on the general list of officers fit for service in France and subject to reduction in rank if necessary, and in the event of failure to conform to said orders, such officers were to be returned to Canada and placed at the disposal of the Adjutant-General?

4. Did Captain Flynn agree to go to France in accordance with said orders, or did he prefer to return to Canada and accept an appointment similar to the one he had in England, with the First Depot Battalion, 2nd Regiment of Quebec, at Quebec?

5. If so, were there not, on the list of the Department of Militia, officers having seen service in France with the 22nd Battalion and who had made application, and were qualified and well recommended, to be appointed, adjutants of the 22nd Regiment of the Permanent Force?

6. How many officers, having seen service in France with the 22nd Battalion, have applied to serve with the Permanent Force of Canada?

7. If Captain Percy Flynn had no service in France, and if he returned to Canada under the conditions mentioned in question No. 3, after a number of years in England, is it the intention of the Government to continue him as adjutant of the 22nd, or will the Department of Militia consider the appointment of a former officer of the 22nd, having had service on the firing line in France, as adjutant?

8. Is it the policy of the Government and the Department of Militia to give a preference

to officers having had service in France who desire to serve in the Permanent Force of Canada, or are all officers placed on the same footing as those who have only seen service in England, Canada or in Siberia?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. The appointment of Captain Percy Flynn as adjutant of the 22nd Regiment is in a draft gazette dated the 29th April, which has been submitted to the Privy Council for approval.

2. He did not see service in France.

3. This officer was appointed a lieutenant in the 57th Overseas Battalion in May, 1915, and received promotion to the rank of captain on appointment as adjutant on the 19th January, 1916. He proceeded overseas on the 2nd June, 1916. During his period of service overseas he held the following appointments: Transferred to the 69th Battalion, 8th June, 1916; appointed assistant adjutant, 21st June, 1916; appointed adjutant, 1st July, 1916; transferred to the 10th Reserve Battalion, 4th January, 1917; appointed adjutant, 8th January, 1917, which appointment he relinquished on the 29th April, 1918, to return to Canada. The services of Captain Flynn were specially applied for by the General Officer Commanding Military District No. 5, Quebec, in February, 1918, as an experienced officer was necessary to undertake the duties of adjutant of the 1st Depot Battalion, 2nd Quebec Regiment, Quebec, and Captain Flynn was considered to be the best officer for the appointment. His return to Canada was, therefore, approved, and he reported for duty on the 22nd May, 1918. He was subsequently appointed to the Canadian Expeditionary Force (Siberia) and served in Siberia from December, 1918, to May, 1919, as a company commander.

4. It is true that officers were called upon to revert to the rank of lieutenant to proceed to France, and the records show that Captain Flynn, on the 25th October, 1917, applied to revert accordingly, and that he was compulsorily retained until he could be suitably replaced as adjutant of the 10th Reserve Battalion by a French Canadian overseas casualty. The records further show that these conditions prevailed until the return of Captain Flynn to Canada was approved by special request referred to in paragraph 3. Under the circumstances, it was not considered that his lack of service in France should debar him from permanent military employment.

5. A list of applicants for appointment to the 22nd Regiment, a number of whom served with the 22nd Overseas Battalion in France, is on file in the department.

6. Twenty-five applications for appointment to the permanent force have been received from officers who served with the 22nd Battalion in France.

7. This department concurred in the appointment of Captain Flynn as adjutant of the 22nd Regiment owing to the special requests and recommendations of Lieutenant-Colonel H. Chasse, D.S.O., M.C., and of the General Officer Commanding Military District No. 5, after consideration of the names of all officers who had applied, and having regard to his excellent qualifications for the appointment, this department sees no reason for making any change, providing Captain Flynn continues to prove himself an efficient officer as in the past.

8. The policy of the department has been, when possible, to make selections to fill permanent force vacancies from officers who have seen service in active theatres of operations during the late war, having due regard to their qualifications and the nature of the appointments for which they are required.

[Mr. Marcile.]

GERMAN AND AUSTRIAN IMPORTS.

Mr. RINFRET:

1. What was the amount of imports from Germany and Austria during the year 1919?

2. What was the total amount of said imports for the first three months of 1920?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1.

From Germany	$14,041
From Austria	779
Total	$14,820

2.

From Germany	$30,223
From Austria	48,944
Total	$79,167

INQUIRY RE QUESTION.

Mr. DEVLIN: Was question 32, which is a very simple one and one which could be answered readily, answered?

Mr. SPEAKER: Question 32 stands.

Hon. Mr. REID: I must get the information from the Canadian Pacific Railway and I have not the information as yet.

Mr. DEVLIN: As I read the question, the information would come from the Post Office Department.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any reference to the answering of questions should be on the Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. HAY:

1. What are the working hours of the civil servants in the Inside Service, stenographers, clerks and others?

2. Are these hours strictly observed?

3. What salaries are stenographers, clerks and others receiving? That is, the average generally, also average bonus?

Mr. ANDREWS:

1. How many married women whose husbands did not serve in the Canadian Expeditionary Force are in the pay of various Government departments at Ottawa?

2. Is it a fact that the Department of Immigration has in its employ a lady at a salary of $300 per month?

3. Is this lady the wife or mother of a returned soldier, and was any effort made at the time of her employment to secure the services of a war widow or dependent?

4. Is this lady's husband in the employ of the Government or of one of the Provincial Governments?

5. Is it a fact that the daughters of several departmental heads are employed by their fathers in Government service and that in many such cases these young ladies hold positions which could be well filled with men who have been trained by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment for the Civil Service, but are unable to secure appointments?

Mr. COPP:

1. Did the steamship Metagama sail from Liverpool carrying soldiers and their families on or about the eighth day of February, A.D. 1919?

2. If so, were any complaints made to the Militia Department or any other department of the Government as to the condition of said steamer at time of sailing and during said voyage?

3. Were any complaints made to the Government or any department thereof as to the treatment accorded to said soldiers, their wives or families during said voyage?

4. Did a delegation from the city of St. John appear before a committee of the Cabinet on or about the 27th day of February, 1919, protesting against alleged ill-treatment of said soldiers and their families during the said voyage?

5. If so, who comprised said delegation and what members of the Government acted on said Cabinet committee?

6. Did the Government take any action as a result of said conference? If so, what action and what was the result of same?

7. Did said delegation file affidavits or solemn declarations of passengers as to the condition of the steamer and treatment accorded said passengers during said voyage?

8. If so, did the Government hold an investigation concerning said complaints?

9. What was the result of such investigation?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. DUFF:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports, documents and other correspondence between the Post Office Department, the Post Office Inspector at Halifax, and any person at Vogler's Cove, Nova Scotia, regarding complaints in connection with the manner in which post office matters are conducted at the said Vogler's Cove.

DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT.

The House resumed from May 12, consideration in committee of Bill No. 12 (Hon. Mr. Guthrie) respecting the election of members of the House of Commons and the Electoral Franchise.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When progress was reported upon this Bill on Wednesday last, paragraph (k) of clause 2, clauses 32, 63 and 101 had been allowed to stand. All of the other clauses had been agreed to with the exception of clauses 19 and 76, which cannot be adopted until the House has concurred in the required money resolution. Clause 32 had been discussed at length and was still before the committee. Shall clause 32 carry?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Since this matter was last before the committee I have had the benefit of a conference with some of my hon. friends opposite with regard to clause 32, in an effort to carry out, if possible, the suggestions made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), and other hon. gentlemen opposite. As a result of that conference, I have prepared certain amendments to clause 32, which amendments will, I think, generally speaking, pretty fully meet the suggestions made, although perhaps not in every case to the letter. If the amendments prepared to clause 32 are adopted, the result will be briefly this. In any province of Canada where there is a provincial voters' list not more than two years old, that list shall be adopted as the basis of the Dominion franchise. In cities, towns and villages, or in what are known as urban polling divisions, the procedure laid down in schedule A to the Bill as drawn, will be very nearly followed, there being a few minor amendments to schedule A. But in all rural polling divisions the procedure has been somewhat changed. The provincial list, if not more than two years old, will be accepted as final and complete for rural polling subdivisions, with two provisions, first, that a person may still apply under section 63 of the Act to be added on election day and may vote; second, that a person who is not on the provincial polling list may apply to the revising officer of an urban division in the same electoral district to have his name added, and the revising officer is given power to add that name and to notify the

returning officer that the name has been added to the list. Therefore, there will be a double remedy to anybody who has been left off the provincial list and who is a resident of a rural polling division. First, he may go to the poll on election day, be vouched for by two electors who can swear to his qualifications, obtain his ballot and vote. Secondly, he need not wait for election day; he can go directly to the revising officer, have his case determined and have his name added to the list. There is this further provision, that if the revising officer refuses to add his name, after hearing and inquiring into the case, that man shall not subsequently on polling day be entitled to go to the poll and swear himself on. If he does that, we have provided a penalty. The committee will note that the result is this. In a city, town or village, or in a division having cities, towns or villages, the procedure is unchanged and schedule A will prevail. In rural divisions, the procedure is radically changed where there are provincial voters' lists. If there be in existence in any province no provincial voters' lists of less than two years of age since last finally revised and completed, the whole list shall be made in both rural and urban divisions, in urban divisions under schedule A, and in rural divisions under schedule B. This matter was discussed at the conference which we held on Thursday last, and the proposals seemed to meet with the approval of those present. I have heard that one or two minor objections have since been raised, but the amendments which I have now the honour of moving have been drawn on the basis which I have just outlined. They will involve a considerable amendment to both the schedules of section 32 and a slight amendment to section 33.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What will be the machinery for adding the names of women who are not on the provincial lists in the province of Quebec?

Mr. GUTHRIE: They will go on either by application to the revising officer or by application to the deputy returning officer on polling day. I appreciate the point raised by my hon. friend. Personally, I favoured the old arrangement whereby a rural register would be appointed and would see that all the women as well as the men who were entitled to vote were put on the list, thereby avoiding unnecessary expense. It was put to me most squarely on the ground that where there are lists it would be an unnecessary expense to appoint enumerators throughout Canada for rural polling divisions when you had these two safety valves—section 63, as well as an application to the judge. Under the amendment as now proposed women or men who are not on the provincial list will have to apply in either one of the two ways I have indicated.

Mr. DENIS: I have listened with great interest to the minister's explanation of the amendments. While I have every confidence in the members who assisted the minister in drafting these amendments, I must say that it is hard to appreciate offhand their significance under the new conditions. In the province of Quebec all the women will have to be placed on the list. In the rural divisions they can have their names put on the list, under this new amendment, by applying to the returning officer. How long is he going to sit?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Five days.

Mr. DENIS: How many revising officers will there be for each constituency?

Mr. GUTHRIE: In every urban division there will be one registrar up to a population of 4,000, and an additional registrar for each additional 4,000. Under 1,000, of course, it is a rural division. One revising officer is appointed for each electoral list. He is the county judge and has power to appoint as many additional as may be necessary.

Mr. DENIS: It seems, then, that the women will be obliged to travel a long distance to have their names registered.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They will have to travel to the poll in any event, and they can vote on polling day without going to the judge.

Mr. DENIS: The difficulty will be this. There will be 300 electors to each poll. Now it has been said, and with good reason, that it is rather hard to poll 300 votes in one day in one division, though it can probably be done when all the machinery has been set in order in advance; but if every woman voter has to bring along two witnesses on polling day who will prove that she has a right to vote, that procedure will take some time, and I submit that it will be absolutely impossible for all the women to vote within the time set, on account of the unavoidable delay which this procedure will entail. I think that objection should strike the mind of the minister. It is easy to calculate how many minutes each person will have to vote when 300 voters have to vote within a certain time, and a calculation will show that the time allowed for each is very limited. There are

bound to be periods during the day when no voters are coming forward, and if there is a crowd of women coming to be sworn in at the end of the day, it will be absolutely impossible for them all to vote under the procedure I have mentioned.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I was of the same opinion as my hon. friend. I preferred the Bill as originally drawn, but these amendments have been drawn to meet the objections of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) and my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau), who pointed out that in cities in the province of Quebec the lists were prepared only once in two years. I do not hink it is possible to meet every suggestion, or to meet everybody's convenience. You cannot grant just as much convenience as you would like in a matter of this kind. The voters have to put themselves out some. However, I do not anticipate even in the case as stated by my hon. friend, that there would be very great difficulty in polling all the votes. A ten-hour day for 300 voters would allow each voter two minutes each, which is more than the average voter takes. Then as a rule they do not all vote. The voters have also another way of getting their names put on the list, by going to the judge, and that would no doubt be done by those who found it convenient to do so. I think that the greater number of those who applied to the deputy returning officer on polling day would be able to vote. I do not mean to say that this is a perfect scheme, but it is the best we have been able to evolve.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton): May I ask the minister to give his reasons for not having an up-to-date list in the rural districts as well as in the cities?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Under these proposals it will be just as up-to-date in the rural districts as in the city districts. If there is a provincial voters' list not more than two years old, it will be adopted, and there is power to add to or strike off that list.

Mr. FIELDING: The revising officer is a judge?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes. That would be an up-to-date list. As the Bill was drawn, there was no provision for a revision in the country; it was considered that it would involve too much trouble, because people would have to come to the cities, and it might involve too much work for the revising officer. It was thought that if you adopted the provincial list and gave the individual the right to apply personally to get on that list, or to go to the polls on polling day and be sworn in and vote, you would have an up-to-date list for people who desired to vote, at all events.

Mr. ROSS: In Quebec the names of women are not on the provincial lists, whereas in Ontario they have been put on the lists. I was not at the conference on Thursday, but as I understand the proposed amendment, application has to be made in person, to the revising officer to be put on the list. Am I right?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I gave you a copy of the amendment. I do not remember the precise wording at the moment.

Mr. ROSS: It does not absolutely say so in so many words. I have not had much time to study it carefully, but I think that is the effect. That was not the case under the Bill as originally drawn.

Mr. GUTHRIE: To apply in person to the revising officer.

Mr. ROSS: If it does, I can make the suggestion more pointed. Under the Bill as introduced a voter was entitled to be put on the list by the registrar upon the evidence of a credible person; that was the proposal until this amendment was suggested.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Have you any objection to that being followed out?

Mr. ROSS: As far as the revising officer is concerned?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, to the Bill as originally drafted.

Mr. ROSS: Yes, because there is no appeal to the registrar. If it was right to have the registrar, who is to some extent a partisan officer—I do not care what government is in power, whether Liberal or Tory—put on the list a voter on representations made to him by a credible person, why, should it not be right for a judicial officer, without asking the personal appearance of that person, to put on the list the name of a man or woman on similar evidence being offered to him? If the argument was strong in that case, and the original Act was right, it surely would be stronger in this case when the revision is being made by a judicial officer.

I may say that I was not at the conference on Thursday. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) has gone a long way and has been very generous in this whole matter. But under the amendment he suggests applying to the province of Ontario, this sit-

uation arises. As the law of the province now stands, lists are prepared for October, 1919, and if the two-year limitation is left in the Act as it is—and I have no objection to that—on the 20th of October, 1921, there will be no provincial list available, and under the suggested amendment of my hon. friend on the 20th of October, 1921, we in the province of Ontario will have to revert to this very thing that we are eliminating for two years. Well, if it is good to eliminate the appointment of registrars and the expense attendant thereon for two years, it is good to eliminate them after the two years.

I suggested to my hon. friend this morning an amendment along these lines, drafted by Mr. Biggar, and I think he will be able to work it in properly.

If in the province of Ontario—

This would apply after two years had gone by. I think it should be made to apply now generally.

—no lists have been prepared and completed as aforesaid,—

That is, within two years.

—but municipal lists are required by law to be annually prepared and to include all persons who could be entitled to vote under this Act at the date of their preparation, the last of such lists shall be used as the voters' list for such election—

What does that mean? I suggest that the municipal lists in Ontario as prepared by the municipal authorities under the provincial laws, and which are prepared every year and include the names of all persons who are entitled to vote under this Act, shall be the basis of the Dominion Elections Act; but there shall be added thereto and subtracted therefrom the names which should be added thereto or subtracted therefrom under this Act in the manner my hon. friend has suggested in his amendment. But if he will not concur in that, I would suggest that he put in the Act the amendment that has been drafted just casually—I do not say it is agreed to or anything like that—by Mr. Biggar to the effect I have mentioned. Because if he does not do that by October, 1921—although we will have complete municipal lists which will be almost man for man and woman for woman the last lists we want for Dominion purposes—in the province of Ontario we are thrown back on the appointment of registrars to prepare new lists at a cost of half a million dollars a year. As I say, if it is good up to 1921 it is good after 1921, and I would ask my hon. friend in all fairness and as a matter of economy to have that suggested amendment made.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton): Is it not a fact that the municipal lists in Ontario are based upon a property qualification? How could you make use of that?

Mr. ROSS: Under the Bill introduced by Premier Drury and which is before the Ontario Legislature at the present time,—and which, I have no doubt, will be passed before this Parliament rises—the system of making up the municipal lists is being entirely changed. At the time of the last election the enumeration system was adopted and found to work very unsatisfactorily, thousands of men being left off the lists and the expense being very heavy, over $500,000, as I pointed out the other day. But the Ontario Government is now passing a law that every man and woman twenty-one years of age shall be put on the assessment roll, and the assessment roll is made the basis of the voters' list, consequently the voters' list prepared by the municipality are just as complete a basis as can possibly be secured for federal election.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton): But that Bill may be changed in the same way as this Bill has been changed; it has not passed the Legislature yet.

Mr. ROSS: That is true; but even if it is changed, all that will mean will be that the revising officer will have a little more work to do—a few more names to add; it cannot mean anything else.

Mr. FIELDING: With regard to the Nova Scotia lists about which there was some controversy, I am glad to be able to say that the proposals made by the hon. minister (Mr. Guthrie) go very far to remove the objections which I ventured to offer. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that I tried to picture the Nova Scotia lists as so safe and sound that they could be accepted in their entirety. The Bill departed from them in two points. In urban districts it provided for an appeal to the county judge, which is retained in the Bill as it now stands. While I thought that was unnecessary, I have no objection. Our chief difficulty, however, was in regard to the rural lists; there it was proposed that the Nova Scotia lists under the provincial law should be revised by officials called registrars. I am glad to note that the minister, for various reasons, one being the large expense throughout the Dominion, has withdrawn the provision regarding registrars. He has

retained, however, this safeguard, that if there are any persons who feel that they have been improperly left off the Nova Scotia lists, they shall have the right to appear at the polls and by there swearing on qualify themselves. As I have already said, I do not like the idea of a man swearing himself on the list on election day. However, the minister has guarded that by the amendment that he has made, and I do not think there is any very serious objection to be urged now. I want to say with regard to elimination of the registrars, that the minister has gone a long way to meet our wishes, and I hope on other grounds we will be able to come to an understanding. On the Quebec and Ontario lists I must refrain from expressing any opinion, because I have not given so much attention to those as to the lists of my own province.

Mr. ARTHURS: In all Franchise Acts at present, both provincial and Dominion, special provision is made for the unorganized districts in any province. According to this Act no special provision is made so far as I have been able to discover. I would point out to the minister in charge of the Bill that lists two years old are as a rule absolutely useless in an unorganized territory. The ordinary voters in a mining or lumbering district almost entirely change in the course of two years, and this mode of preparation as suggested by the amendment would practically annul all such lists. There is also this to be considered, that in many cases these lists being in existence, polls will be held in subdivisions where there will be absolutely no voters at the time of the election. On the other hand, the men who had been voters in those polling divisions will have moved to some other part of the constituency, or to another constituency, in which they would have no chance to be placed on any of the lists. I think this matter should have the consideration of the minister before pressing the amendment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I realize that in unorganized districts where there are no municipal institutions there is more difficulty in regard to the voters lists.

Mr. ARTHURS: There is no difficulty under the system of registration.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would like to see a list prepared in unorganized districts within thirty days if it were possible, but that breaks the rule we are applying to the rest of Canada. We must try to have a uniform system. I have had to tell my hon. friends from Quebec that we cannot make a special provision for Quebec; they must be put to some inconvenience too. If one is going to make an Act to bring every convenience to the door of everybody it is going to be a very difficult thing to frame one that will in the end be practicable. Objections have been raised from the province of Ontario to this arrangement by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) and objections have been raised to the arrangement on behalf of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I see the difficulty pointed out by my hon. friend from Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs). If we cannot adopt something that is going to be of general application I do not see anything to do but to make a uniform law and stick to the proposition originally drafted even although it would involve heavy expense. The proposals I make are not made on my own behalf or on behalf of the Government but they are proposals made to meet the objections raised by hon. gentlemen opposite. If they are not satisfied with them there is no use of going on with a proposition that pleases nobody and displeases everybody. I would rather hear a little further discussion before coming to a conclusion; I do not wish to impose my will on the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The main purpose of the conference, as I understood it was to see if it were possible to avoid the duplication and the great expense involved in the prepartion of voters' lists where lists are already prepared and are satisfactory. Each one can speak best in reference to his native province. The present proposal refers particularly to the province of Ontario. The Ontario Government is putting through a law which will require that every year lists shall be made up in every municipality urban an rural, which list will include the name of every man and woman who is entitled to vote. These lists will be made up year after year. What we ask is that these lists, with the prepartion of which Ottawa has nothing to do, they being prepared by the municipality, shall be taken as the basis of the voters lists for federal purposes. If the law stands as it is at present all this work will be done by the Provincial Government, but in addition to that the minute we propose to have a federal election the Dominion Government will have to appoint an army of enumerators to go over the province of Ontario to prepare fresh lists disregarding those lists which

are perfect in themselves. This is an enormous waste of money.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton): We have to do that in Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The cost at the last election ran up to half a million dollars or more. Why should that amount be spent to produce lists less satisfactory? The question that has arisen with regard to Ontario arises from the fact that we are not certain just when the provincial lists will be completed and what my hon. friend from West Middlesex desires is simply to make certain that there will not be under this Act the expense of the double preparation of the voters' lists. I think that was also the purpose in regard to the other provinces such as New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Where these lists exist the idea is to use them as the basis of the federal franchise and to save the enormous expense involved in the preparation of new lists.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In view of the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) I must say that my question as to the means of putting women on the lists in the provinces where they have no vote was not intended as a criticism of the amendment. I very much prefer the amendment to the clause as it stands in the Bill. I think we should do away with this enumerator business altogether. My hon. friend need not say that he will withdraw the amendment because we have criticized it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It was not on that account I made that remark but it looked to me as if the amendment did not please hon. members on either side of the House.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I like it better than the clause.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My objection to my hon. friend's statement in regard to the Ontario lists is this: I do not think it a proper thing to make a patchwork of the election law, and that we should have one law for one province and another law for another province. If we cannot get some kind of uniformity we had better stick to the old law. We should have a uniform franchise law and a uniform method of carrying on our elections. The hon. member for West Middlesex and the hon. the leader of the Opposition both take the ground that it may possibly be that in the course of time we will have municipal lists which will suit our purpose, but they cannot give the assurance that that will be so. The hon. member for West Middlesex is hugging a Bill—I have not had the opportunity of examining it—and he says that the Drury Government is going to do so and so. It has not done it yet. As a matter of fact in the province of Ontario we have the provincial voters' lists prepared last fall still in force, and if this House dissolved to-day those voters' lists would be the basis of the lists that we would have to use. It is beneath our dignity to wait on the Drury Government and see what they are going to do. They will probably change the law; it may be amended and reamended. When they see what we have adopted they may meet our suggestions. I cannot see any sense or reason in the suggestion that because a Bill has been introduced into the Ontario Legislature which may or may not ultimately suit the case, we should deliberately drop something we believe to be the best suited to carry out the purpose in view in order to meet some policy which they may adopt in the Ontario Legislature and which they may undo two or three weeks hence. In regard to Nova Scotia, I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) that the object to be attained there was the avoidance of expense and duplication of effort, and that it was possible for us to do that for the simple reason that they have provincial lists there just as they have in British Columbia, where they have an annual preparation of voters' lists. In Quebec they have one every two years.

Mr. DENIS: Every year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Every year in the rural parts, but every two years in the large cities.

Mr. DENIS: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We are changing the clause as originally drawn from one year to two years to meet the case of the cities in the province of Quebec, but we give it general application throughout Canada and the whole of the clause has been drawn to that end. No matter whether it is Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, or any other province that has a provincial list, we adopt that list. I am not going to make exceptions. I do not counsel the making of exceptions for different provinces. I do not think it would be wise or fair to do so, and if the amendment is not going to be better received on both sides of the House than it has been I am satisfied it is going to disappoint a great many people. That is the reason I would like to have the matter more fully discussed. I do not want to have it condemned, because there is merit

in it, but if we are going to add to it, to take from it, and re-write the whole thing, why let it go.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that we are not taking any exception for the purpose of having an amendment which would be generally applicable; the point we are raising at the moment is simply one of interpretation to carry out the spirit of the amendment. The purpose of the amendment being to use, if possible, the lists that are in existence, we simply want to make sure that if those lists are in existence they will be used and that they will not be lost sight of altogether through failure to draw the attention of the Government to a possible consequence of the kind.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is a very grave exception to draw an amendment to provide that in the province of Ontario we shall accept the municipal lists, because if at the next session of the legislature of the province they change their method of getting up the provincial lists we shall be all away from it. Then we would have adopted the Ontario municipal lists, and the legislature would have provided for new provincial lists.

Mr. ROSS: I do not think my hon. friend quite understood the purport of my suggested amendment, although doubtless he appreciates the spirit in which I made it; it was only to carry out what I understood was the conclusion arrived at in the conference on Thursday. Now the suggested amendment which I made was this: The time may arrive when more than two years may elapse and there will be no provincial list.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But there is a provincial list.

Mr. ROSS: I know that as well as my hon. friend does. However, I do not want to get into a controversy with him. I admit he has been very generous in trying to meet these cases, but I am only pointing out that there is one little point that he has not meant by his amendment.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have met the only case I tried to meet. I never agreed—and never heard it suggested until to-day—to adopt the provincial list.

Mr. ROSS: I am not saying that the hon. gentleman is not correct, I am only pointing out a situation which may arise. Supposing election does not take place until two years from last October. There will then be no up-to-date provincial lists in force. The amendment I suggested was simply this: If in Ontario the provincial legislature enacts that municipal lists shall be prepared annually—which we think they will enact—and that on all such lists the name shall appear of the persons who are entitled to vote under our Dominion Franchise Act—if that happens and the provincial lists are more than two years old then the municipal lists containing all the names of the electors that are entitled to be on them under the Dominion Franchise Act that we are enacting to-day shall be taken as a basis and names added thereto or subtracted therefrom according to the very plan my hon. friend has set out. I will frankly admit that the amendments my hon. friend has made are a great improvement on the original Bill, and we appreciate them very much. It may be the suggestions that I have made are not good, but I am not making them in any spirit of opposition. I am advancing them in the hope, if possible, of still further improving the Bill and saving expense, a thing we all admit would be a wise procedure. That is the whole object of my suggestion.

Mr. CALDER: In the preparation of the municipal lists by the municipal authorities each year will the names of persons be included regardless of whether or not they had the proper qualification?

Mr. ROSS: My hon. frieend has put a very fair question and in reply to him I will read the clause from the Ontario Bill. It is section eighty-six, which reads as follows:

> In addition to the particulars required by The Assessment Act, to be entered upon the assessment roll, every assessor shall enter upon the roll the name of every person who is of the full age of twenty-one years, a British subject, and who has been a resident of Ontario for a period of nine months—

In this Bill the period is nine months, but I believe an amendment has been adopted to provide that the period shall be twelve months——

> —prior to the date fixed for the assessor to begin to make up his roll, and who is a resident of the municipality and qualified in other respects as the assessor believes, to vote at elections to the Assembly.

My hon. friend will see how broad this provision is. It applies to every person twenty-one years of age, who is a British subject, who has resided in Ontario for nine, or twelve months, and who is a resident of the county.

Mr. CALDER: That being the case what is the provision of the proposed law in so far

as regards making that the provincial list at the time of the election?

Mr. ROSS: I will explain to my hon. friend: That is the basis of the provincial list, and once a dissolution of the provincial House, or a vacancy in the Assembly, occurs in an individual city, an election board, consisting of the county judge and four other persons, sits and takes that list as a basis. In each municipality they take that list and add to, or strike off, the names of persons who are entitled to vote for a member of the legislature. But the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie), with suggested amendments, has provided just as efficient machinery whereby that list can be taken as a basis and by the revising officer—for whose appointment the Bill provides—names can be added to, or struck off the list just as in the Ontario Act. We are quite ready to concur in the machinery which my hon. friend has provided except that we would like to see this one suggestion adopted. That suggestion, I would say, is made in all kindness.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton): My hon. friend has just read from a Bill which has not yet been passed by the legislature of Ontario.

Mr. ROBB: That is absolutely true.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend who has just spoken in regard to the Ontario list, will see the significance of what is in our mind when I mention to him that until the provincial legislature is dissolved there will not be in existence a provincial list for Ontario, although all this work of registration will have been completed year after year. The present Government in Ontario may hold office for the next four years, and we recognize that unless some provision of the kind suggested is made the provincial list may not apply at all at the next general election and under the machinery of the present Bill the lists would have to be prepared by a great army of enumerators, and the advantages that would be derived from using the existing lists would be lost.

Mr. SIMPSON: Lists are prepared annually by the municipalities in organized districts, but we have unorganized districts in Northern Ontario, and I presume also in Northern Quebec.

Mr. GAUVREAU: No.

Mr. SIMPSON: There are large numbers of voters whose names would not be on any municipal list, and if it is incumbent that they should appear in person before the revising officer in order to have their names added to the voters' lists it would mean in some cases their travelling three hundred or three hundred and fifty miles for that purpose. Therefore I think we should consider such a provision very carefully before we adopt it.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I must say that I am absolutely opposed to the adoption, as a basis for our own lists, of a provincial list that may be two years old, and I am opposed to adopting a municipal list, leaving it to be revised in the manner that is suggested. Any man who has had experience in connection with the preparation of municipal lists knows that there is not a municipality in the province of Ontario—or in any other province for that matter, where the assessor makes up the list—where there are not scores of voters left off every list. Now, in order to have those voters placed on the list one of two ways is open to you: First, an appeal may be made to the registrar, who may be ten or twenty miles away. You ask the individual voter to appear in person before the registrar in order to have his name placed on the list, and two citizens must accompany him to the poll and also take an oath. Otherwise that man cannot cast his ballot. I have seen sixty names taken off the list in a poll of less than three hundred—and that a list which had been prepared the same year. Now, if you have twenty or thirty people coming to a poll who must be sworn, each with two or three others who must be sworn, you will never be able to poll all the votes. At the last election, in polls of two hundred and fifty or three hundred, or more, it was found difficult to get the votes polled during the prescribed hours, even though only an occasional person had to be sworn. A federal franchise should be a federal franchise, independent of the provincial, municipal or any other authority. Surely Canada as a whole is sufficiently interested in the election of members to the House of Commons to be willing to bear the expense of having an up-to-date voters' list. In the past we have had the experience of one province having one law and another another. I remember when one man could vote two or three times in one province and could only vote once in another. Hon. members from Quebec know that it is only a few years since men in their province could, if they had the property qualifications, vote in as many different polls and in as many different

places as they could get around to in the hour.

Mr. BELAND: But in different ridings.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I know, but it was the case of one man voting two or three times, whereas in another province one man could vote only once.

Mr. DENIS: Of course, he had to be qualified in each riding.

Mr. SEXSMITH: We used to have a similar law in Ontario, but we changed it and adopted the principle of one man one vote. I believe in the principle of one man one vote, one woman one vote, all over Canada, and that we should have an up-to-date list—a list which is right up to the minute.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think that this point we are now discussing in regard to Ontario really need not have been raised at all, if we have in mind what took place in debate here before the matter was discussed in committee. In the conference we were simply seeking to give expression to what had been said on the floor of Parliament in regard to Ontario by the Acting Solicitor General himself. Let me read from Hansard, page 2430. The question in our minds was as regards the application of the Ontario lists, and I asked the Acting Solicitor General at the time:

> Assuming that the Ontario law were now passed and that lists were prepared under it by November or December of this year; then those lists would be used?
>
> Mr. Guthrie: They would be valid for twelve months.

Now, that was the impression we all had at the conference. That was the impression that I think every one had until this morning, when my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) pointed out that a different construction of the Ontario law might leave us in the position of having no Ontario lists until the provincial House had dissolved. Well, that was a situation that we had never contemplated, either in discussion here, when we decided to have a conference, or during the conference itself. All that we are suggesting at the moment is that if possible we give expression to what was in our minds, not at the conference but in the committee when this matter was discussed the other night, namely that we use for federal purposes lists that have already been prepared and concerning which there can be no question.

Mr. MORPHY: I am not quite so clear about the things that are to be done under this Ontario Bill as the leader of the Opposition seems to be. We do not know what the law of Ontario is going to be; moreover, no matter what it is going to be, no matter what it does when finally passed, we have no control over legislation respecting the Ontario franchise or qualifications for voters. There is really involved in this question the thought of what an interesting and difficult situation might arise in the changing views of parties in the Ontario legislature. There is a suggestion from some hon. members that we want to avoid expense. I think every hon. member desires to avoid unnecessary expense, but after all I do not think that we should throw too much expense upon the individual, upon the people at large. That is what the suggestion which has been made would do; it would put every person who is unfortunate enough to be off the list under the obligation of travelling, perhaps, some distance at considerable expense in order to make personal application to have his name put on, and to prosecute appeals, and so on; and upon voting at polling day to bring two neighbours to vouch for him. Here are three oaths; a most complicated piece of machinery, throwing upon the public at large what I conceive ought to be done by the Government—that is, the making of a complete, definite and up-to-date franchise law under which every one would know that his name was on the list, provided he did not by supineness or neglect fail to reach the forum at home through which he might get his name upon it. It looks to me as if the tail were wagging the dog. May I throw out the suggestion to hon. gentlemen that we are really engaged in drafting a franchise law for the whole Dominion? The franchise is a valuable right concerning which the public at large are zealous as well as jealous, and it is the duty of this Parliament to make out a proper list, no matter what the expense may be. Under the Bill as proposed, a part of the expense, it is true, will be avoided in the case of those provinces which have lists. If every province had a list—and I do not see why they should not—the work would be largely done, and, if it was properly done, the only additional expense would be that involved in picking up the few persons who had failed to get on the provincial lists. I do not think that the suggestion of expense involved in bringing that about may be looked upon as an insuperable difficulty. Take Prince Edward

Island as a case in point. They have no lists at all. A man walks up to the polling booth and presents his qualifications in the shape of having paid his poll tax, or otherwise; he votes, even though there never was a list upon which his name could be put. I do not know how far I should be right in saying that it is worth while having a list in Prince Edward Island, but it seems to me that if every province were listed either by this Parliament or by the local legislature, there would be a tendency to bring the situation to a finality. But to put upon the individual here and there who is left off the list the onus and the extreme expense of getting his name on does not appeal to me as a democratic way of dealing with the public who desire the franchise. Surely this Government is big enough to carry out its own franchise laws. In fact, we were pretty well agreed in this regard until my hon. friend (Mr. Ross) threw a monkey wrench into the machinery and brought on this discussion. I am satisfied that if the provincial lists were to follow this legislation instead of our following provincial legislation, as hon. gentlemen opposite want us to do, a solution of the whole question would be found.

We were very close to having a list that would be satisfactory to all hon. members; but the hon. member (Mr. Ross), as the Acting Solicitor General says, hugging to himself a Bill that is not a Bill, an Act that is not an Act, an Act that may to-morrow be abandoned altogether and not passed, would put this Parliament into the position of following the arguments founded upon that flimsy basis, and of passing legislation that would not be operative at all because either of the failure of that Bill to be passed, or, if it be passed, later on to be changed, thus throwing all the machinery out of gear.

Mr. ROSS: I did not intend to throw any monkey wrench into the machinery at all, and I do not think I have done so. My hon. friend will see that I did not say that this Act had been passed or was going to be passed or that any other Act was going to be passed. My suggested amendment is entirely hypothetical; it may be operative or it may not. If certain things occur, it will become operative. If in Ontario no lists have been prepared and completed as aforesaid, that is, if no provincial lists have been prepared and completed for provincial purposes within the two years, then there is a hiatus and we would have to appoint registrars.

[Mr. Morphy.]

Mr. MORPHY: This is based on an "if." I understood my hon. friend was going to say that municipal lists were to be prepared every year.

Mr. ROSS: If my hon. friend will allow me to finish my suggested amendment, I think he will see that my suggestion has some merits. If lists had been prepared and completed, they would be used as aforesaid, but the municipal lists are required by law to be prepared annually and to include all persons who would be entitled to vote under this Act.

Mr. SEXSMITH: That is not the case at the present time in Ontario, is it?

Mr. ROSS: The present time would not be affected at all, because provincial lists will be in force for two years from the 20th October, 1919; but if this time should expire and there are no provincial lists in force, and if Ontario, by any accident or by design, should pass this legislation which is now before the legislature, my suggested amendment becomes effective. In that case there is an annual revision by the municipalities and all names which would be on the lists prepared by the House of Commons are put on the municipal lists, and those lists shall be adopted.

Mr. MORPHY: "If."

Mr. ROSS: If that does not happen, my suggested amendment will not become effective.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton): We might as well be frank in this matter. The question that is bothering my hon. friends opposite is not one of expense, if we have regard to what transpired in the country when they had control of expenses in the conduct of elections. What is troubling them most now is this, that if we can prevent enumerators from being appointed under this Act, as they would be, going around from house to house and making the enumeration and using their influence, as was done in the West when the provincial elections were held, it is the desire of the Opposition to prevent that as far as they possibly can. My hon. friend (Mr. Ross) has nothing other in view than the fact that an enumerator appointed by the Government has an opportunity of going from individual to individual and imposing his personal views upon him, and if the enumerator is an appointee of the Government, he has a certain amount of influence. That is the objection raised by the Opposition, but it is not stated as a fact.

Mr. EULER: Is it not a good objection?

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton): Yes it is a good one, but what is practised upon me in my province, I want to practise upon the other fellow. I am willing to be imbued with a Christian spirit to a large extent, but not to the extent of turning the other cheek to the enemy. In a constituency such as I represent, which is 700 miles long by an average of 150 wide. I take the provincial list that has been prepared by the enumerators of the Alberta Government, and who is going to tell me at Fort Chipewyan or at Fort Smith, five or six hundred miles away from Edmonton, who should be on that list? Are you going to place on me the onus of sending men up there at a cost of five or six hundred dollars each to check up that list for me and find out whether all the Indians have been put on it or not. If the provincial lists were prepared to my satisfaction in an honest manner, I would be quite willing to accept them; but I know how elections are run in Alberta, and you would adopt the provincial lists of Alberta, because in 1923 or in the fall of 1922 the Provincial Government must go to the people, and I assume, unless there is something that I do not know of in the federal law, this Government must also go to the people before 1923. In that case we would be within the two year period when we are bound to accept the provincial lists such as they are. It is all right to speak about revision, but who is going to look after and pay for it? Some time ago I gave in this House an instance where men's names had been placed on the list, and the last night before the deputy returning officer gets the lists for the poll, the enumerator who made the list has power under the law to erase every one of those names from the list. It is a noted fact to-day that, as a result of what has been practised in our province, people are applying by the hundreds to this Government for naturalization papers. Why? Because during the election these people were given naturalization application papers. They believed they were naturalized; they were put on the list, and they voted. Are we going to accept this list? Am I to be responsible for going around every Ruthenian community in my constituency to find out if everybody is properly on the list or not? I would rather have an enumerator go around and do that work, even if he uses his influence, because if so, that is exactly what has been practised upon us in that province for the last few years. Let my hon. friends opposite admit that they do not want these enumerators because they are afraid that these enumerators are part and parcel of a machinery that will be used against them. Then we shall be able to deal with my hon. friends.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As regards the enumerators, let me be perfectly frank. I feel the electorate generally has not the same confidence in a list prepared by enumerators as in a list prepared in the regular way for municipal and provincial purposes and serving also federal purposes. If we can, in working on this measure, do anything which will help to bring about in Canada a system of preparation of lists which will serve for municipal, provincial and federal purposes, we shall be rendering a service to all three organized groups. As my hon. friend (Mr. Morphy) said, that was the thought that was in our minds at the conference the other day, coupled with an endeavour to give expression to what had been virtually agreed on between the two sides in the previous evening's discussion. I would suggest that we consider the amendments which the minister has introduced, in the light of what he himself has in mind, namely, framing something that will be applicable to the whole Dominion without exception one way or another. That is the basis on which we should proceed. After we have adopted the general suggestion, we might consider whether we should go further than that and add some amendments to meet a condition that is temporary, and that will exist possibly only for the next year or two. But to throw aside what is of general application simply because there has been brought to the attention of the committee a circumstance that has a bearing on one province for one election, would, I think, be a great mistake and very unfortunate.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton): Because it may be favourable to Ontario or Quebec to adopt a certain method, is that any reason why I should support that method when it is objectionable to me?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not at all.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton): Then make my province an exception. I do not want the provincial list, and I am going to vote against this amendment.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think in the province of Alberta the lists are prepared by the system of enumeration, and the suggestion that is now being made will not apply to that province at all.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton): But if a Dominion election is held within two years after a provincial election, the provincial lists form the basis of the Dominion lists, and I must accept those lists whether they have been prepared correctly or not. If I were a candidate in the same constituency, I would be put to the trouble and expense of going to every individual on that list to find out whether he was properly on the list, and whether men who were entitled to be on the list had ben left off. Who is going to pay for that? Suppose there was no provincial list: I am entitled to my enumeration, anyhow. But in the case of a Dominion election being held within two years after a provincial election, I am bound to accept the provincial lists as a basis for the Dominion lists, and I would have to have enumerators going from one place to another throughout a constituency 700 miles by 150 to ascertain whether these lists were properly made up. I say the Government should pay for that. If I have to do it in the next election I shall not run, because I have not the money to do it.

Mr. ARTHURS: I want to protest against the suggestion that the northern parts of Ontario and the unorganized districts throughout Canada are asking for special treatment. These unorganized districts have always been accorded special treatment in this regard under the law. The Franchise Bill as introduced provided for a system of registration by enumerators, which was essentially the practice followed in the unorganized territories in the past. So we are asking for no special treatment for these unorganized districts in the preparation of the lists, because that has always been the law.

I would also point out that if the present amendment should carry, it will disfranchise thousands of good citizens in Northern Ontario and other unorganized parts of Canada, and we would also have cases in the unorganized portions where there would not be a single inhabitant in some of the polling divisions. I know divisions in my own riding that had a voting population of 200 upwards, but where when the poll was held next year, there were no voters except the returning officer and the poll clerk. The men who had been in that polling division had moved away to other parts, and I say that if this amendment is adopted, thousands will be deprived of their vote through having moved away, or they will have to travel a long distance and give up two or three days' time to make a personal appearance before the judge to have their names put on the list. If they took the alternative and appeared on polling day to vote, who is there in a mining or lumbering district who could swear that these men, hundreds of them, were entitled to vote? I say the provision is absolutely unworkable. I repeat, we are not asking for any special treatment for the unorganized portions of Canada, but simply for the franchise law as it has stood on the statute book for years.

Mr. EULER: I would not like to subscribe to the doctrine enunciated by my hon. friend (Mr. H. A. Mackie). He apparently feels that his party has been getting the worst of it, by reason of certain actions of Provincial Governments, and he would like to get even with them in Dominion elections. I would not care to endorse that principle.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton): The hon. member does not quite understand me. I pointed out what I considered were errors practised by the Povincial Government, and I say you should not force me to adopt the results of those errors. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we should not have enumerators, because they see an evil in that. It is an evil that has been practised against us. I say that if it is an evil, that is no reason why I should have to adopt the result of that evil. If there is an evil in having enumerators it is only what is practised by the other side.

Mr. EULER: The hon. gentleman if struck on the one cheek would not be content to turn the other, but it occurs to me that if this method is not adopted, and you place the making of the lists in the hands of partisans he would possibly be struck on both cheeks at once if a different kind of government came into power in this country. What I rose to say was this: While I appreciate what my hon. friend (Mr. Arthurs) has said as being perhaps the only valid objection to the suggestion that has been made from this side of the House, I shall support the proposal of the hon. member (Mr. Ross) because I believe we shall thereby get a more complete and a fairer list at less expense. I have no particular complaint to make so far as the elections of 1917 are concerned with regard to the enumerators in my constituency. They were not perfect, but I have no special complaint to make. I do say this, however: Municipal lists prepared by assessors who are, we might say, experts in that particular work are almost certain to be more complete and more accurate than lists that are prepared by men who are employed in

many cases, not so much for their ability in that particular work, but perhaps more for partisan purposes. I am not going to make any criticism of that, because no matter what government is in power, whether it be Liberal, Conservative, Unionist, Farmer, or any other, the enumerators are pretty sure to be selected from amongst the Government's own supporters.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton): If you lived in a province where it was possible for the provincial enumerator to erase as many names off the list as he liked just about six hours before the poll opened, would you be willing to accept that list as a basis for your Dominion list, and be put to the personal expense and trouble of checking the list?

Mr. EULER: That may be a very fair objection, but the point I was going to make was that the amendment proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Ross) would not affect the province of Alberta at all.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton): That is quite right.

Mr. EULER: But as regards the province of Ontario I say the Government would do a great deal better to adopt the lists that are prepared by men who are better qualified than anybody else you could possibly select, than to have the lists prepared by men selected haphazard, according to their partisan affiliations. In the cities you have men appointed as assessors who are reputable in every way, men of ability, and who know practically every citizen in the community. They are not very apt to overlook any one, and as they put names on the list for municipal purposes, it is not likely that they will be governed in the slightest degree by a man's political belief or leanings. I support the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Ross) because I believe it will mean we will get lists that are fairly made up without any reference to a person's political belief, or colour or stripe, or anything of that kind. The case was mentioned here last week of the enumerators in the city of Toronto who had left 30,000 names off the list. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that could not happen under the assesors' system. According to the amendments submitted by the Acting Solicitor General, provincial lists are to govern if they are not more than two years old. I see no objection why, beyond that time, we should not accept the lists prepared by the assessors. If the Bill now before the Ontario Legislature goes through--

Mr. HENDERS: Why put the two-year limitation on at all?

Mr. EULER: I would be quite satisfied, as far as I am concerned, to change that. But if after the two-year period you want to use lists complete and free from most of the objections that can be urged in political affairs, you cannot do better than accept the lists prepared by the assessors. As far as the other provinces are concerned, I admit that I know very little about their electoral machinery, and there may be very serious objection to the amendment. I think the point mentioned by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) is probably well taken. But if these assessors' lists are taken I think we shall get the best lists available.

Mr. MANION: I desire to point out one weakness in the proposal of the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross) supported by the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Euler) in regard to adopting municipal lists. For example, I happen to own property in the city of Fort William and also in the city of Port Arthur, and those cities are in separate constituencies. Consequently my name being on the municipal lists of both cities I could, according to this proposal, vote in both constituencies.

Mr. EULER: Those municipal lists are to be taken only as a basis.

Mr. MANION: Property owners on the municipal lists are absolute voters. I go across and vote in Port Arthur at every municipal election and dozens of others do the same.

Mr. EULER: I do not think it is the intention that those municipal lists shall be adopted holus bolus; they are simply to serve as a basis.

Mr. MANION: I quite understand that. But, for example, take a man on the voters' list in the city of Toronto and also on the voters' list of the city of Hamilton, which is only a short run by automobile, and he may be also on the voters' lists of other municipalities in the neighbourhood—I am not acquainted with their names—he might be on half a dozen voters' lists.

Mr. EULER: He can practise personation, of course.

Mr. MANION: It is not a case of personation; he would be voting legally because his name is on the municipal list.

Mr. DUFF: No, he has to vote where he resides.

Mr MANION: I vote in the municipal elections of Port Arthur and of Fort William.

Mr. BELAND: That is quite right.

Mr. MANION: If the municipal lists are adopted for the province of Ontario, my name will be on the voters' lists for the two constituencies I have referred to.

Mr. BELAND: If my hon. friend is on two lists, what of it? It is one man one vote.

Mr. MANION: Then if the municipal lists are adopted, and my name is not struck off either the Fort William or the Port Arthur list, I could vote in the two constituencies.

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. MANION: However, Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious to any one listening to the discussion that it is impossible to prepare any law to suit every one on both sides of this House. The members of the Opposition have brought up many amendments to the various clauses, and I think the minister in charge of the Bill has been very fair in adopting them, but if he is going to adopt every suggestion from every quarter, we will have to sit here until September. I would like to see a general law adopted that will be as fair as possible to the whole Dominion, but I do not think it is wise for the minister to attempt to satisfy every hon. member.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will my hon. friend say which of the suggestions made by hon. members on this side of the House have been adopted by the other side?

Mr. MANION: I do not know that I could give them in absolute detail.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know of one to date.

Mr. MANION: I think objection has come to a number of clauses from the other side that have been adopted by the minister, and he can give the details.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am afraid that the hon. member for Quebec East has not been very regular in his attendance.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have been here all the time.

Mr. GUTHRIE: You must have heard those suggestions adopted, then.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In order that we may know exactly where we were at the time of this conference, allow me to remind the House what was said the other evening as to what had changed the feeling of most of us on this side. When this Bill was first introduced nothing had been said about the possibility of the Ontario Government devising any machinery for the purpose of preparing election lists. The result was that as we read this Bill it seemed to us that the Government wished to adopt the system of enumeration for the whole Dominion. Once, however, the Ontario Government introduced a Bill which provided machinery for the preparation of lists, and this Act by remaining as it is, just in the words in which it is at present expressed, indicated that where provincial lists were available those lists would be used, our whole attitude changed, because our objection was, first of all, to this system of enumeration, which we think is thoroughly bad; and, in the second place, to the additional expense of preparing separate lists. On Wednesday evening in speaking to the minister I drew attention to the fact that our attitude had changed, because according to his own interpretation of the Bill, since he introduced it in the House, if there were lists in Ontario prepared by the Ontario Government those would be the lists which we would use in federal elections. The point that has been raised to-day through the amendment of my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Ross) as brought to the notice of the House, was not thought of on Friday night, and has not been thought of since, and was not in the mind of the minister at the time at which we expressed our willingness to accept section 32 as it stands, if it had the interpretation which we believed it to have. Let me read what was said in debate so that hon. members may see the situation for themselves.

At page 2430, speaking myself, I said:

> In order to make clear the effect of the law as it would be if we passed this section,—

That is, section 32 as it stands at the present time.

> —let me put a question to the minister.
>
> Assuming that an election were to take place in Canada within a year of the time the Drury Government was formed, that is, before November of this year, then that election would be held on the lists used in the last provincial election?
>
> Mr. Guthrie: If they were not more than twelve months old.
>
> Mr. Mackenzie King: If an election came before November of this year, the lists used for federal purposes so far as Ontario is concerned would be the lists that were used in the last provincial election. Now if the general election

came in December, before the law now being drafted in Ontario, was put into motion, then the lists would be prepared by enumerators in accordance with the provisions of this Act, without any reference whatever to the law that the Ontario Government is putting through at the present time.

Mr. Guthrie: No, unless lists were prepared under that law.

Mr. Mackenzie King: Assuming that the Ontario law were now passed and that lists were prepared under it by November or December of this year then those lists would be used?

Mr. Guthrie: They would be valid for twelve months.

Mr. Mackenzie King: But if they were not prepared until say March or April of next year and a general election took place before then, lists would be prepared under the provisions of this Act?

Mr. Guthrie: Well, I understand that the proposal is that the Ontario Bill shall be passed and that the provincial lists for this year shall be prepared under it. I understand that they have to be prepared for municipal purposes in any case.

Mr. Mackenzie King: I simply wanted to make the point clear.

Mr. Guthrie: I think that the Ontario law will be in force by December next, anyway. There might be a month or two after November and before the new provincial lists come during which, if a general election were held, we might have to prepare new lists.

Clearly what the minister believed and what he gave the House to understand at that time was that under section 32 as it is in the Bill now, irrespective of any conference one way or the other, if the Drury Government passes the Bill which is before the Ontario legislature at the present time, which makes provision for lists based on municipal lists prepared by assessors, those lists would be the lists used for federal elections, provided that those lists were prepared within this next year.

That was the understanding that we had in this House and it was to give effect to that understanding that we had the conference. I drew attention to the fact that the minister's interpretation of the Act as it was expressed made us seem very much closer together than we had believed would have been possible. The reason I say that is that when this Bill was introduced there was no thought of making provision for the use of Ontario lists whereas the use of provincial lists being provided for as matters are at present the complexion of things is changed. If we can consider the amendments which my hon. friend from West Middlesex has suggested as covered by the interpretation which the minister has given to the Ontario Act, I am perfectly satisfied. I do not think there is any need to go a step further. With reference to the point which my hon. friend has raised, if there is a doubt of any kind we would be negligent if we did not draw attention to it and suggest the insertion of a subclause which would remove any possibility of doubt. When a matter of a complicated kind is under consideration men who have the opportunity of sitting down together and thinking only of what is going to be of the greatest service to all concerned can perhaps work it out more clearly than can be done in a discussion where we jump from one subject to another.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Do the provincial officials have absolute authority in connection with the revising of the provincial lists?

Mr. GUTHRIE: What list does my hon. friend refer to?

Mr. TWEEDIE: The provincial lists which are to form the basis of the enumeration.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The provincial officers would have the authority while they are provincial lists but they are, under this Bill, accepted as the basis of the federal lists and the final authority in urban centres would be the judges and in the rural centres the judges and the deputy returning officers when a man goes to the poll and asks for a vote. I do not quite agree with the statement of the leader of the Opposition. In the discussion which took place on Wednesday night there was no confusion in my mind about provincial or municipal lists. The first time I saw the amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Middlesex and saw the words "municipal lists" I said: "That won't go; I will not agree to that?" When you propose to use provincial lists approved by a province and used in the elections in a province that is one thing but when you propose to use municipal lists that is something entirely different. I think I said at the time that I would approve of provincial lists provided the age was limited and that is what I am prepared to abide by. There was a meeting held on Thursday morning and at that conference we reached an agreement. The leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) and the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy), all from Ontario, were at that conference. I raised the question that I have raised to-day. I think we left that conference virtually in agreement and I spent the necessary time to draw the amendments. They are pretty complicated amendments to draw, they entailed a great deal of difficulty but I thought that I had finally found a way out of it. Now we are

met with the suggestion that whereas the province of Ontario has no provincial lists we should accept the municipal lists. The province of Saskatchewan has only municipal lists. There is no official provincial list in the province of Saskatchewan until there is an election. That is the system which Premier Drury intends to adopt in the province of Ontario. I do not agree that we should wait on the whim or fancy of the Ontario Government in this respect. We are going a long distance when we say we will adopt the provincial lists as the basis of our federal franchise. We are going a long distance when we say that they may be two years old. We are going a very long distance when we drop out the original proposition of registration or enumeration in rural districts. Farther than that we have never been asked to go, and farther than that we do not purpose going. When you do give way the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) gets up and says you have never accepted a suggestion or anything of the kind. He must have been in the House while this matter has been under consideration and he will remember that I amended section 16, at the suggestion of the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs); I amended section 29 at the suggestion of the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler); I amended section 28 in regard to the polling subdivisions at the request of the leader of the Opposition; I amended section 64 at the request of the leader of the Opposition; section 80 at the request of the leader of the Opposition and I propose to amend section 100, when we come to it, at the request of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee).

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think that my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) was referring to the general question but just to a particular matter.

Mr. GUTHRIE: You do not get credit for anything you do agree to. I have not agreed to these amendments because I thought they made the Bill more workable but simply because hon. gentlemen opposite thought that they made it better. Now I think we have come to a time when the opinion of the House should prevail. There is a very strong feeling on this side of the House that the amendments are unworkable but I am not going to press them for a minute. I think the best thing we can do is to ask that the clause stand for further consideration. Otherwise I am prepared to withdraw the amendments, if nothing is going to be gained by them. Let the clause stand. It will have to stand for a considerable time because the Budget is coming down tomorrow. We might go on to sections 100 or 101.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): The hon. gentleman said that the amendments provided that the provincial list which is to be used in the province for their own election is the only list which will form the basis for a federal election?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): In the province of Alberta at every election they have a separate enumeration. I would understand from what you have stated that if that is the effect of the law, in my province we are not bound to accept any provincial list of any kind as the basis for a federal election.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If you have a completed provincial list which is not more than two years old it will be the list.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): In Alberta they prepare a list for every election. According to the law if we have an election within two years of the time of the preparation of that list we take the provincial list as prepared?

Mr. GUTHRIE: As the basis for the Dominion list.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): But you added nothing in your remarks to the effect that your amendment only provides for the use of the provincial lists which are used for the provincial elections. In Alberta the law provides for an enumeration every year. Are you, therefore, going to force us by the federal law to adopt a provincial list which is absolutely discarded by the Provincial Government themselves when they hold an election?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It may be a list which, under the law of the province of Ontario, is a valid and subsisting provincial list, and not more than two years old—it is a list prepared within two years by that Government.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): Then I withdraw all my opposition to the adoption of the provincial lists elsewhere, because what the minister now says makes it absolutely impossible for the Federal Government to be bound by any provincial list in the province of Alberta, whether a Dominion election is held within two years of the other Government or not.

Mr. COWAN: As I understand the matter, under this proposal which has come from this most extraordinary conference, the enumerators are done away with in the rural districts. Is that correct?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Where there are provincial lists not more than two years old.

Mr. COWAN: If you adopt this proposal the people in the rural districts are going to be put to a much greater amount of trouble to get on the lists than they would have been subjected to under the original Bill—much more trouble. It means that there will be hundreds, yes thousands, of people, especially women, who will not take that trouble. Now that we have enfranchised women we ought to do everything we possibly can to make it easy for every woman who has a right to vote to be placed on the voters' list. Of course, if you provide that they may come on election day and swear in their vote, that is all right. But I know what the result will be because I was a scrutineer, under the old enumeration system a good many times, and in my case—and in the case of every other scrutineer—when a person comes to me whose name is not on the list, we simply say to the deputy returning officer, "Give them every oath in the calendar"—that is the stereotyped phrase—and the result is that they have to take every oath provided for. Well, there are thousands of these women who, when they find they have to take every oath in the calendar will never go near the polling place. I do not think we should put them under any such disability. For my part I think the Government should have adhered to the original Bill; it was a whole lot better than what this reactionary conference has given us.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I object to the amendment because it is absolutely unfair to the people of the rural municipalities. In one province there is the possibility of appointing enumerators to go around from door to door and give the residents the privilege of having their names on the list. In another province that privilege is withheld and you accept as a basis for your Dominion list a provincial list that may be two years old. Then hundreds of people whose names may not be on the provincial list are obliged to watch for a sitting of the court and then go in person, it may be five, ten, fifteen or twenty miles, and make application for the privilege. I consider that is unfair. I know from personal experience what it means to have voters' lists revised, and I would like the minister to state who would be responsible for the revision of the lists in a province where a two years' old provincial list is accepted as a basis in the rural districts?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think I understand the question.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I understand that where you adopt the provincial list as a basis in rural constituencies you do not appoint enumerators. Then who is responsible to the individual elector or to the candidate, whoever he may be?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not know what you mean by "responsible."

Mr. SEXSMITH: I mean those who are responsible. In one province you appoint enumerators that go around from door to door—

Mr. GUTHRIE: Where they have not any provincial lists.

Mr. SEXSMITH: —and every man and woman has a right to have their names put on the list by the enumerator who calls at their residence. What I say is that in every province where you adopt provincial lists that may be two years old the names of hundreds of people will be absent from the list. I know that to be a fact; I never saw it otherwise. Then you say to these people who may be entirely ignorant of the whole condition of affairs and may know nothing of the requirements of the law, "If you want your name on that list, you must go to the city, town or village (as the case may be) and have your name put on the list, and if you neglect to do so, you will have no vote."

Mr. GUTHRIE: Oh, no.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Excuse me. There is another provision that you may go and swear your vote in on election day provided you bring with you two neighbours who know the facts and who are also required to swear with you. That is to say, three parties are required to appear and take an affidavit before that particular elector can vote. I think the machinery is altogether too complicated. Furthermore, there is this condition in my riding: When you talk about adopting a municipal list there are hundreds and hundreds of people on that list who reside all over Canada and in the cities of the United States, such as Chicago, Detroit, Buffalo, and New York. Who is going to take the responsibility of permitting those names to remain on or having them struck off the municipal list? I am certain I would not care to take the responsibility, and yet there are hundreds

of such people on the list; they own property and are assessed, and their names are on the municipal list, and at every municipal election they have a right to come and vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Putting the oath to them is the only safeguard for which the Bill provides.

Mr. CLEMENTS: I am quite sure that my hon. friends opposite, as well as a great many hon. members on this side, do not for one moment realize the conditions which exist in the province of British Columbia. Without enumeration in that province, I venture to say that in the rural districts at least one-third of the electors would lose their votes. We have no municipalities in the rural parts of British Columbia; they are practically all unorganized districts except in the villages. I want to say to the minister, and to this committee, that it would be most unfair to leave British Columbia in that position. I therefore strenuously oppose any amendment seeking to do away with the enumeration system as far as that province is concerned.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I am not sure that I understand exactly what this proposition means, but so far as I can gather its purport it is this: That if in rural districts there are lists less than two years old there shall be no enumeration or registration. That would mean, if the lists were less than two years old, every man and woman on it would have to swear in order to be entitled to vote. I think the Minister of Immigration and Colonization knows what such a system as that would amount to as far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned, and I can hardly imagine that he was at the conference referred to at which this amendment was adopted.

Mr. CALDER: That has been our system in Saskatchewan for several years past.

Mr. THOMSON: But we have had enumeration; now you propose to do away with that. I think I know what the result will be in the districts that I am acquainted with in the West. At one time the Saskatchewan Government ordered the list to be prepared every year. I presume my hon. friend (Mr. Calder) will remember that, too. That was done for two years in succession, and I recall that in my town I was acting for the Liberals and trying to revise the lists while a friend was acting for the Conservatives, and after we got through twenty-five per cent of the names were struck off the list and perhaps a little more than twenty-five per cent added. I am satisfied, as regards several small towns in the West, that if you adopt the plan suggested by this amendment twenty-five per cent of the voters, in order to have their names placed on the list, will have to go and swear to the facts, with two persons to identify them. That means where you have one hundred voters to be added in a polling place, three hundred people will have to be on hand to swear to the correctness of the applications, and as my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Cowan) says the applicants are liable to have to swear to every oath on the list. I do not think the thing is practicable at all, and I cannot understand how my hon. friend (Mr. Calder) came to agree to it when he knows the conditions in the province of Saskatchewan so well.

Mr. CALDER: I was not very far away when the committee was sitting, and at the time I thought the proposition was a very reasonable one. I am not just so certain of my view at this moment as a result of the discussion that has taken place. I wish to very briefly correct an impression that exists among some of the members on this side. When an enumeration takes place in the province of Saskatchewan it is not provided that the enumerator shall call at every house—that should be clearly understood. If the law provided that an enumerator should call at every house the expense would be enormous—in fact practically prohibitive. As a consequence of that our law has simply provided that the enumerator may, if he chooses, sit down in his own house and make out as good a list as he can from all the material that is available to him. There was a time, some eight or ten years ago, when we required the enumerator to make a house-to-house canvass, but that system was so expensive that we abolished it and adopted the other system under which the enumerator could take the municipal lists or any other material he found at hand and make out the very best list that he could. In addition to that, under the old federal law, as well as under our provincial law, there was always a provision that the voter whose name was not on the list could come forward on election day and swear in his vote. I must say after a great many years' experience with the working out of that law in Western Canada that while occasionally there may have been some slip, as a rule the law has been accepted by our people as workable and

fair, and so far as I am aware no serious criticism of it has come from any section of the community.

The real question that faces the committee and which we discussed the other day at our conference is whether or not it is possible to provide some means whereby the enormous cost of preparing lists under a system of enumeration can be avoided. Some take the view that it is better to put enumerators at work in order to get as complete a list as possible immediately prior to the election. Personally I am inclined to the other view; I think that if we can devise machinery which will enable us, looking at it from the federal standpoint, to prepare lists that are reasonably fair, then we should avoid the unnecessary expense of having the lists prepared by enumerators. In Saskatchewan and Alberta, if there have been provincial elections and lists have been prepared which are not more than two years old, we will accept those lists, not as final, but merely as a basis for revision if they are available. In our urban communities there is machinery in the law for the revision of these lists immediately prior to the holding of a federal election. There is no reason why under this proposal every person who is qualified to vote in any of our cities or towns with a population of over one thousand should not have his name put on the list after the writs are issued. If, on the other hand, these provincial lists which are not more than two years old are loaded with the names of persons who are not qualified to vote when the federal election comes round, there is no reason why the lists should not be cleaned up in that regard as well. That position should be reasonably satisfactory to every one; there will be machinery for the obtaining of an up-to-date list immediately prior to the holding of a federal election. Now, as to the rural end of it, those lists prepared within the two year period would be used simply for what they are worth. They are there as a matter of record. It does not follow that any person whose name is on that list is entitled to vote or that any person whose name is not on the list is not entitled to vote. The list is merely to be used as a convenience. It will not be revised in the sense that the city lists are to be revised; it will simply be handed to the deputy returning officer to be taken for what it is worth. Personally I have no objection to that provision so far as Saskatchewan is concerned so long as I know reasonable machinery is provided which will enable any man who is entitled to do so to come forward on election day and put in his vote. That is all that we attempted to provide. Under the suggested amendment now before us provision is made whereby a rural voter whose name is not on the list may apply, in the first place, to a judge and have his name added; or on election day he may have his name added by having his qualification vouched for by two fellow-electors. I say frankly that I can quite understand how it is that members from the East who are not familiar with this sort of law desire to have its provisions safeguarded. In the West we have had a law which enabled the man himself to come forward on election day and swear in his vote, and we have never had any trouble with it. In Eastern Canada there are a good many people who are doubtful of the results of a law of that kind and desire to throw around it certain safeguards. Well, if the proposal made is objectionable and some other safeguard can be found that will be regarded as reasonable, then I think that the committee should endeavour to find that other safeguard.

The problem before the committee has two aspects. In the first place there are those who maintain that regardless of expense we should put an army of officials in the field immediately prior to an election for the purpose of getting the lists and, in the second place, there are those who hold the view that if it is possible to do so—and it would mean a saving of a million or a million and a half dollars—we should endeavour to devise machinery whereby we could avoid that expense. Personally I am strongly inclined to the latter viewpoint. My good friend from East Edmonton (Mr. H. A. Mackie) speaks of the enumerator. I know what the enumerator system is and I think I may fairly say that after observing the operation of that law as a member of the Provincial Government for fifteen years and watching as well the federal elections held out there, the appointment of enumerators and the actions of enumerators do more harm to the Government that appoints them than they do to the other side. That is my experience; if I wanted to run an election and had the choice of appointing enumerators or letting the other fellow do it, I would rather let the other fellow do it.

An hon. MEMBER: You are quite right.

Mr. CALDER: Because there is always a great deal of criticism against that method

of building up lists. My own view is that if it is at all possible to avoid that system we should do so, especially if a good deal of money can be saved.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): May I ask the Minister of Immigration a question? He has made a statement which is at variance with the statement made by the Acting Solicitor General, and that is the whole point of my remarks this afternoon. My objection is that we should take in Alberta as the basis of a federal election list a list prepared by the enumerators, because I recognize the very thing that the minister recognizes—that enumerators are not what they should be. But I say that you should not force the provincial list upon us as the basis of a federal election list; that is my whole objection. Now, I want to make sure about this. I asked the Acting Solicitor General: Is it not a fact that you said that the only list we are going to use as the basis of a federal election is the provincial list which is going to be used as the list for provincial elections, and his answer is, yes. Well then, I say I have no objection, because in Alberta we have no such provincial lists. Every time there is an election, a new enumeration is made; but according to the amendment before the House, it is possible that the list prepared by the Provincial Government, which list is not one that they use themselves as a basis for the next election, will be the list which the Federal Government, if they hold an election within the period of two years of the making of this list, will be obliged to adopt, and you are forcing us to adopt a list made up by a class of men to whom you take exception. If you force us to accept a list made up by a class of men to whom you take exception, why do you object to our asking that you accept a list prepared in a similar manner? Who is right, the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), or the Acting Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie)?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: After having listened to what the Minister of Immigration and Colonization has said, it must be apparent to hon. members that those who were together when these suggestions were being discussed have, in regard to this whole matter, a point of view which it may be difficult for other hon. members to have who have not before them the exact amendments that are proposed. It is quite clear to those of us on both sides who discussed this matter that there are distinct merits in the suggestions which are to be moved, if the committee so agrees, as amendments to the Bill as it stands, and I think the discussion, if we have regard to what has been said by different hon. members, discloses that many of the difficulties that are feared in what has been proposed, arise from the members not having before them the exact amendments as suggested. I know we are all anxious to get this legislation through as quickly as possible, and perhaps the quickest course to adopt would be for the minister to state to the committee the amendments he has in mind so that we shall have all the amendments before us and shall then be in a position to accept or reject them speedily. That would save a great deal of debate, and I am sure, if hon. members have an opportunity to consider these amendments from no point of view other than what is best for the country, what will give most confidence in an Election Act and what will avoid most extravagance and lessen the possibility of waste of public money, they will feel that what the Acting Solicitor General is about to suggest is most in accord with the public interest.

Mr. TWEEDIE: The argument on the Opposition side of the House is that to adopt provincial lists as a basis for a federal list would mean a saving of a great deal of money to this country, but I have not yet heard any hon. member point out how the saving would come about. For instance, each province has power to pass a Franchise Act regardless of the franchise qualifications in any other province. Let us assume for the purpose of argument that every province in the Dominion passes different qualifications, and that the Dominion passes a Franchise Act in which the qualifications are different from those of any one of the nine provinces. What would be the result? The result would be that persons who are charged with the preparation of the lists must satisfy themselves as regards every name which goes upon the federal list; and as regards the provincial list forming a basis for the preparation of the federal list, it cannot possibly be any better basis than a list compiled from a city directory or a telephone directory or a municipal list or any other lists of names of people living in the community in which the voters' list is being prepared. Let us assume that the Federal Act provides a residence qualification of twelve months in the district, and that the Provincial Act provides a residence qualification of six months in the district, and that in all other respects the franchise qualifications

agree. What does that mean? It means that we have placed in the hands of the federal officers a list under which the qualification of residence is six months. Therefore, the federal officers must satisfy themselves as regards every man whose name is on the list. If we were at a stage where the qualifications for the exercise of the franchise were uniform in the various provinces and in the Dominion as a whole, there might be no question as to adopting the provincial lists as the basis of our lists or as the real list of those who are entitled to exercise the Franchise in a Dominion election. But where the respective qualifications vary, it is absolutely necessary that the qualifications of every man whose name is on any list should be investigated to ascertain whether they conform with the requirements of the Federal Act under which he wishes to exercise the franchise. As a matter of practical economy, I cannot see where one dollar will be saved if justice is to be done in connection with the federal franchise.

If the Federal Franchise Act says So and So may vote and any province varies from that, in that province every name that goes on the federal list must be examined to see whether or not the man has, not the qualifications of the Provincial Act, but the qualifications of the Federal Act under which he wishes to exercise the franchise. I should like to hear some hon. member explain where the real economy in this comes in. I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend (Mr. H. A. Mackie) that what is at stake is really who is going to exercise the authority of preparing the list of voters to be used throughout the Dominion of Canada.

As regards the revision clause, I think I pointed out before that where any class of work is being done on behalf of the Federal Government or the Provincial Government, the officers who are performing that work are the servants of the Federal Government or the Provincial Government respectively. The Government would be ill advised to accept officers of another Government to perform duties in connection with its own Act. You must have the utmost harmony, and you can get that only when you appoint men who are subject to your jurisdiction and instruction. It is an anomaly for us to say that we shall have a Federal Franchise Act prepared for ourselves, and at the same time place the doing of that work in the hands of some persons who are not in any way responsible to this Government.

As regards the conduct of enumerators in Alberta, I must disagree with the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) who says that the lists used in the last election would be the basis of the federal lists. My understanding of the provincial enumeration list is that as soon as an election is held, the list becomes a nullity; it automatically dies under our Statute, because it is used only for the purpose of the particular election for which it was prepared. If we were to hold another election in Alberta three months later, we would still be required to prepare a new list by the method of enumeration, the old list being dead. I have always found that the enumeration method has worked out well in Alberta. There is no doubt that mistakes occur and perhaps once in a while you might find an enumerator who did not do his duty properly; but the practice has been that the enumerator goes from house to house in order to ascertain who are entitled to vote in the city or in the country; he can get that definite information only by going from house to house and office to office to ascertain that he gets the names of all those who are entitled to be on the lists.

Mr. CALDER: The Bill does not provide for enumeration in a city like Calgary.

As to the other point raised, the question of economy, at this very time the Manitoba Government is preparing lists for an election to be held in June or July. In the city of Winnipeg they have personal registration. Every elector must come forward and have his name put on the list. I suppose that will take probably three or four or five weeks. After that personal registration takes place, they must go through a form of revision, to strike off and put on. Let us assume they have completed their list and held a provincial election, and that we hold a federal election six months from now. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that if we took that list which was completed only six months before, and merely revised it for the purpose of our federal election, that there would not be a large saving of money and a great saving of trouble and expense on the part of the people? Notwithstanding the existence of that list, which so far as I am aware is based on exactly the same requirements as our list, as to residence, naturalization, and everything of that character, does he suggest that notwithstanding the expense to which the province of Manitoba has been put in the preparation of that list, we

should go to the trouble and expense of duplicating all that work, simply because the list was not prepared by the Federal Government? It seems to me that if we provide the necessary machinery to make certain that that list is not prepared from the ground up, but merely revised for the purpose of our election, we are bound to save a great deal of money and put our people to far less trouble and expense than they would otherwise be put to.

Mr. TWEEDIE: That is exactly the suggestion I intended to make. My point was that if the qualifications for voters throughout the various provinces were uniform with the federal requirements, that system could be carried out. But we have no control over the franchise of the provinces; they can make their own qualifications, and they may all be different at the present time, or, after we pass our Act, they might pass an Act which would be entirely repugnant to ours. My point is that where there is any variation between the provincial and the federal qualifications you cannot adopt the provincial lists, because you must investigate the qualifications of every voter on that list. The province may require a residence of six months in the province, two months in the constituency, and a month in the polling division, and the Federal Act, twelve months in the province, six months in the constituency, and two months in the polling subdivision. Those are three distinct points. They exist at the present time in various provinces. What does that mean? Every one of those names must be investigated to see whether or not the voter has the qualifications which are required by the Federal Franchise Act, and they are not entitled to be put on the federal list until that information has been gathered. It means that you could use the provincial list simply as a sort of index or directory, as a list of the names of people who might possibly have the qualifications. But it is the duty of the federal officers to go out and ascertain whether they have the qualifications required by the federal law, because they were placed on the provincial list under different qualifications.

Mr. ROSS: Maybe I have been the unhappy cause of this discussion. I did not intend to be. In the case mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Tweedie), the protection would be the swearing-in of the voter at the polls.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Does my hon. friend mean to suggest that every man who goes to vote should have to take the oath? You would not get the votes polled in a week in that case.

[Mr. Calder.]

Mr. ROSS: I am not contending that. The local officers would know whether they had the qualifications. That is not the point I rose to speak on. I have the amendment before me, suggested by the Acting Solicitor General, to carry out the views of the conference held on the 13th of May, and I think they are all an absolute improvement on the Act. I did not move any amendment at all, but simply threw out in good faith a suggestion to the committee. If the committee does not see fit to accept it, well and good.

Mr. HENDERS: I think we are pretty close to an agreement except on the one point as to the provision to be made for the rural votes. I am not at all satisfied with the amendment as it stands for taking care of the rural voters. I am of the opinion that it would be possible to provide that in the rural districts, just as in the city districts, there shall be opportunity for revision some days before polling day. I think if that could be done, we ought to be able to reach an agreement.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I want to make it clear that I have not moved an amendment. I have made a suggestion, and the suggestion has certainly come from the conference which was held on Thursday last. I think it might not be out of the way if I followed the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition and let the committee know the exact language of what I suggest. I handed a copy of the document which I have in my hand to the chairman of the committee, but I have not made any motion by way of amending section 32. The ideas of the conference of Thursday last, as reduced to writing by me, are about as follows. I may not have carried out all the views of those present, but I have tried to. There are one or two minor amendments to section 32 before we come to the schedules. I was going to propose that schedule 1, which is apparently a somewhat clumsy enactment as drawn in the Bill, be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

Rule (1). Immediately after the receipt of the writ the returning officer shall appoint, by writing, in Form E one person only to be registrar of voters in each city, town or incorporated village which is wholly or partially contained in the electoral district for which the election is pending and which has a population of over 1,000 or less than 4,000 persons, and one for each additional 4,000 persons, who shall, before acting as such, take the oath in Form F;

and the registrars so appointed shall be assigned by the returning officer to such parts or such number of polls as he may deem right and proper.

That is important only in regard to the number of registrars which we will have in urban districts. The next amendment of any consequence would be to schedule B, page 22, which is the schedule providing for the lists in rural polling divisions. I propose to strike out Rule 1 as printed, and insert instead the following:

Rule (1) No rural registrar shall be appointed in any electoral district in any province where provincial voters' lists are available for the purposes of a Dominion election under the provisions of subsection one of section thirty-two of this Act. In such cases provincial voters' lists shall be adopted as final and complete for rural polling divisions; subject, however, to the right of any person to apply to have his name added to the voters' list as provided by section sixty-three of this Act; and subject also to the right of any person resident in a rural polling division to apply in person to the revising officer of any urban polling division in the same electoral district, or if there be no urban polling division in such electoral district, to the nearest revising officer in another electoral district, to have his name added to the voters' list for such rural polling division; Such application may be made at any time during the sittings of such revising officer as provided by rule 13 of schedule A of the said section 32; and the revising officer to whom such application shall be so made, if satisfied that the applicant is a person qualified as an elector to vote at the election then pending within such rural polling division, may by writing under his hand addressed to the returning officer of the proper electoral district, order that the name of such person be added to the voters' list for the proper rural polling division. The revising officer shall thereafter, and not later than the twelfth day before polling day, deliver or send by registered mail to each returning officer and to each candidate in each of the electoral districts affected thereby, a list of all persons added to the voters' lists giving the names, residences and additions of such persons and designating the rural polling divisions in which such names have been so added to the voters' lists. The returning officer shall thereupon and in due time before polling day notify the deputy returning officers in each rural polling division affected of the names, residences and additions of the persons so added to the voters' lists by the revising officer. For the purposes of this rule the method of procedure and the powers and authority of the revising officer shall be similar to those set forth in Rules 14 and 15 of Schedule A to the said section thirty-two.

That would be rule (1). Then the present rule (1) I would merely amend in the first few lines as follows:—

If under the laws of any province no provincial voters' lists exist which are available for the purposes of a Dominion election under the provisions of subsection (1) of section 32 of this Act, the returning officer shall, immediately after the receipt of the writ, appoint by writing in Form E one person only to be registrar of voters for each polling division. Whenever a competent person can be secured—

And add the words:

—who is a resident within the limits of the polling division, such person shall be appointed, and only in case of necessity shall a registrar be selected from an outside polling division.

Then I would also suggest that another rule be added to Rule B to be known as 4 A, or to be renumbered after the clause is passed, in the following words:

Any person claiming to be an elector who is dissatisfied with any decision of a registrar under the last preceding rule may apply to the revising officer of any urban polling division in the electoral district wherein such person resides in the same manner as provided under Rule (1) of this Schedule and such revising officer may hear and determine such application, and may order, notify and report upon the same in the same manner and to the same end as provided under the said Rule (1).

Then I would add another rule as No. 4-B:

Any person who has applied either under Rule (1) or Rule (4) of this schedule to a revising officer to have his name added to the voters' list and whose application has been refused by such revising officer shall not thereafter be entitled to apply to have his name added to the voters' list under the provisions of section sixty-three of this Act. If any person, after such refusal by a revising officer, as aforesaid, shall require or request any deputy returning officer to add such person's name to the voters' list under the provisions of section sixty-three of this Act, such person shall be guilty of an offense under this Act and shall be punishable therefor as provided by section eighty-five of this Act.

Then I make provision for the amendment of subsection (1) of section 32 by changing the term "one year" into "two years" in regard to provincial voters' lists. And it would be necessary to make some amendments to section 33 by adding at the end of subsection (2) the following in regard to voters' lists, that is, where an election has taken place and the lists have been returned to the Chief Electoral Officer and a new election is called:

And the same—

Meaning the voters' lists.

—shall thereafter be completed, revised and distributed as provided by Schedules A and B respectively to section 32 of this Act.

Then I would suggest that subsection 3 and 4 be struck out.

It would be necessary also to bring section 63 into conformity with the provisions which I have just read. Therefore, if my suggestions were met, I would propose to amend section 63, subsection (1) as follows:

At polling stations in rural polling divisions the deputy returning officer shall, while the poll is open, if required by any person whose

name is not on the voters' list and who is vouched for by two electors who are resident in such polling division, administer to such person oath number (1) in form "Z" No. 1 of schedule 1 to this Act and to each of such other two persons an oath in form "Z" No. 2 of schedule 1 to this Act, and such oath having been taken by the applicant person and by such two other persons, the deputy returning officer shall at once cause such applicant person's name to be added to the voters' list, with the word "sworn" written thereafter, and subject to the next following subsection of this Act, such applicant person may thereupon vote.

I would add to the next following subsection, which is subsection (2) by inserting in line 30 after the word "make" the following words:

including the names of the two persons who vouched for the applicant person.

I have also prepared a form of oath to be taken by the two persons who act as sureties or vouchers for the persons whose names are so added, which is practically a repetition of the oath of the elector, that they know the elector, and they know and state his qualifications to vote at the election. That, I think, would make more certain that this privilege of voting under section 63 would not be abused.

Then, as I intimated a few moments ago, I would suggest that section 100 be amended by striking out the words "or other persons" in the first line. That would confine the section in its application to railway men, sailors and commercial travellers.

These are the amendments which were in my mind, suggested as a result of the conference which we held on Wednesday. I have given them now to the committee in order that hon. members may fully understand the scope of them; but it must be borne in mind that I have not yet moved them as amendments.

Mr. STEELE: One or two features of this Franchise Act appealed, I think, to almost every member when it was introduced. One was that we were to have valid up-to-date lists, a matter in which the rural constituencies have suffered for many years as compared with the urban constituencies. Representing a rural constituency as I do, I think it is a most important feature of the Bill that rural lists should be up-to-date—even more important, I think, than that the urban lists should be up-to-date.

Another feature which commended itself to me was the simplicity of the machinery prescribed for the preparation of the lists. Perhaps it is expensive. Those of us who have had to do with the preparation and revision of these lists in years past know that the old method in Ontario was exceedingly expensive,—especially to the candidates. We cannot have an accurate up-to-date list without expense. It is a question whether the Government should bear the expense or whether the individual candidates themselves should bear it. After the discussion to-day, and especially after the reading of the Acting Solicitor General's proposed amendments, I have lost my vision of up-to-date lists for the rural constituencies and a simple method of preparing those lists. Franchise Acts in the past have been very confusing to the average man. But I do not think I have ever heard or read of any provisions which were proposed for a franchise Bill which would be more confusing to an ordinary elector than the proposals now laid before the House by the Acting Solicitor General, and if these are the best fruits of a conference, then I would say do away with conferences and leave the matter in the hands of this committee, which could decide perhaps more promptly and with better results what the provisions of the Act should be. Many members probably do not appreciate what it would mean to adopt this method of preparing the lists in rural constituencies. Three or four years ago I made an estimate of the changes which would be made in my own constituency, which is a very small and stable one; there not being many people coming and going. I found about 450 names of new voters on one list as compared with the previous list. That probably is about the average number of changes that take place each year. If we were using a list two years old containing the names of the old electorate and when the women were not included there would probably be a thousand changes. With the women added we would probably have 2,000 new voters. What does it mean when we enter an election campaign to have 2,000 people who are entitled to vote but whose names are not on the list? This amendment provides for people going to some revising officer somewhere and having their names added. If they do not do that they can go up on election day and swear in their votes. Just imagine what that would mean in my small constituency. I venture to say that in North Perth there would be from 4,000 to 6,000 voters whose names would not be on a two-year-old list when the election campaign came on. It seems to me that a statement of this kind is sufficient to let the House see that the system is practically unworkable. The result will be that if that

system is followed there will be hundreds of men and women who will be deprived of the right of voting or who will have to go to the polls on election day and swear in their votes. The polling booths will be so congested from morning till night that there will be ill feeling, disturbance and uncertainty at the polls. I sincerely trust that the Acting Solicitor General will return to the original clause, even if it is necessary to make some amendment to meet the question of expense. I think that would be very desirable. I do not see why we should not have in any rural constituency the same system which is adopted in an urban constituency. Have a revising officer in each municipality, and if there are names on the list which should not be there the necessary changes can be made by the revising officer. That would simplify it very much. Voters would know exactly where they had to go and what they had to do, while under the proposed amendment the confusion will be very great because so many people will desire to have their names put on the list.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I understand that a voter in a rural district who is not on the revised list would have the right to vote if the revising officer in some town should add his name. If the revising officer should refuse, would he still have the right to have his name put on the list by a judge?

Mr. GUTHRIE: If he does he will commit an offence which under the Act is punishable. The presumption is that the judge will inquire into the matter and decide whether he has the right to vote or not.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: Then the revising officer is the final court of appeal?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: Why should there be an appeal in the urban district and not in the rural?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is the same.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: You have an appeal to the judge in the urban district.

Mr. GUTHRIE: A man in the rural district, under the amendment, has an appeal to the same judge.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: That is what I was asking you. I understood he would not have.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, and the decision of the judge will be final in both instances. But if a man in a rural district should attempt to swear himself in he will be liable under the Act.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: The hon. gentleman misunderstood my question. I understand the applicant has an appeal to a judge and that if the judge decides that he is not entitled to vote, he must not swear his name in?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is right.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: With regard to swearing on the name, I concur in what the hon. the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) says, that where the practice has been tried it has been found thoroughly satisfactory. I think that is the agreement of hon. members on both sides of the House who know anything about it. I think it is the best and safest plan you could possibly adopt, and to do away with it is a most dangerous thing.

Mr. MORPHY: In the application of the law is a voter's oath alone taken as sufficient?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: Has that been quite satisfactory without having the oaths of two resident electors?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I am quite willing to accept that because apparently hon. gentlemen who do not know how the system is actually working in the province of Saskatchewan are frightened. It has been found satisfactory there. But let us have the addition which the Acting Solicitor General has suggested because it may be that people in other provinces, being unfamiliar with the system, are suspicious of it. But do not shut out the right of a man to record his vote by that method in a rural district because if you do you are going to shut out a great many votes.

Mr. HAY: I am not sure that the amendment is going to be workable in country districts. Where a Dominion election was held within two years after the provincial list had been revised, the electors would have no means of placing their names on the list except by making application to a judge or enumerator in a town where there were 2,000 inhabitants. In a large country constituency, such as I represent, I fancy this would be practically impossible. Where the vote is changed so quickly and where a great many new voters are coming in I fancy the Act would be entirely unworkable. If we had 300 names on the list in a polling subdivision and it should be necessary to swear in fifty, sixty or a hundred more, I cannot see how it could be done unless we

created double polls in each polling subdivision. It would be practically impossible to get the vote polled in the time allowed for the polling to take place. As far as I can see a thorough revision of the lists in the country constituencies is necessary previous to an election, especially where those lists are two years old. I cannot see any other procedure to follow that would give justice to the people living in the country; and in my opinion it would be a mistake to adopt any amendment that would tend to disfranchise great numbers of these electors. Probably hon. members who represent constituencies in the East have no idea of the size of our western constituencies. For example, my constituency is something like three hundred miles long by one hundred and fifty miles wide, and it would be out of the question for many persons to travel such a great distance to register in any town or village. Yet their only means of getting their names on the list would be on polling day, and they would be compelled to bring two of their neighbours a very great distance to give evidence that they were properly qualified. Therefore I think some other method should be adopted whereby registration can take place in our rural constituencies. I would like the committee to carefully consider these matters because they affect the western constituencies in a very important manner.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY OF CANADA AT WASHINGTON.

On motion of Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) for Committee of Supply:

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queens): Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of this motion to invite the attention of the House for but a few minutes to what I regard as a question of large importance. I refer to the negotiations which seem to be in progress respecting the representation of Canada at Washington.

During the war a number of business men were sent to United States, appointed to what was called a War Mission, whose business in that country was to endeavour to obtain for Canada a share in the large volume of contracts that were being made for munitions of war and for supplies. I

believe that the Mission discharged that duty in a way that brought a great deal of business to Canada, and that its work in that respect was eminently successful. At the last session of Parliament an appropriation of $50,000 was asked for that Mission, and associated with that in the item was, "Representation of Canada at Washington." I am inclined to think that what was contemplated by the Government at that day must have been materially different from the larger project of which we know a little, but very little, at the present stage.

Let me say frankly that my own observation and my own experience in relation to transactions of public business between Ottawa and Washington lead me to entertain great doubt as to the wisdom of the step that the Government are taking. I am afraid that it means that, at a time when everybody is talking of the need of economy; at a time when many worthy projects are turned down because the Government say they cannot find the money for them,—at such a time I am afraid that the Government are plunging into a form of expenditure which promises but little substantial good for Canada but which is full of possibilities of future trouble. But while I give that in passing as my own impression, I wish it to be distinctly understood that I give it only as an impression and one for which I alone am responsible. I realize that the question of representation at Washington is one on which there may be difference of opinion, not unlikely on both sides of the House. I take it for granted that at a later day opportunity will be afforded for a wider discussion of the question. I do not propose at this moment to enter into the wider question of whether or not it is expedient to have representation for Canada at Washington. I quite realize, as I have said, that there are differences of opinion on that subject, and I myself feel that for lack of information we should all be disposed to reserve a final judgment until we are better informed. I do not ask the House to associate itself with the impression I have given. But I do think there is a point upon which the House might well take strong ground, and that is that in a matter of such large importance this Parliament is entitled to be furnished with more information than it has received in this connection.

There has been a great deal of talk from time to time of what is called government by Order in Council. More than once during this session, and not on this side only, members have expressed the view that

there was too much government by Order in Council. There is, I am afraid, a tendency in our Parliamentary system—I believe that students of English politics have found the same there—to magnify the power of the Cabinet and to minimize the power of Parliament; and that is a tendency which we should guard against. The Cabinet, after all, is only a Committee of Parliament, and beyond that we should not be prepared to give it unlimited power. There are times, I know, when a Government must determine things promptly. An emergency may arise; a crisis comes; the Government must act promptly; it must come to a decision and trust to Parliament to justify it later. There is another set of circumstances under which a Government may be justified in feeling that they have public opinion behind them. After a question has been discussed for a long time in Parliament, on the platform and throughout the country, a Government may feel that they have a clear knowledge of public opinion which will enable them to reach conclusions without taking Parliament into their confidence until a later stage. But there are no such conditions here. There is no emergency; there is no crisis; there is nothing in connection with this Washington business so far as Canada is concerned which could suffer if it were delayed for a week, a month,—aye for a year; and the Government by Order in Council which might have been justified in time of war, cannot be justified in time of peace.

Then, as to the second point. I have said that there may be occasions when a Government is justified in making up its mind that it has public opinion behind it, after there has been a long discussion, perhaps an agitation,—debates in Parliament; discussions on the platform. All these are conditions, I say, which may create a ground upon which a Government may feel that it has public opinion behind it. But there is no such condition here. There has been practically no discussion of this Washington business, beyond a brief reference to it in the last session, there has been no debate at all. There has been no resolution of this Parliament setting forth that we were dissatisfied with the present state of affairs. There has been no discussion on the public platform. No candidate has presented himself to the electors of Canada on the ground that he wants a definite representation of Canada at Washington. In all these respects, then, there is nothing to justify the Government in coming to a hasty conclusion. Nevertheless, it would seem, from the little information that we have, that the Government are disposed to reach a conclusion without taking Parliament into their confidence.

I have said that it appears that the project the Government now have in hand is larger than was in their mind a year ago. When the item of $50,000 was voted to which I have referred, the minister in charge, the President of the Privy Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell) stated that they were about winding up the business of the War Mission but that it was intended to have a permanent representative at Washington, whose range of duties would be somewhat wider than that of the Mission. Then the question of expense was mentioned, and he said that the cost of the War Mission had been from $4,000 to $5,000 a month. I quote my hon. friend's words:

> The present expenditure in connection with the Mission is between $4,000 and $5,000 a month. We do not anticipate that the permanent representation will exceed that amount.

So it was evident that at that time a very modest project was in the mind of the minister. But what do we find to-day? Not only do we find a much larger scheme indicated by the memorandum read the other day by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster); we find that the modest appropriation of $50,000 last year has already jumped to $80,000 in the Estimates of the present year. I venture to say that if the project be carried out it will be found at no distant date that much more than $80,000 will be needed to meet the expenses.

Now, I have stated, Sir, that my own impressions of this matter are not favourable, but I want to emphasize the fact that I am not asking the House to join me in that. I am reserving these impressions for consideration at a later day if that be necessary. But I want to urge very strongly that in a matter of so much importance Parliament is entitled to have received in a larger degree the confidence of this Government. I say that in a matter of so much gravity, for the Government to withhold information and proceed to commit the country to this new scheme at Washington is a step which Parliament ought to look upon with very grave suspicion. It is a matter of large importance. It is of financial importance; for I am satisfied that even the $80,000 which is asked this year will be found quite inadequate to the maintenance of the proper dignity of Canada's representative as proposed at Washington. But it is important in another respect; it is important in its relation to our

communications with the United States. It is important in its bearing on our relations with the Mother Country. It is important in every respect; it comes nearer to being a constitutional change than any of the various matters which have recently been brought to the attention of the House. For all these reasons, on an important matter, on a matter which is not urgent nor pressing, on a matter which affords every opportunity for preliminary consideration and reflection, it would be a wise policy for the Government to halt in their proceedings, and before they go further, to bring the whole matter fully before the Parliament of Canada, in order that we may be able to exercise sound judgment on the subject. For that reason, without dwelling on the matter further, and with the full understanding that at a later stage on the main question, if necessary, I shall be permitted to discuss this matter further, confining myself at present entirely to the question of Parliamentary procedure, I move:

That all the words after the word "that", to the end of the question, be left out and the following words be inserted instead thereof:

"This House desires to record its opinion that before any arrangement respecting the permanent representation of Canada at Washington is consummated, the House should be fully informed concerning the negotiations between the Canadian, Imperial and United States Governments, and all correspondence and Orders in Council on the subject should be submitted to the House."

Hon. N. W. ROWELL: (President of the Council): I am sure hon. members have listened with interest to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) who has moved this amendment. I may congratulate my hon. friend on one point of his remarks at least, that is that, after persistently denying for a year and a half or two years in this House and in the press that Canada's status had been modified in any degree whatever, he to-night acknowledges the fact that there is some modification and improvement in our status, as shown by the step that has been taken.

My hon. friend's criticism of the action of the Government appears to be based on three grounds: First, that there is no occasion for such an appointment, that no conditions exist which call for it; second, that there is no public opinion in the country behind such an appointment; and third, that before any arrangement is consummated, all the facts should be submitted to the House.

Dealing briefly with these points in the order in which they are raised by my hon.

friend, let me say with reference to the first, that my hon. friend and the other members of the House have only to recall conditions existing between two great countries having a boundary line 4,000 miles in extent, and in which for many years the chief work of the British Ambassador at Washington related to Canadian affairs, to realize that Canada has important and vital interests at Washington which require the attention of a representative of Canada. My hon. friend has conceded that during the period of the war Canada required representation at Washington and that we were represented by business men who did a fine piece of work for Canada. I am sure my hon. friend realizes the fact that the largest part of the external trade of the Dominion of Canada is with the great nation to the south. Does he realize that the great nation to the south has a larger trade with Canada than with all the republics of Central or South America? We are one of the very largest customers of the United States, and the United States is the country with which we in Canada have the largest trade. Not only the question of trade, but other questions do and must inevitably arise between two nations geographically so closely and intimately related as the peoples of our two countries and these call for the attention of a Canadian minister.

What are the objects of having a representative at the capitol of another state; to safeguard and protect the interests of the people of the country concerned. Does any hon. member doubt that a Canadian, possessing the intimate knowledge which a Canadian should of Canadian affairs and trade conditions, is better qualified, to look after Canadian interests than a man who has not that knowledge or experience? Surely no hon. member will question that fact? That being so, I do not think hon. members will question that it is in the interests of Canada that we should have in the capital of the neighbouring nation a Canadian to look after our rights and interests. I do not wish to mention questions that are coming up. Hon. members have only to recall questions that arise from week to week and from month to month which are provoking discussions in the press of the United States and in the press of Canada, to realize how important it is that we should be in a position to communicate directly with the American Government, to represent the views of the people of Canada to that Government through our representative at Washington in order that the rights and interests

of the people of this country may be properly guarded and protected in the premises. In saying this, I have nothing but words of appreciation for the conduct of the different British ambassadors at Washington. They have sought to place themselves in touch with Canadian conditions; they have put forth every effort to represent fully and adequately our views so far as it has been possible for them to do so. In what I have said about the importance of Canadian representation, I do not wish that any implication should arise that the British ambassadors who have been present at Washington have not put forth every effort to look after Canadian interests there.

My hon. friend's second contention was that there is no public opinion behind this change. The difficulty with my hon. friend is that he suffers from such an incurable obscurantism on all matters concerning Canada's status, that he is unwilling to see the evidence of public opinion in this country on this matter. I could turn to the press of Canada, and point out that the Canadian newspapers from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with the possible exception of the journal so ably edited by my hon. friend, have been discussing this matter for the past year and a half. My hon. friend says that there is no public opinion behind this change. Let me draw attention to one of the leading newspapers of Western Canada about which I have knowledge because the matter has been drawn to my attention, and I am not sure that what I say of this one paper is not equally true of other newspapers in Western Canada. Every one recognizes the influence of the Winnipeg Free Press as an exponent of public opinion in Western Canada, whether one agrees or disagrees with it. From the time this question was raised that paper has been explaining and expounding the question, urging that the time had come when such a representative should be appointed, and stating that it was the duty of Canada to see that such a representative was appointed. Let me instance the leading papers of Ontario, the Toronto Globe, the Mail and Empire, the Star. I am not sure about the Telegram.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Are they your newspapers?

Mr. ROWELL: The Toronto Globe, the Mail and Empire and the Star have all been strongly advocating the appointment of a Canadian representative. I am not sure but that the same is not equally true of the World, although my attention has not been called to the position of that particular paper, while it has been called to the position of the other papers. Although I have not gone through the press with a view of getting at the facts I am quite sure if you examine the newspapers of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific you will find that this question has been discussed for a year and a half at least and that the overwhelming expression of opinion, as voiced through the press, has been strongly in favour of the proposal which the Government has now consummated.

Then my hon. friend says: Public opinion has had no opportunity to register itself. In that respect I should just like to draw my hon. friend's attention as to what has actually been placed before the Parliament of Canada. In the first session of last year the Estimates were laid on the table of the House on the 19th of March. An item was included providing the sum of $50,000 for the Canadian War Mission and representation at Washington. That estimate came up for the consideration of the House on the first day of April.

Mr. FIELDING: A suitable day.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend says "a suitable day" because he has such an idea of Canada, of her position and her future, that he has not yet been able, since these discussions arose, to take the broad gauge view of Canada's position and her place in the Empire. I appeal to my hon. friends: Have faith in your country, have faith in her people, have faith in their ability to look after their country's interests when the need arises.

Mr. BUREAU: Legislate them good.

Mr. ROWELL: It would take a good deal of legislation to make my hon. friend good.

Mr. BUREAU: Don't use your own yardstick in judging others.

Mr. ROWELL: Turning again to the question of public opinion as expressed in this House, this matter came up in this House on the first day of April, and my hon. friend who was then leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) suggested that the matter should stand over for further consideration. On that occasion my hon. friend the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) asked the question—I was in charge of the estimate—whether it was the intention of the Government to appoint a representative at Washington.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Be careful there.

Mr. ROWELL: I will read my hon. friend's words.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question, question.

Mr. ROWELL: I do not wonder that my hon. friends are getting a little impatient, because they should know that on this matter the Government is carrying with it, without a shadow of doubt, the judgment of the people of Canada. This matter came up on the first of April, and my hon. friends will find a reference to it on page 1074 of Hansard. In answer to the question that it should stand, I stated:

> It is an item that involves an important principle and will stand some discussion.

Then my hon. friend the member for Maisonneuve asked for information on it, although it was agreed that it should stand over. He asked:

> Has there been any correspondence exchanged between this Government and the Imperial authorities with regard to representation at Washington?

Then he goes on to say that the question came up while Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in power, and that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had the idea of appointing a representative at Washington, but that the matter had dropped.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A representative at Washington?

Mr. ROWELL: What my hon. friend stated was:

> as Commissioner at Washington, having the same status as our Canadian Commissioner at London.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: Then he goes on to say that the proposal did not eventuate, and he asked what the situation then was. Though it was agreed that the matter should stand over, I stated that the item in the Estimates was to make provision:

> For a permanent representative at Washington. The exact form which that representation will take is a matter of consultation between the Prime Minister and the Imperial Government .....The intention is to continue the present Canadian War Mission in existence until the arrangements are made for a permanent representative. The moment those arrangements are concluded the War Mission will go out of existence, but we do not consider it expedient that there should be an interregnum between the end of that Mission and the appointment of a permanent representative. That is the object of inserting this item in the Estimates.

My hon. friend then made a suggestion as to who would be a good representative, and congratulated the Government on the proposal.

That announcement, Mr. Speaker, was passed from one end of Canada to the other through the public press. It also went over to England and was the occasion of certain questions being asked in the British House of Commons. At the request of the then leader of the Opposition, as I have already intimated, it stood over for consideration and discussion, and it was not called up again for five weeks, until the 5th of May. So if any hon. members desired to formulate any views in reference to this matter they were given an abundant opportunity to do so; they were given nearly five weeks in which to consider the matter before the question was again called up. Did hon. members on that occasion protest against the necessity of appointing a representative at Washington? According to my recollection not one member on the other side of the House raised a protest. The matter was before the House all through the spring session, and unless I am mistaken my hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) said not a word about it from the beginning to the end of the session. Other members on the Opposition side did, but generally speaking, their words were words of congratulation on the action which the Government proposed.

Lest there should be any misunderstanding, I was asked specifically on that occasion what was involved in the appointment. I think it was the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) who asked whether the Canadian representative at Washington would have diplomatic standing, and whether he would be entitled to conduct negotiations direct with the American Government, and my answer was that I believed that so far as concerned purely Canadian affairs he would conduct negotiations direct with the American Government, and so far as concerned matters that were not purely Canadian, they would be dealt with in co-operation with the British ambassador. That was the effect of my statement made on that occasion, on the 5th of May, 1919. That is the exact effect of the statement made to the House by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) on Monday last. The principle was clearly laid before the House last year, before the Government asked the House to vote the amount in supply. If hon. members did not appreciate its significance, the Government and members on this side of the House are not responsible for that. If hon. mem-

bers did not take advantage of that occasion to express their views on the matter, if they had any criticism to offer, hon. members on this side of the House are not responsible. The Government had every reason to believe that they had not only the people of Canada behind them, but a united parliament in the action they were about to take.

My hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has said: But you should not have done this by Order in Council. When my hon. friend says that we should have submitted something further to the House than we have submitted, I confess I am at a loss to understand just what he has in view. We have passed no Order in Council in connection with this matter. Nothing so far has been done by Order in Council in connection with this matter. The Government's legislative section and authority to take action during the year was the estimate voted last session; the Government's legislative sanction and authority for action now will be the item contained in the Estimates this session. The item last session passed the House, was concurred in and formed part of the Bill of Supply which was passed unanimously and the Government had the full sanction and authority of Parliament for continuing the negotiations in order to reach a conclusion on the matter.

I should add this matter came up again a few days later, on May 8, 1919, when my hon. friend for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), referring to a despatch which appeared in the papers reporting a question asked in the Imperial House of Commons, inquired in reference to the appointment of a Canadian representative at Washington, and then suggested that possibly as that representative would only be a commercial representative or agent, it was not necessary to consult the Imperial Government with reference to the appointment. My reply to his question will be found on page 2202 of Hansard of May 8, 1919, and is as follows:

> The Canadian representative at Washington will be very much more than the Canadian agent. His status will be very different from the status of the Canadian representative in Paris or London. Therefore, there is consultation with the Imperial Government with reference to the appointment. I stated the other evening that confidential communications had been held between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Imperial Government in reference to this matter but that these were not yet concluded and that when they were the House would be advised of the whole purport of them.

Could there be any clearer statement made to the House as to the character of the negotiations that were being carried on? And yet not one member on the Opposition side of the House questioned our proceeding with the negotiations along the line I have indicated, and the spring session of 1919 concluded with not a real word of criticism or of protest. Can my hon. friends, after the matter having been submitted to Parliament as I have mentioned, and after their having failed to offer any real opposition to it or any real criticism of the Government for continuing and concluding the negotiations, with any degree of fairness now seek to criticise the action of the Government in doing what the Government then intimated they were about to do?

The Government continued the negotiations and concluded them. At what date, Mr. Speaker, would my hon. friend say that the Government should have brought this matter again before the House and asked the sanction of Parliament? How could we bring it before Parliament any further than we did until an understanding was arrived at? In confidential negotiations of that kind we could not bring down a partial understanding. The negotiations were necessarily confidential between the British Government and this Government, particularly as they affected representation in another country. It would have been just as reasonable if my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) had been criticised in 1911 and told: "You should not have concluded an agreement at Washington until you first submitted your proposals to the House and had the sanction of Parliament." My hon. friend did what was the reasonable thing to do if the Government of the day was prepared to take the responsibility for it. He went ahead and concluded the agreement and then submitted it to Parliament, as that agreement had to be submitted for it affected the changes in the tariff. That is exactly what the Government did in this case, but they did more—they brought the matter down a year ago while the negotiations were in the early stages and laid the principle of it before the House, they took a vote of the House in respect to it, and there being no opposition they had the mandate of the House to go on with the negotiations.

The Government have now concluded an understanding embodied in the statement made to the House by the Acting Prime Minister, and the House will be asked to give its legislative sanction to that understanding when it is asked to vote the item in Supply which will come up in due course.

What arrangement could be fairer? How could the Government take the House more fully into its confidence than it has done in a matter of this kind? I submit that my hon. friend's criticism is wholly beside the mark and does not touch this grave and important step in Canadian constitutional development.

One word more, Mr. Speaker, I am sure my hon. friend must realize, if he is a student of constitutional history, that the conduct of foreign affairs is the special prerogative of the Crown; and when I use the word Crown, I am using it in the sense in which it is used under our constitution: the Crown advised by its constitutional advisers. It is the duty of the Government to carry on these negotiations and to reach a conclusion on them, and there is no obligation to consult the House before they reach a conclusion; in fact, the conduct of foreign relations would, I submit, be impossible, if the Government went further than they have done in the present case. They laid the principle before Parliament; they had parliamentary approval of it; they went on and negotiated an understanding; they have informed Parliament of the nature of that understanding; they have submitted an estimate to the House in order that Supply may be voted to maintain and support the representative thus established.

The Government has followed true constitutional practice and precedent in the course it has taken. My hon. friend's criticism of the Government's course, I submit, is unfortunate in this respect: it may give rise to the impression that there is a real difference of opinion among Canadian people upon this question. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is any real difference of opinion in Canada upon this question. I believe that the overwhelming mass of our people are in favour of the proposal and look upon the step taken by the Government as one distinctly in the interests of Canada, and, I believe, also in the interests of the British Empire. It means that Canadian affairs at Washington, when the representative is appointed, will be conducted by a Canadian direct with the American Government. And I can only repeat that I am sure that is a step that our people desire to have taken. We cannot always remain in a dependent position having our affairs looked after and managed by other people.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend says, "Hear hear." I hope he will say "Hear, hear" with equal emphasis when I say,—that we are not going to change our settled allegiance to the King and cut the tie that binds us to the Mother Country in order to obtain the management of our own affairs.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: We are going to do two things—manage our own affairs and maintain the unity of the British Empire. We believe that we are entitled to manage our own purely Canadian affairs within the British Empire, and that is what this policy implies and involves. In so far as it does involve a constitutional departure—and I agree with my hon. friend that it does involve a constitutional departure—it is the logical and inevitable development of what has been taking place in this country for the past five, ten, twenty, thirty years; it is the logical and inevitable development of the work of our soldiers overseas, of our status under the Peace Treaty, and of the present position of Canada within the British Empire and in the world.

In the course the Government has taken, the Government are carrying out not only the judgment of Parliament but the judgment of the people of Canada having regard to Canada's status and vital interests. For, whatever my hon. friend may say to the contrary, Canada is to-day associated with the Mother Country and the other Dominions in a great League of Nations of equal status under a common sovereign—the strongest and most influential factor for the preservation of the world's peace that exists to-day. And it is of vital moment that good relations should be preserved between the British Empire as a whole and the United States, the other great branch of the Anglo-Saxon race. Good relations between these two countries are not only important so far as they affect Canada and the Mother Country, they are important so far as they affect the future peace of the world. There is no better way to maintain a good understanding than by being able to meet men face to face, to talk over problems in which you are both interested, and to supply full information, for the majority of international, as well as personal, misunderstandings, spring from a lack of knowledge and a lack of appreciation of the viewpoint of the other. I believe that a Canadian representative in Washington, meeting and talking with representatives of the American Government and dealing with problems common to both, will make for strengthening the good relations that

now exist between the two countries, will make not only for their maintenance in the future, but also help to remove some of the misunderstandings that from time to time arise between some people in the United States and some people in the Mother Country. The whole effect should be to strengthen and bind together nations having so much in common in their history, in their traditions, in their ideals and in their common love of democratic government and free institutions.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), namely, that all the papers concerning this change should be brought before Parliament and that the question should be fully discussed before a final decision is taken. My hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) has certainly not given all the details that are necessary to enlighten the House as to the meaning of the change that is being made. We are just as much at sea as ever after the speech delivered by my hon. friend. We were told in the official statement that was given to the House a few days ago that this change is practically no change at all. Here are the words of the statement:

> This new arrangement will not denote any departure either on the part of the British Government or of the Canadian Government from the principle of the diplomatic unity of the British Empire.

Yet, we are told that this appointment to Washington involves a very important change—the President of the Privy Council having used the words "very important departure." The language is certainly ambiguous, as all diplomatic language is, and I think I am within the mark when I say there are not five members of this House who really know the meaning of the change that is being made by this proposal.

My hon. friend says that Parliament was consulted last year when an estimate was voted for a certain amount, and that my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) at that time approved of the step. The very few words uttered by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve indicate that he understood, as we all did at the time, that the proposal was to appoint a trade commissioner at Washington. The President of the Privy Council at that time said that it was to continue the work done by the trade commission which had been in Washington during the war, and my hon. friend from Maisonneuve said that it was even more important to have a commissioner in Washington than in Paris or even in London. Will the President of the Privy Council say that it is only a trade commissioner that is going to be appointed to Washington?

Mr. ROWELL: I stated then clearly that it was a great deal more. If my hon. friend will turn it up in Hansard he will see it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But my hon. friend will admit that it was understood by the House at that time that the work of the representative was to continue the operations of the trade commission in Washington. Surely the voting of that sum did not mean that Parliament had decided on such an important question as this. As far as I am concerned, I will readily admit anything that looks like national self-assertion, anything which advances Canada along the road of nationhood, appeals to me. As General Smuts said last year, in a figurative way; "The British Empire ended in July or August, 1914," that is, that all the countries under the British flag are sister nations, the word "Empire" meaning a dominant state with subordinate states. But we must know exactly where we are going, because the body that is responsible to the Canadian people for any such important step as this is the Canadian Parliament and not the committee of the Privy Council. If we are to accept the words of the official statement that was made to the House this may be a very important change although later on it is said there has been no constitutional departure. This statement reads:

> Accordingly, it has been agreed that His Majesty, on advice of his Canadian ministers, shall appoint a Minister Plenipotentiary who will have charge of Canadian affairs and will at all times be the ordinary channel of communication with the United States Government in matters of purely Canadian concern, acting upon instructions from and reporting direct to the Canadian Government. In the absence of the Ambassador the Canadian minister will take charge of the whole Embassy and of the representation of Imperial as well as Canadian interests. He will be accredited by His Majesty to the President with the necessary powers for the purpose.

There is no better constitutional authority than Professor Keith and here is what I read in his work "Responsible Government in the Dominions," page 1133 volume 3:

> It would be a completely different thing to approve direct communications on political matters or the direct negotiation of treaties proper, and it would clearly be in theory a termination of the existing unity of the Empire, and the fundamental alteration of its constitution.

The same author in his recent work "Imperial Unity and the Dominions" speaks as follows, page 297:

It would be hopelessly expensive for any Dominion to duplicate the system of consuls, and even if the men were appointed they could not receive any consular status, as the right to appoint consular officers is one which appertains only, and is accorded in treaties solely, to the sovereign power in the Empire. If it were desired to give them consular status, this could indeed be done by securing their appointment by the Crown as His Majesty's consuls for Canada, or whatever other Dominion was concerned, but such an appointment would mean that the holders of office were appointed on the advice of the Imperial Government, and would have to be subjected to the control of the Imperial Government, since that Government would be responsible for them vis-à-vis the foreign Government, as it is not now responsible for mere commercial agents.

The same result can be attained more effectively and easily and much more cheaply, by the use of British consuls by the Dominions, who can pay if necessary any extra clerical expense caused by their employment. The same consideration, it may be added, applies to the representation of the Dominions by diplomatic officers in the foreign capitals: These officers could not, as long as the Empire is constituted as at present, be other than appointees of the Crown on the authority of the Imperial Government.

Mr. Curtis, who is a great Imperialist, in his important book, "The Problem of the Commonwealth" takes the same position, and says:

For, when trying to protect their subjects against disorder, the British Government would be obliged to say that Canadians were no longer included in that description. It would have to declare that Canadians had ceased to be British subjects, and the Canadian Government would have to admit that declaration. These consequences are such as no human ingenuity can change or evade. For all British subjects control of their foreign relations must rest in the hands of one Government only. Any section of British subjects who transfer that final authority to a government special to themselves and different from the government which decides those issues for other British subjects, in doing so renounce their status as such. To reconcile a common citizenship with allegiance to two different states is no more possible than to construct a triangle of which two sides are together less than the third.

This method, therefore, of completing the achievement of responsible government by the Dominions, so much in harmony with the process already followed, and so simple in its inception that it needs but a few strokes of the pen, is one which involves the least moderate change in the condition not only of the Dominion itself, but of all its citizens. It leads not merely to reform but straight to disruption of the Commonwealth—to consequences of the most revolutionary kind; and that, no doubt, is the principal reason why no Dominion Government has ever attempted to follow it. To argue whether they should follow it or not is beside the purpose of this inquiry. The people of the Dominions must settle that for themselves. Here we are simply concerned to discover the most moderate reform which will give them the same responsibility for their foreign affairs as the people of Britain, and to show that this particular method, though simple in appearance, involves revolution and not reform is enough for that purpose.

Mr. DEVLIN: On what page is that to be found?

Mr. LAPOINTE: At page 130. Mr. Curtis, recognizing the natural desire on the part of citizens of the Dominion to have a voice in the control of their own affairs, even foreign affairs, indicates only two methods of arriving at that solution. He says, first you must have either an Imperial Council, or an Imperial Cabinet, composed of ministers of the different Dominions as well as of the Mother Country. The other solution he indicates is an Imperial Parliament—all the apostles of Imperial Federation have advocated the same scheme—and he says it is the only solution for the Dominions, if they want to have a voice in foreign affairs. The only other alternative is independence, and of course he deprecates this mode of arriving at a solution of the question. Now if men, able men, students of constitutional affairs, men who desire a solution of the constitutional relations between the Mother Country and the various parts of the Empire, state that the only way for the Dominions to have a voice in their foreign affairs—if they do not desire independence—is the establishment of an Imperial Parliament which will have the control of all those representations in the foreign country, I say that such a step as the one which has been adopted should have been submitted to Parliament for full discussion before it was entered into. That is specially the case when we have been told for the last two years that immediately after the war an Imperial Conference would be called for the purpose of considering, studying and settling all the constitutional changes which are desirable in the relations between the Mother Country and the various Dominions of the Empire. Why did not the Government wait until this conference had been held before taking a step that may be very important, because when this conference takes place some people may come and say: Here is an accomplished fact; the Dominions have already a voice in their foreign affairs; and that being so they must agree to some Parliament or council or cabinet to which those diplomatic representatives shall be responsible.

Further, Mr. Speaker, it is said that the Canadian representative at Washington will automatically replace the British Ambassa-

dor when he is absent. If that representative is appointed by us, surely we will be responsible for his actions. Will the people of Canada be responsible for all the actions of that representative when he acts in the capacity of the British Ambassador in the absence of the regular ambassador? Another question I wish to ask is this: If the Canadian representative acts as British Ambassador surely the British Parliament or the British Government will have something to say in the selection of that representative, and he cannot be selected or appointed on the recommendation of the Canadian Government only? I could not believe that the British Government would agree to be represented by, and held responsible for the actions of, a man in the selection of whom they would have no voice whatever. Again I say Parliament should be given all particulars, all details about this appointment: Upon what conditions the British Government have agreed to the appointment of a Canadian representative at Washington? What is the real status of that officer? To what extent will the Canadian people be held responsible for his actions when he acts as British Ambassador? To what extent will the Imperial Government or Parliament have responsibility for the appointment of that officer? Then, and then only, shall we be able to discuss the question, and then only shall the Canadian people be in a position to decide as to the merit or the demerit of the constitutional change effected by this policy.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): It is sometimes said of a policy that it is damned by faint praise. I think it may be said of this proposal to appoint a Minister Plenipotentiary at Washington, that hon. gentlemen opposite have praised it by very faint condemnation.

My hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe) has referred to certain constitutional authorities and has pointed out the grave apprehensions entertained by those authorities if such a course should be pursued. I do not propose at this moment to enter into the question of the future constitutional relations of the Empire. As my hon. friend has said, that subject will be discussed at a great constitutional conference, not called, I assume, this year, but perhaps next year; and I hope at that conference both sides of this House, whatever party may be in power, will be represented. I believe that as foreign relations in the United Kingdom are lifted beyond the petty controversy of party politics, so the relations of Canada to our Empire may be lifted beyond the petty controversy of party politics in this country. As I have already said in this House, if I should be Prime Minister of Canada when that conference is called, I should certainly invite hon. gentlemen on the other side to participate with us in the discussions which will take place. I am not going to enter into that question now; I have just this to say: that he would be a bold man who would undertake to set forth the precise lines upon which constitutional changes in the future will be worked out and upon which the constitutional relations of the different nations of the Empire to each other and to the Mother Country will be based in the future. On the other hand, I think he would be a timid man who is not confident that the problem is not insoluble and that those relations will be worked out in such a way as to give to every nation of the Empire its adequate voice and place within the Britannic commonwealth.

I should like to point out to my hon. friend that when in days gone by, forty or fifty years ago, the question was raised of handing over to the Canadian people and to the Canadian legislature the control of their public domain, the control of their fiscal policy, the control of all their domestic affairs, the same grave apprehensions were expressed as to the effect which those just and merited concessions would have upon the solidarity of the Empire. My hon. friend need have no apprehensions as to the effect of this proposal. What does it amount to, after all? It amounts to this and only this: that a country like Canada, with eight and a half to nine millions of people, bordering the great republic to the south for four thousand miles and far more intimately associated with that country than with any other country outside the British Empire, should have its representative in the Embassy at Washington which represents the whole Empire. Is there anything startling or novel in that? Is there any reason why it should not be carried out? Does my hon. friend know what the Government did of which he was a supporter? He raises grave constitutional difficulties as to who shall appoint this minister and who shall be responsible for him. Does he know that the Government which was in power before 1911 concluded a treaty with the United States under which three Canadians were appointed to act with three men appointed by the United States Government on an International Joint Committee to

deal with the matters covered by that treaty? What are these men but ambassadors, in a sense—ambassadors charged also, it is true, with the duty of settling differences between the two countries not only by judicial determination but also by report and recommendation? When my hon. friend the then Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) went to Washington in 1911, what was his position, to all intents and purposes? He was an ambassador sent on behalf of Canada to the United States for the purpose of negotiating a treaty. If that is good constitutional practice for three, four or five months, where do you find any violation of the constitution in appointing a permanent representative to do the same thing and to deal with matters of precisely the same or more varied character?

My hon. friends on the other side seem to be strangely alarmed about this proposal. The hon. member (Mr. Lapointe) says that he is very happy to support any assertion of the dignity and status of the Canadian people, or words to that effect. He does not seem to be very happy in his support of the proposal this evening. I hope that his mind will be reassured after this debate has taken place and that he will come to a more illuminating and happier view of the proposal which has been placed before the country.

The hon. gentleman is strangely alarmed as to the terrible consequences which will ensue to this country if the Canadian minister at Washington in the absence of the British Ambassador should venture to carry on negotiations with the United States Government, and he wants to know to what extent the people of this country will be responsible. They will be responsible to precisely the same extent as if the British Ambassador himself had carried on the negotiations; no more and no less. I should have thought that that answer would have occurred to my hon. friend before he propounded that rather curious question.

Well, let us look a little at some of the observations which the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has made. In the first place, in connection with his demand that all the correspondence and Orders in Council should be laid on the table of the House, I should like to say just this: the correspondence has been conducted on the one hand with the Government of the United Kingdom and on the other hand with the Government of the United States. The correspondence does not tell the whole story, because there have been many oral interviews in which the subject has been discussed on many occasions during the past three years. I had the correspondence examined very carefully; I myself examined it carefully. I must say to my hon. friends on the other side of the House that in my judgment it cannot be brought down with any advantage to the public interest,—more than that, without detriment to the public interest. The negotiations with the Mother Country were naturally of an exceedingly confidential character. That is equally true—and I will emphasize this fact—with regard to the negotiations with the Government of the United States. My hon. friends on the other side are well aware, no doubt, that no country has the right to demand that any other country shall receive its minister. Every country grants that only in response to a request, and it is not obliged to grant any such request. We must accordingly be scrupulously careful to respect their confidences. Therefore, while the consultations with the British Government were of a highly confidential nature, whether they were written or oral, so on the other hand, the consultations and the correspondence with the Government of the United States are confidential to an even greater degree and cannot be disclosed in this House. All that has been arranged so far, with the exception of some minor details, perhaps not yet fully consummated, has been placed before the House in the statement read by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) just a week ago to-day, I believe.

As regards taking the initiative in this matter, I accept, at once and with the greatest possible grace, the fullest responsibility for the part that I have taken. It would make no difference whether I accepted the responsibility or not, that responsibility would rest upon me. I began these negotiations with the Government of the United Kingdom more than three years ago by oral discussion with the then Secretary of State for the Colonies and with the then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The matter rested for a time, and then it was taken up again in the autumn of 1917; but on account of war conditions and by reason of the enormous pressure of business affairs between the two countries, the conclusion was then reached that the purpose for the time being during the war would be better served by the appointment of a Canadian War Mission. That War Mission was appointed, and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has borne worthy and true testimony to the fact that members of that Mission

did splendid, unselfish, patriotic service for the country which they represented. Later on, and after the War Mission had about completed its work, the subject was further discussed. While I was abroad last year it was discussed, not only with members of the British Government, but with some members of the other Dominions of the Empire, notably with the Prime Minister of Australia. The matter stood then until October last when it was taken up in a more systematic form. Negotiations have been carried on ever since, and they have resulted in the announcement which was made in this House just one week ago and which has been received with great favour, not only in this country but in the United States. What reasons are there for appointing a Canadian representative at Washington? I need only emphasize them, as the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) has dwelt upon this phase of the argument.

Let me pay a tribute to every British Ambassador with whom I have been associated as Prime Minister, Lord Bryce, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, Lord Reading. I found every one of them eager and anxious to do everything within his power to maintain the interests of this country; but Lord Bryce himself said to me that three-quarters of the work transacted by the Embassy at Washington had relation to the interests of Canada. We all know perfectly well that the staff of the British Embassy at Washington was never selected, so far as we could observe, with any special purpose of placing thereon persons specially familiar with the ideals of the people of this country and with conditions in Canada. I felt many a time during the past nine years that we should have a representative at Washington, and I am confident that such was the view of Sir Wilfrid Laurier during the latter years of his tenure of office as Prime Minister. I should greatly doubt whether his proposal merely suggested the appointment of a commercial agent at Washington. Why should you appoint a commercial agent at Washington?

Mr. FIELDING: The Prime Minister says "his proposal." What proposal does he refer to? Where does he find the evidence of such a proposal?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) alluded last year to a proposal.

Mr. FIELDING: Not to any proposal. The hon. member for Maisonneuve said that he understood it was the desire of Sir Wilfrid Laurier to make an appointment, but I am free to say that the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier never made any proposal on the subject.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I know that he never made any definite proposal. I was speaking of proposal in another sense. If my hon. friend is sensitive as regards the word "proposal," I will substitute "idea" or "thought," if he finds fault with my language. I know perfectly well that his idea was not put into execution, but I am certain that he had some such idea in his mind and that he did not intend to send a commercial agent to Washington. Why should he send a commercial agent to Washington? If he wanted to send a commercial agent to the United States, he would send him to some of the great commercial centres, such as New York or Chicago. He surely would not send a commercial agent to Washington, because a commercial agent would be practically useless there.

I have spoken of the tremendous interests of Canada at Washington and of the great volume of work in the Embassy relating to the interests of this country. I have spoken also of the absence of any person distinctly Canadian in his ideals or knowledge who might have afforded necessary assistance in dealing with these questions. The condition as it existed before the war in respect of relations between the United States and Canada will continue in the future, and I anticipate great advantages from the proposal which the Government have announced.

Criticism has been made that we should have come to Parliament with these negotiations. We could not come to Parliament with these negotiations because they were of a highly confidential character from first to last. Every gentleman familiar with constitutional procedure should know that in respect of such matters it is absolutely essential that the Government shall take the initiative and that the result of any proposal which they may formulate shall be announced to Parliament afterwards. I should say to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) that when we announced last year that we proposed to send a diplomatic representative to Washington, we said about everything that could be said on the subject. That involved everything because the practice of diplomacy is an ancient one and is governed by a great body of rules, conventions and understandings that have grown up, so that the send-

ing of a diplomatic agent is perfectly intelligible to any one who cares to study the subject. Further than that, the whole matter under British constitutional practice has always been regarded as peculiarly within the sphere of the prerogative of the Crown, and that means, under our constitutional practice, within the discretion of the executive government. Instead of the view that this infringes in some way upon the rights and privileges of this House, I should like to point out to the hon. member for Quebec East, who is a constitutional student, that the exercise of such a prerogative in this way gives to the House of Commons a greater control of the whole question than it could get if legislation were introduced. Let me read to him the words of a great constitutional authority on that subject. Dicey, than whom no man stands higher in the discussion of constitutional questions, points out that:

> The survival of the prerogative, conferring as it does wide discretionary power on the Cabinet involves a consequence which constantly escapes attention. It immensely increases the authority of the House of Commons, and ultimately of the constituencies by which that House is returned. Ministers must in the exercise of all discretionary power inevitably obey the predominant authority in the State.

As the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has said, the Cabinet is only a committee of the House of Commons, and it can continue to act as such only as long as it has the support of a majority of that House. Then Dicey continues:

> Now that the House of Commons has become by far the most important part of the sovereign body, the ministry in all matters of discretion carry out, or tend to carry out, the will of the House. When, however, the Cabinet cannot act except by means of legislation other considerations come into play.

In the Mother Country the power of the House of Lords is sometimes interposed. In this country we sometimes find our benevolent efforts frustrated by the action of another body. A very good example which is given by Dicey is this: During Queen Victoria's reign the House of Commons passed a Bill for the abolition of purchase in the army. The Bill was rejected by the Lords. The object, however, was achieved by Royal Warrant under the prerogative. Dicey sums it up in this way:

> The prerogatives of the Crown have become the privileges of the people.

Now every one who is at all familiar with constitutional questions knows that the Sovereign has prerogatives in respect to foreign relations. Those prerogatives must be exercised upon the advice of the Sovereign's advisers. When, therefore, we undertook to deal with this matter we dealt with it as advisers of the Crown by confidential communication. When those communications had eventually reached an understanding, when matters were ripe both in the United Kingdom and in the United States for an announcement to be made to this Parliament, the announcement was made. So the Government accepts, as, of course it must accept, full responsibility for the course which it has taken, and that responsibility is one which we shall bear very lightly, because we believe that the time has long since been ripe when this great and growing nation should have its own direct representative at Washington. Instead of cavilling at the idea that a Canadian Minister sitting at Washington should represent the whole British Empire when the ambassador is absent, I am inclined to think that the people of Canada will be proud and glad that so important a duty and responsibility rest upon a Canadian sent to Washington by the Government of Canada.

Further than that, the intimate association between the people of the United States and Canada has led to a very perfect understanding between the peoples of the two countries. Perhaps there are no two nations in the world between whose peoples a more perfect comprehension exists at the present time than that which does exist between the people of Canada and the people of the United States. Thus, I venture to think, as my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) has well said, that this proposal to have a Canadian at Washington acting, not in opposition to, but in co-operation with the British ambassador, will tend not only to the good of this country but to a more perfect understanding and better relations between the Empire of which we form a part and the great republic of our kinsmen to the south.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, as this is the first opportunity I have had in this House of addressing my right honourable friend as Prime Minister may I avail myself of the occasion to say that I am pleased to see my right honourable friend so restored in health as to be able again to resume the very onerous duties of his high position.

I am sure it will come somewhat as a surprise to the people of this Dominion when, on reading the debates of this House

to-morrow, they discover that in this new and far-reaching step which the Government is about to take, if indeed, it has not already been taken, the only word the Government has to give to the people of Canada to all intents and purposes is:—this is not a matter on which we can give you any information one way or the other; this is not a matter on which you are entitled to know anything one way or the other; it is a matter so secret that the Government itself must deal and settle it without any knowledge on the part of the people or of the people's representatives in Parliament. That is the main point in the motion which is before the House this evening. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) and the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), have dwelt at considerable length on the reasons why Canada should have a permanent representative at Washington. There is nothing in the motion before the House to-night referring to the wisdom or unwisdom of having a permanent representative at Washington. My hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) in introducing this resolution took particular care to point out to the House that that was a question which might well be discussed at another time or upon another occasion; that what he wished to do by this resolution was to bring concretely before this House and the country the question of the supremacy of Parliament or the autocracy of the Cabinet. That is all that is involved in the resolution before the House. Let me read the resolution:

> This House desires to record its opinion that before any arrangement respecting the permanent representation of Canada at Washington is consummated, the House should be fully informed concerning the negotiations between the Canadian, Imperial, and United States Governments, and all correspondence and Orders in Council on the subject should be submitted to the House.

Is there an hon. member of this House representing a constituency in this country who will say that that is not what his own constituents demand of him? I, for my part, cannot see how any member of this House can go before his constituents or before the people of this country and say he is prepared, in regard to any transaction, I do not care how small or how great, to defend any action of a ministry which cannot be openly disclosed before the people's representatives in this House.

When, a week ago, the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), at that time the Acting Prime Minister, announced in the House the matter which we are discussing this evening, I asked my right hon. friend if he would at a very early date lay on the table of the House all the correspondence relating to this matter, and he replied in these words:

> I would merely say that all the available papers in connection with the negotiations will be brought down as quickly as possible and presented to the House.

That was the promise given to us a week ago, that all the available papers in connection with the matter would be brought down as quickly as possible and presented to the House. My right hon. friend at that time evidently anticipated that it was going to be possible to give the representatives of the people in Parliament at least some information in regard to this far-reaching matter. But to-night the Prime Minister says to us: I have had all the correspondence carefully gone over, I have examined the papers myself, and hon. members of the House of Commons shall not see one of them. That is what we are now told, that the file has been gone through by the Prime Minister himself, and that having been looked through, the people's representatives in Parliament are not to have any access to the papers or any of the correspondence. Well, Sir, all I can say is, it is a mighty bad beginning in a new departure if our foreign policy,—because this is a venture in foreign policy,—is to be bound up with secrecy from the start. We are driving right into the very vortex that created the whole situation in Europe, going against the very thing which the allied nations have been urging so strongly, namely —that diplomacy should not be secret but that it should be open and above board. Why, Sir, if in a matter which concerns the relations between the different parts of the Empire, between different nations, we start off by informing the people's representatives in Parliament that they cannot be told one word in regard to the conditions which have brought about such an all-important change, what may we expect as the result of such diplomacy?

Now, my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) said that this matter had been discussed in this country back and forth, and that there was no doubt about the voice of the press in regard to it from the Atlantic to the Pacific. He spoke particularly of one paper, the Winnipeg

Free Press, and he said that we would all recognize that paper as the exponent of public opinion in the Middle West. Well, I have in my hand the latest editorial on this very subject in the Winnipeg Free Press, and I will read it to my hon. friend, and to the House, because apparently while the President of the Privy Council is not willing to listen to anything that may be said by the people's representatives here, he attaches great importance to the press generally, and to this organ in particular. What the Winnipeg Free Press says in its editorial is what my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has said in his motion. Under the heading, "Our Minister at Washington," the Winnipeg Free Press of May 12th has the following:

> The appointment of a Canadian Minister Plenipotentiary at Washington is an interesting innovation about which it will be possible to comment intelligently when more information is available than was supplied in the very guarded statement read to the House of Commons on Monday by Sir George Foster.

And that is all the information we have.

> Mr. King, the Opposition leader, expressed the view that before the arrangement—whatever it might prove to be—was made, Parliament should have been given the opportunity to discuss and consider it. However this may be, it is beyond dispute that it will be the duty of Parliament to submit the arrangement to very keen scrutiny to make sure that it is all that is being claimed for it. It will be within the right of Parliament to object, if it does not approve of what is being done; and any such recorded objection would bring the whole thing to the ground.
>
> Meanwhile the need is for full and explicit information.

Does the hon. President of the Privy Council hear that statement?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is exactly what my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), is asking, that before this matter is consummated we get full and explicit information.

> It is intimated that our Canadian minister will deal with all matters arising between Canada and the United States which are exclusively Canadian in character; the Imperial ambassador will participate in the negotiations only when Imperial interests are involved. Very well; but what happens if a disagreement should arise—which might easily happen—

Those are questions which any hon. gentleman sitting on the other side might reply to later in the evening, so that the country may get light on this subject as speedily as possible.

> —between the Canadian minister and the British ambassador as to whether a question is, or is not, exclusively Canadian? Even in the exclusively Canadian matters about which there is no dispute, will the Canadian minister carry negotiations through to the end; or will it be necessary, in the final resort, to call in the British minister to do the actual signing?
>
> Our representative is to be known as a minister. Will he be accepted as a minister by the State Department at Washington? Will he be a member of the diplomatic corps, having all the rights, powers, immunities and privileges enjoyed by the ministers of all other countries represented at Washington? Will he be the equal in diplomatic statute of, let us say, the minister from Venezuela? Or will his position at Washington be actually undefined with a mere courtesy status? Parliament and the country will need conclusive answer to these and similar questions; and not until this information is supplied will it be possible to say whether this is a step forward or backward.
>
> It is asserted in certain quarters that this marks an enlargement of Canadian powers and that it is another step forward on the road to nationhood. The Government at Ottawa no doubt believes that this will be the effect of the innovation. But we regard with some trepidation formal arrangements entered into three years after the adoption of a declared policy of equality of status between all the British nations by which it is possible that Canada may accept ratify, and confirm a status of admitted diplomatic inferiority, formally putting her name to documents that confirm this subordination. If the Canadian minister at Washington is only a camouflaged chief clerk or a commissiner it would be better to have no minister there.

Those are not the words of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, they are the words of the Winnipeg Free Press, which my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council so highly values.

Mr. MURPHY: A Government authority.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The article continues:

> If his position there is by courtesy, if Canada cannot endow her representative with all the powers which other ministers enjoy, then Canada should send no one to Washington until she can vest him with the true prerogatives of office.
>
> Information upon these extremely important points is lacking; until it is forthcoming any conclusive judgment upon the wisdom or otherwise of the Government's action is not possible. But the matter is of great importance and Parliament should regard it as one of its prime duties to see that the matter is fully discussed from all angles and in the light of full knowledge.

It is unnecessary to point out, Mr. Speaker, that that is exactly what we on this side of the House are asking should be done. In this resolution we are asking that Parliament should be informed in as much detail as possible in regard to this transaction before it is finally consummated.

But we have not only the views of our Canadian press. Since this announcement was made, there has been time for word to come from other parts of the Empire, and

what do we find? In Great Britain, in Australia and in the other Dominions we find expressions of opinion questioning the wisdom of this arrangement without any light or information upon it. Let me read from another leading daily, an organ of the present Government—the Montreal Star. That paper has a well known correspondent in England whose cables, published under the name of "Windermere," are read with interest in all parts of this country. And I should mention to the House that those who know "Windermere" know him to be a member of the British House of Commons. If one looks at the Montreal Star of May 12, one will find a despatch relating to the announcement which was made in this House on this subject and to a similar announcement made in the British House on the evening of the same day. That despatch was cabled by "Windermere." Omitting a few preliminary remarks, it says:

There is, nevertheless, widespread sympathy among Parliamentarians—

Those are the members of the British Parliament.

—with the view recorded from Ottawa that so momentous a departure might well have been calmly and fully debated in Parliament, so that a momentous departure setting a precedent for a revolution in the whole machinery of British diplomacy in all countries could have been reviewed in all its aspects before the change was made. As it is, the change seems to the public as having been rushed.

Then referring to the Australian view "Windermere" says:

An Australian of high rank whom I consulted assures me that Australia is now certain to demand that she also have full rank with an Australian minister at Washington. New Zealand and South Africa should, he declared, follow suit, with the result that ultimately, not alone Washington, but every other great foreign capital, and certainly Paris, Rome, Berlin, Petrograd, and Tokio, will have its circle of fully accredited British Empire ministers among whom the British Ambassador will be first, perhaps, but first among equals. He added: "If the Canadian minister at Washington is to be the fully authorized British Ambassador in the absence of the British representative, we assume that the Australian minister will be singled out for the same distinction in some equally important European capital, or say, Japan.

"You Canadians claim that this is the national prayer and, indeed, the inevitable sequel to Canada's new natioinal status as accorded at the Peace Conference. Very well! we as Australians throw up our hats with you, but don't run away with the notion that you have not perhaps unwittingly taken on far-reaching new responsibilities which every Dominion within the Empire will wish to take too, and which carries the seed of vital changes in the whole structure of an Empire.

"There was some cheering in the British Commons when Bonar Law announced the change. Most English public men welcome every sign of increasing power and influence of England's younger partners overseas, but I can quite understand the feeling of many longsighted Englishmen and perhaps some Australians that before making this plunge into the unknown at the bidding of the Canadian ministers, who, perhaps, only half appreciate its ultimate significance, it would have been wiser to discuss the whole subject round the friendly family table of the Imperial Conference. We could have all had our say then."

Will any one, viewing the affairs of the British Empire from the point of view from which they are likely to be regarded by representatives of the British Isles and of the different Dominions, find anything unreasonable in a request of that kind? If our action in failing to discuss this matter openly and freely is going to create some unrest in Australia, South Africa and New Zealand, and some concern in England, surely we are not helping to bring about the closer relations between the different parts of the British Empire which it ought to be the object of every free Parliament within the Empire to bring about. There are very strong reasons why a transaction that is fraught with so many possibilities should not have been finally consummated until Parliament had had a full opportunity to discuss it in all its bearings.

When hon. members have referred to the debates that have taken place in this House they have spoken about a permanent representative at Washington. That is a subject upon which we might all be very much united, and it might well be that there might be no difference of opinion as to the propriety of having a permanent representative at Washington. If there were differences of opinion, surely it would be worth while having those differences discussed in Parliament and the case considered upon its merits. But what the Government have consummated in this transaction is something far different from a proposal to establish a permanent representative of Canada at Washington. It is not only a permanent representative that is proposed, but a Minister Plenipotentiary is to be appointed who, to all intents and purposes, is to be the British Ambassador at Washington during the time when the British Ambassador may be away from the country or absent from duty. No one can say how long a time that will be; no one can say what questions will come up while the Canadian plenipotentiary is acting as British Ambassador at Washington. Is there any one here who believes that a step of that kind is going to be free from all kinds of possible danger? What is it that has brought about the desire to have our own

representative at Washington? It is that time and again we have taken exception to what British diplomatists at Washington have done on our behalf. Is our representative likely to be so perfect that he will always satisfy British opinion? Why not let British diplomatists manage British affairs and let us manage our own affairs? Then we will not get into those mix-ups and troubles which on occasions have given reason to doubt the wisdom of British diplomatists voicing Canadian interests in matters between the United States and ourselves. Is it to be supposed that the time will never come when the people of Great Britain will have reason to feel that their interests as watched by the Canadian plenipotentiary acting as British Ambassador have not been guarded in as satisfactory a way as they could have wished?

There are two extreme views that may be taken in regard to a matter of this kind. One is that the affairs of Canada should be managed exclusively by the British Embassy; the other that the Canadian representative should manage the British Embassy, for part of the time as is here proposed. What seems to be the more rational course is the middle one, that in matters between Canada and other countries Canada should manage her own affairs, and that in matters between Great Britain and other countries, Great Britain should manage her own affairs, always when necessary with co-operation and conference between the two. At the present time, when the British Ambassador is absent the British charge d'affaires is responsible for the business of the Embassy. My right hon. friend had something to say about responsibility. Let us go into this matter a little. Sometimes it is necessary to recall an ambassador. Let us assume that the British minister is away and that it happens that the Canadian plenipotentiary has been acting when, perchance, a mistake is made. Whom are the British Government going to recall? Are they going to recall the Canadian minister at Washington? They cannot do that; he does not belong there; he belongs here. Are they going to recall the British Ambassador? He is not responsible; he has had nothing to do with the transaction. These are complications which suggest themselves. Are these things not worth considering; are they of no concern to the future of the British Empire? They surely ought to be considered here as being matters intimately bound up with our relations with the Mother Country. We should have co-operative relations, relations by conference and discussion, but when it comes to so vital a matter as that of taking on the responsibilities that must come from the larger and vast considerations involved in this departure as proposed, I do not believe that, proud as the Canadian people are of their status as a nation, they would wish to have any representative of this country go to Washington and deal with questions that affect all parts of the British Empire in their relations with the United States, questions which may relate to the different countries of Europe, questions which may grow out of conflicting matters that come to the fore in connection with the League of Nations, of which the United States is as yet not a member and may not be a member for some time to come.

I do not believe the Canadian people wish to launch too deep into experiments in foreign policy at the present time. All matters of government, and particularly matters affecting diplomatic relations, are matters of constitutional evolution. If we are going to advance, by all means let us proceed along the line of evolution; but let us take one step at a time. Do not let us begin with the extreme step that is being taken in this arrangement without any reference to the views of the representatives of the people. I submit to my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) that at this of all times it would have been fitting and in accordance with the rights of this Parliament, as it was owing to the supremacy of parliament and its position as a great deliberative assembly, before concluding anything, to have brought before this House a resolution expressing the opinion of the Government that Canada should be represented at Washington by a Minister Plenipotentiary and to have given hon. members an opportunity of deciding upon that question here. If the Government wished to go a step further and to say they desired that the Canadian minister plenipotentiary should be also the British Ambassador at Washington, for the time being, they might well have presented that view also in the form of a resolution and have given us an opportunity of discussing it here. That would not be ignoring Parliament, that would be leaving it to the Canadian people through their representatives to say what they wished to have done, but the Government has not done that; the Government has brought forward no resolution. It has done all of its own volition.

The President of the Privy Council says: "We will give you a chance when it comes to voting the money." That is about the

only time this Government ever comes to Parliament in regard to anything. We have had one measure after another during this session in regard to which we have been told: "No, the transaction is already settled, an Order in Council has been passed and all we want is that you should vote the money." That is all we have a chance to do. We have had Orders in Council and agreements placed on the Table and we have been told "we want you to ratify." Why? Because they cannot put these things into effect without money; money is needed, and they have to ask Parliament for it. But there is no chance for the people's representatives to discuss the merits of the transaction; everything is signed, sealed, and delivered; as it was with the Grand Trunk agreement, and as it is with this transaction. The only think left is to vote the money. The Government simply says to its supporters: "You vote the money, you support the agreement, or we will go the country and you will be out of your seats for good." The right hon. the Prime Minister smiles, but he knows perfectly well that he can go away for months and months and that when he comes back he will find his followers responding to every crack of the whip. The Government say: "You give us your support, or if not we will go to the country, and out you go." I think the time has come when the Government should recognize its responsibility to the people, and bring before this Parliament every transaction that has any bearing upon the future relations of Canada with other countries or that has to do with payments which our people will have to make.

Mr. Speaker, I might refer to many other points but I think that what I have said will, perhaps, be sufficient to indicate that all we are asking in this resolution is that the supremacy of Parliament in matters that pertain to the well-being of the people shall be recognized and that that is a wise request. It does not matter how far this transaction has gone at the present time; we still ask that this Parliament be given full information, and that it be given enough correspondence to let us see that at least there is something in writing about the matter. We do not know at the moment that the Government have even got a signed agreement as between the British Government and the Government of Canada, or as between the United States and this country. The Prime Minister says that we are to have nothing. Well, how this Parliament is to ratify or act upon nothing is a mystery that it is going to be difficult to explain; and until we get something that can be concretely seen and regarded not only by Parliament but by the people of the country we are justified, I think, in taking any course calculated to secure to the people their rights in this matter.

Now, in regard to the secrecy of this kind of diplomacy, the inability to bring down any correspondence, let me remind the House in regard to one subject that was mentioned here this evening—the Reciprocity agreement. My right hon. friend, referred, I think, to the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's as having negotiated that agreement, and he compared the action of the Minister going to Washington on that occasion with the kind of action which will be expected of this Canadian Minister permanently resident at Washington. But what position did the Government of the day take in regard to the reciprocity agreement? Did they come and say to this Parliament. "We have made an agreement with the United States. It is signed, sealed and delivered; there is nothing for the Canadian people to do but to accept it, and vote whatever money is necessary to carry it out?" I think my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) will bear me out when I say that the ink on that agreement was not dry before he brought into Parliament the agreement itself and all the correspondence that related to it—laid before Parliament all the documents necessary for free discussion—and from Parliament the issue was carried to the people for their consideration, and was settled by the vote of the people themselves. That is parliamentary government, under the British system: recognizing the rights of Parliament and the rights of the people; and all that we ask in regard to this particular measure—which may have consequences more far reaching and serious than any that have taken place in connection with any of the measures referred to this evening—is that upon the present occasion a similar course shall be adopted. As it is, we are establishing a new precedent, and surely, in so doing, we should have all the information that we can possibly obtain. This is a question that relates to inter-Imperial and international relations, matters of foreign policy; and on such questions—even more than on matters of home policy—we should have the fullest information. We are entitled for example, to know the status of the Minister in regard to all of these questions that have been raised in the editorial of the Winnipeg Free Press to which I have referred. The people, being called upon to pay the expense of this new

office and position, are entitled to know how much it is going to cost and to what it is going to lead. Finally, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that we are entitled at this stage, of all times in the history of the world, in matters respecting our relations with other countries, to end secret diplomacy once and for all, and have our diplomacy open and above board or not have it at all.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, some time in the history, I believe, of every man it occurs that what seemed to him golden in the heated moment of discussion appears to him very much like lead when, an hour or two afterwards, he has cooled off. So, in the best of good spirit, I would suggest to my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, that when he reads his speech to-morrow, after he has cooled off, and looks at it coldly as it appears on the printed page, I doubt if he will be very proud of that speech. And I might also carry that suggestion a little bit further, and apply it to those hon. gentlemen who so valiantly applauded him—as to whether, reading the speech over in cold blood, they will think of it in exactly the same enthusiastic way in which they have applauded the speaker to-night.

An hon. MEMBER: We shall be more enthusiastic.

Mr. McMASTER: It will warm the blood.

An hon. MEMBER: Much more so.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I can quite see that, and I will say it is no disadvantage to my hon. friends opposite, who have been so lethargic for so long a time, that they should have some warm blood pulsing their veins to let the country know they are really alive.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What about yourself?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is just by the way. I am not going to enter very lengthily into discussion of this matter to-night, but I will take up a few points that my hon. friend has made and see how much there really is in them.

In the first place, he made much of the statement, repeated over and over again, that the Government was denying information to the House and to the representatives of the people. That is always a favourite chord to touch when you want to arouse your followers—either in the House or out of it—on any particular subject; but how far was my hon. friend right in demanding the information which he demanded on this particular subject and at this particular time? After all my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding)—who has probably had one of the longest experiences in public life of any Canadian now in Parliament—knows that in all governments there are certain negotiations that take place, and it is impossible to make public the stages of those negotiations and their various phases whilst they are in progress; and a great deal of information—sometimes a very great deal—never is made public at all during the time when publicity might be harmful in many ways with reference to living statesmen in different countries who have been carrying the negotiations on, or with reference to the countries themselves whose interests have been under discussion. That is one of the things that every statesman and every Cabinet Minister of experience knows; it is simply a demand which is absolutely without good foundation, that certain things shall be known while negotiations are going on, or shall be made public, and that there shall be nothing secret, nothing confidential, nothing kept away from the view of the legislature or of the people—that everything shall be open—open diplomacy as my hon. friend said. Now that position is nullified by actual fact and by actual practice in the experience of every statesman and every member of a government. In no case where Governments carry on international negotiations, even in these days when open diplomacy is in far greater vogue than it was in previus times, is the course of the negotiations step by step and from hour to hour made known to parliaments, legislatures and the public of the different countries concerned. The events which have taken place during the last five years; the events which have taken place even since the Armistice have been one great proof of the impossibility of successfully carrying on negotiations of a delicate and complex nature, involving the prejudices, the policies, the national aspirations, of different countries, if every day the reporter puts before the public just what has taken place, what has been said and what has been concluded with reference thereto. You must draw a line somewhere; there must be a point beyond which you cannot go in publicity. After all, the chief thing is the conclusion that has been arrived at; the arrangement that has been actually made. If I buy a watch, the purpose which I had in mind is carried out when that watch keeps the correct time and enables me to ascertain the hour of the day by referring to it. But if I am curious to know

how that watch is made up and I dig into its springs and its cogs and its general interior, I shall make impossible of achievement the very purpose and idea of the thing itself. As I say, the thing that has been actually come at as a conclusion is the thing that matters, and it is the gist of that which has been given to Parliament and which Parliament has a perfect right to know.

My hon. friend would raise this matter into a controversy between the autocracy of a Cabinet and the supremacy of Parliament. Now, that is an exaggerated method of expressing what is happening to-night with reference to the demand of our friends on the other side and the information which is being given by the Government. It is not a case of the autocracy of the Government against the supremacy of Parliament; it is a case of the proper co-ordination of the functions of Government and the functions of Parliament. My hon. friend says that we should have come down with a resolution affirming the principle that a trade commissioner should be sent to Washington—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not a trade commissioner; oh, no.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Or, if you want higher flights than that: a resolution that a Minister Plenipotentiary should be stationed at Washington. Then, he says, we should come down with another resolution stating that if it was considered best, that Minister Plenipotentiary sent to represent Canada at Washington should also be empowered to represent the British Government as its ambassador, if the British Government so desired. That was the way in which my hon. friend would approach the subject. Would he have got anywhere in approaching the subject in that way? Is it feasible? Is it practical? You must first proceed by way of negotiation, oral and otherwise, in order that the Governments concerned may test each other's views; in order to settle upon the modus operandi; what shall be the functions, what shall be the powers, what can be done in this respect and in that. Then, after you come to conclusions that are satisfactory to the two Governments you bring your conclusions to Parliament, and there it is that the supremacy of Parliament exerts itself. Parliament is then master of the situation. It can turn out the Government which has gone so far, if it considers it proper to do so. It can stop them at the point at which they give the information and not allow the proceeding to go further, if it considers it wise to do so. Parliament is, in the end, the supreme arbiter; nothing can be finally carried out without its approval. But my hon. friend would proceed in the way that he suggests. Did the party to which he belonged, and to which he still belongs, proceed in that way in respect to the reciprocity negotiations in 1911? Did they bring down to Parliament a resolution affirming that it would be a proper and right thing to send a delegation of ministers to Washington to undertake the negotiation of a treaty of reciprocity with the United States? I have no memory of a course like that having been adopted. And did they then come down with another resolution affirming that certain ministers should go down there as plenipotentiaries for the time being to work upon that principle, bring back an arrangement, and submit it to the House? Not at all. They did what was the practical thing; what was the customary thing, having regard to their prerogatives. They came to the conclusion that it would be a good thing to have a reciprocity treaty with the United States. They therefore sent their ministers to Washington to negotiate a treaty. We in the House of Commons knew nothing about it at that time—did not know what the terms of the treaty were; did not know how much they would give up; did not know how much they would get. The whole thing was done entirely behind our backs. While we were in perfect ignorance of what they were doing from hour to hour and day to day, they were proceeding to negotiate a binding commercial arrangement, a reciprocity treaty, which they would bring back and, if they could, put through the House; if they could not put it through the House they would, of course, take the responsibility and meet the fate which would attach to that responsibility. They went without the voice of Parliament or of the country behind them. They did their work; they brought back the result; and as soon as they asked the voice of Parliament and the voice of the country, they got their answer, as every Government will get theirs if their action is not in accordance with the wishes of the people.

When my hon. friend asserts that we should have proceeded as he suggests with reference to this negotiation, he did not back up what he said by pointing to like things that had been done by his own party. I do not find fault with his party for doing what they did in the case of the reciprocity negotiations. It was their prerogative; it was their right; they acted in a perfectly constitutional way. So in this matter, this Government have exer-

cised their prerogative; they have proceeded with these negotiations; they have brought them to a point where finality has been reached in certain respects; they bring that arrangement back, and they submit it to Parliament. Parliament is supreme in this matter; Parliament is the arbiter of the whole thing.

The hon. gentleman stated that our position on this side of the House was: "When we demand information, you take the position that the representatives of the people in the House of Commons shall not see one whit of what passes, shall not know a thing of the negotiations that have taken place, shall not have all the papers or any of the papers placed before them for their information." That is not, as I stated, the main thing. The main thing is that the arrangement which has been up to this time concluded shall be in its essence and effect made known to the House of Commons, to the Parliament of Canada; and that is what has been done. My hon. friend had rather a grievance that I had stated that all available papers would be brought down. That is always the answer when demands are made for negotiable instruments of that kind. After negotiations have been carried on, when the papers are called for, you bring down the papers that it is in the public interest to bring down, and you are not obliged to bring down, neither is it understood that you shall bring down papers, the publicity of which would not be useful, which might, in fact, be disadvantageous to the general public interest, the international interest, the interest of the people of the countries involved. My hon. friend supported his demand by reading an extract from the Winnipeg Free Press, an organ of great power and intelligence, not by any means an organ of this Government, but an organ of public opinion which I, for my part, like to read and follow in so far as its suggestions are good. My hon. friend also read extracts from other papers. When he analyses really what these extracts from papers show as to the demand that is made and which is expressed in the extracts, it amounts to nothing more than this, that if an arrangement is made, before it is put into effect, Parliament and the country should know exactly what it is. But that is not at all a demand from the press or from those papers that every step of the negotiations, oral as well as written, shall be placed in print or in essence before Parliament. Any one knows that with delicate negotiations of this kind such a course would be neither advantageous or useful. Some one has made the statement—I think it was made in one of the extracts read by my hon. friend—that if we were to have under this arrangement nothing more at Washington than a glorified trade commissioner or a camouflaged chief clerk, the House and the country ought to know that. The House knows that, and the country knows it and will know it. It is not a glorified trade commissioner nor a camouflaged chief clerk who goes to Washington under this arrangement; it is a minister plenipotentiary, and the term itself designates the position and the power of the person who has that appointment. Therefore, the anxiety of my hon. friend that we shall have at Washington something more than a glorified trade commissioner or a camouflaged chief clerk may be set at rest entirely in respect to that.

He has read also expressions of opinion voiced by contributors to newspapers in the old country and in or on the part of Australia, and he has raised many doubts and fears as to what will happen in all this. His counsel would have been that nothing should be done in respect to this matter until all had got together at a general conference in the old country and the matter had been talked over and conclusions reached. He also asks the question: What will happen in Washington when the minister plenipotentiary goes there in his dual capacity of representatives of the interests of Canada and possibly of representative of the British Government in the absence of the British Ambassador? He also asks the question: What will happen and who will be responsible for him, for instance, when the minister plenipotentiary is carrying out his duties with reference to Canada and Canadian affairs, which, in so far as they relate to the two countries, will be within his power? The Dominion of Canada is responsible for him in that capacity; he receives his instructions from the Dominion Government, and he acts in conformity with those instructions. That is plain and evident from the premises. Then the hon. gentleman asks: When the British Ambassador is absent and the minister plenipotentiary is acting as British Ambassador and in his place, who will be responsible for what he does then—will it be Canada or will it be Great Britain? Equally in that case, if he is standing in the place of the ambassador in the absence of the regular incumbent, he is acting under instructions from the British Government, and he is responsnble under those instructions to the British Government.

Mr. McMASTER: Supposing the Prime Minister and the Government of this country gave him instructions diametrically opposed to the instructions given him by the Imperial or Home Government, what would happen?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is not much necessity of asking what will happen then, because that never could happen.

Mr. McMASTER: Such a thing is possible.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In so far as he is the plenipotentiary for Canada and acting for Canada, he takes his instructions from the Canadian Government alone. In so far as he is acting as an ambassador for the British Government in the absence of the regular ambassador, he takes his instructions from the British Government, and he is responsible to that Government for the way in which he carries them out. That is as plain as it can be, so that what my hon. friend conjures up in his mind is an impossibility, a thing which cannot happen. But the alternative which was hinted at by my hon. friend has something appalling in it from another point of view. My hon. friend said: Let Canada manage her affairs with reference to the United States, and let Great Britain manage her affairs alone with reference to the United States, in so far as they touch the interests of Great Britain. If that is pushed to its extremity, is that co-operation? Does it not, when pressed to its logical conclusion, have in it the elements of danger in the future as to co-operation and continued unity and the solidarity of the Empire? It seems to me, and I think it will commend itself to my hon. friend, that if that is his alternative to the principle which has been adopted in the arrangement which has been made and laid before this Parliament, there are greater dangers to be apprehended in the future along that line than along the present line where in co-operation the two countries work together in unity, each having its special work to do under its special instructions from its own government, and co-operating, as they can co-operate, in a spirit of unity and of good fellowship.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend will recall that I coupled what I said in that connection with the remark that there should always be co-operation and conference and discussion.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is that exactly. There is first, a clear definition of the powers. In matters of purely Canadian concern the plenipotentiary takes his instructions from Canada, and he works under those instructions and is not instructed by the British Ambassador. Co-operation, counsels of wisdom and of experience, should, and I suppose always will be perfectly common between the two, but the British Ambassador does not interfere in respect to matters purely Canadian, and the Canadian plenipotentiary does not interfere in matters purely of Imperial concern. At the same time, there may be the closest intimacy and unity of thought and of effort between the two. So I think there is no more danger in an arrangement based on conditions as they have been outlined to Parliament than there would be in following out my hon. friend's line.

My hon. friend made a very fine appeal to the sympathies of his friends on the other side of the House, when he made the rather unwarranted assertion that the Government of Canada, the present Government particularly, never came down to the House except when it wanted money, and that then it came. My hon. friend knows that that is an exaggerated statement. He also knows that there are few things which can be carried out in the way of public policy or public enterprise, initiated or aided by a government, which do not require for their carrying out to have money placed at the disposal of the Government. That is the privilege which Parliament holds. It holds the power of the money vote; and of course it is always necessary to come to Parliament for money in order to carry out the policies and the enterprises initiated through the Government and by the Government. But does not my hon. friend think that he made rather a catch-penny argument when he so strongly and so enthusiastically put it as a point of disadvantage to the Government that they never came to Parliament unless they wanted money? As Parliament holds the purse-strings it is absolutely impossible for any government in connection with any governmental policy, or any governmental enterprise, begun, initiated and brought to a certain point by the Government as the committee of Parliament, not to come ultimately to Parliament and the House of Commons for the wherewithal to carry those policies and those enterprises through. My hon. friend need only look at the history and the experience of his own party to know that governments do act in that way, and to take that responsibility. Take the project of the Grand Trunk Pacific

railway, for instance. Read its history, let your memory stray over the initiatory processes of that undertaking, the effects of which still remain with us, and will for many a generation. I suppose any one might have made the same statement with regard to the government of that day, that they only came to Parliament in respect to this great transaction, involving almost unlimited expenditure, after they had negotiated, signed, and practically sealed the arrangement with the companies with whom they made the bargain. Governments do act that way. They take that responsibility, and they carry out their measures through that medium. They must in the end always come to Parliament for its sanction before any of these enterprises can be carried through to completion.

My hon. friend in the end, as an argument often addressed and an appeal often made, says that in this age we should have no more secret diplomacy. Now what does he really mean by that? When he as the leader of a government carries on the affairs of this country, will he undertake to live by that rule of policy, that there shall be nothing undertaken by the Government in its transactions with Japan, in its transactions with China, in its transactions with France, in its transactions with any other country in the world with which it comes into contact daily, and where delicate questions arise involving negotiation and careful and wise counsels —will he abide by his rule that before he undertakes to write a communication to a foreign government he will come down to Parliament and make plain to Parliament and the country just what he is going to write and get the approval of Parliament and the country before he undertakes to do it? Will everything be open, no secrecy, nothing kept back, but from the very start every transaction made public to the legislature of the country and to the people of the country and to the world? I venture to say that my hon. friend will never lead a government along those lines, or if he attempts it, he will never lead a government successfully. Under the constitution of things as they are in the world, that cannot be done, and it will never be possible for it to be done so long as there are conflicting and opposing interests between different countries of the world.

My hon. friend, I hope, will not be altogether too unquiet with reference to this matter. Has he not conjured up possibilities which have very little foundation in fact? You could, with reference to any policy, at any time within the last eighty years, and with reference to every advance that has taken place in the constitutional development of Great Britain and of her Overseas Dominions and dependencies—you could have conjured up the same difficulties, made the same suppositions in order to prejudice or to oppose or to baulk, the development along certain lines of progress. You could have always done that, and it has always been done. But the supreme fact in the constitutional progress and growth of the British Empire and of its outlying parts has been that these successive steps have been taken, each one adding liberty, power and importance to the outlying portions, each step also adding strength, unity and solidarity to the Empire fabric as a whole, and that the fears of the timid fortunately did not outweigh the strong inspiration and hope of the courageous ones who took the part that progress seemed to indicate and trusted to the good sense, the strength and the capacity of the people of the Empire to guide in ways that would be advantageous and to avoid results that would be hurtful. And so the whole history of British diplomacy and of British constitutional development has passed on from step to step. I for one can see that in any new arrangement bearing within it responsibilities such as this arrangement bears, there may be about it eventualities that may well give us pause, but it is for the good sense, the wise counsel, the steady and cool judgment of the British people—qualities which have been such distinctive features of their progress in the past—to maintain their sway in the future and to guide along proper and safe lines for every one of these opening developments towards greater power, greater importance, greater liberty and consequently greater happiness for the Empire as a whole and for its constituent parts.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I have felt a great deal of interest in the official explanation given by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Borden) and by his colleagues on the treasury benches, Mr. Speaker, as regards the appointment of a Minister at Washington. It seems to me that this question is a very simple one. We have discussed this evening the merits of the case, while the whole point is a question of procedure. And I believe, Sir, that the amendment which has been offered by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) asserts the only principle which ought to be

adhered to by both parties in this House,—because long ago the battle for responsible government was won in this country. After carefully reading the amendment, whose words are well weighed, I wondered why there should be any division of opinion in this House as regards its merits. Because, I repeat, it asserts a principle which embodies a golden rule for the government of Canada.

I do not understand the objections which have been made by my right hon. friend, the last speaker (Sir George Foster), to this amendment, unless the right hon. gentleman has still the notions of fifty years ago. Those of us who are students of Canadian history—and we are all students of the history of our country—know that in the early forties and before as the fight was carried on by the friends of responsible government, they were denounced at every turn by the members of the Family Compact. The members of the Family Compast in those days spoke against Baldwin and William Lyon Mackenzie, as my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke this evening against the grandson of William Lyon Mackenzie (Mr. Mackenzie King) and against the member for Shelburne and Queen's. In those days, as to-night, the friends of responsible government wanted to exact from the government of the day the correspondence, the information, the whys and the wherefores of the policies of the Government, but the governor of the day, who in himself constituted the whole government, Sir Francis Bond Head, speaking of his critics said, "They think they are the friends of responsible government, whilst at heart they are only disloyal." But he lived long enough to see responsible government firmly rooted in Canadian soil, and I am somewhat surprised that seventy-five years afterward we find a Canadian minister and a Canadian government reviving the same old reactionary policy as was advocated by Sir Francis Bond Head in those far-off days.

The Government, Sir, do not seem to be very free with information; on the contrary, they seem to be very secretive indeed. But they live in a fool's paradise, if they think, because during the five strenuous years of the war the people of Canada and the Parliament of this Dominion in a very generous, yes, in a chivalrous way, gave them a mandate to carry on, that they can continue the war system now that the glamour of war has gone. I repeat, they are living in a fool's paradise, because if there is one principle which has triumphed as a result of the great world conflict, it is that a people must be represented by its elected representatives, and that the people should be trusted.

My friend, who is fond of a little story at times, will remember that in the old days of the kingdom of Poland there was a king named Auguste. He had, as my hon. friend had some years ago, his "moments of weakness"—his being different from those of my hon. friend in that they resulted from a fondness for spirits. King Auguste, when he was particularly drunk, would say, "All Poland is now intoxicated." Well, when my hon. friend has the information served to him in council by the Prime Minister as to the whys and wherefores of the appointment of a semi-ambassador at Washington, he thinks that all Canada is informed and ought to be satisfied.

The right hon. gentleman told us that he had many very serious conversations with the Secretary of State for the Colonies in London regarding impending changes in our national status. I accept his word, Sir; I do not doubt that he had many very serious conversations with Lord Milner. But let me say, with all due respect to Lord Milner's great ability as an Imperial statesman, that if the status of Canada was altered as a result of the conversations of our Prime Minister with Lord Milner, that status was not altered on the maximum line but on the minimum.

Indeed the ministers of the Crown during the last five years have so often been away from Canada, have so often approached the round table clubs, and the Imperial conferences, have kept so near Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Balfour and the great Imperial statesmen that they have come to believe that they are no more responsible to that little country, to that little dominion, to that little colony, Canada, but that they are only responsible to the Imperialistic junta over in England.

My hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) said that he had given all the information last year and that we on this side of the House had been perfectly satisfied with his answers. As regards my humble self, let me correct my hon. friend. When the item for a representative at Washington came up for discussion before the House, speaking of Sir Charles Gordon who, is a respected citizen of Montreal and one of its great capitains of industry, I said that he had been during the war an excellent trade commissioner for Canada, had advertised our country, had

built up financial and other friendships with the United States and that if a trade commissioner were to be appointed in Washington I would like to see him continue in the performance of these functions. But I spoke of a trade commissioner, not of a semi-ambassador—a semi-ready ambassador—or a minister plenipotentiary. My hon. friend stated that he had accepted his explanation. My hon. friend who sits at my right (Mr. McKenzie) expressed then, the views of His Majesty's loyal Opposition. He said:

> Is the establishment of new relations between this country and a foreign country, although that foreign country is a neighbour, not of such importance that it should be dealt with by Parliament, and that the will of the people as represented by Parliament should be ascertained upon such a question?

Further,

> These relations are of such an important character that the whole policy of the Government should be embodied in concrete legislation and thoroughly threshed out before being put into force.

In these wise words my hon. friend put the gist of the amendment which is being offered to the House this evening by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. But we are told that this is not merely a trade commissioner, that we are not going to appoint at Washington a High Commissioner such as we have in London, and such as we have in a modified form in Paris, but that we will have in the future a Minister Plenipotentiary. I have nothing to teach my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) in international law; I cannot give him any lesson in the English language because he is a perfect master of language, but will he tell me in all seriousness that Canada, as a Dominion, has the right to appoint in a foreign country a minister plenipotentiary? Does he not know that in international law only independent people and independent countries can appoint ministers plenipotentiary and ambassadors? You cannot appoint a consul. I dare say that the British consul in Washington will have more power and influence than the Canadian Minister Plenipotentiary. Why, Sir, I have been in Europe of late and heaven knows what troubles we have with passports in moving from one country to another. Could I get my passport vised by the High Commissioner in London? Could I get my passport vised by the Canadian Agent in Paris? No, Mr. Speaker, I had to go to the British consul and so it will be at Washington; Canadians will have to go to the British consul.

What is the use of camouflaging this whole question before the Canadian people? The full import of this is that hon. gentlemen during five years of war have carried on in the name, and on behalf, of the Canadian people. The name of Canada has loomed great on the horizon. The name of Canada was never greater than it is to-day as a result of the war but the status of Canada was not changed on account of the war. These hon. gentlemen, in order to justify the extravagance of the Government during these five years, are preparing another balloon for the Canadian people: "We have secured recognition as an international power; we have obtained a new status; we now have a Minister Plenipotentiary at Washington; hail, hail, the people of Canada, come ye brave electors unto the polls and vote once more for the progressive Tory party!" That is the full import of this question; nothing else.

True,—and I make the statement in perfect good faith—there are already forebodings, there are tidings which are teaching my hon. friends that it is not wise to play with fire and you are only playing with fire on this issue. You are not sincere, you are not serious, but the people of Canada, who are sincere, who realize what their status is, who apprehend the dangers they are running in playing at diplomacy—the people of Canada are already telling you that you are doing wrong in this matter.

When I was in London the other day we had what I believe is the opinion of the people of Ontario, at least of the great city of Toronto. It was in the form of a long letter written, no doubt, by Sir John Willison criticising bitterly his friends of the present Government for playing at diplomacy because, as the London Times said through its correspondent, this whole question has been treated very mysteriously. The status of Canada has not changed. We maintain the best of relations with the United States. What the people of Canada are in need of to-day in Washington is a trade commissioner, looking for wider markets in the United States. We are anxious to do business with the United States and we want an alert commissioner to stir up business between the two countries and to open new channels.

The Times of London, printed that in substance, and I can send the warning to my hon. friend, if he wishes to read it. No, Mr. Speaker, the Government is not sincere, and it ought to know—at least the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has

had a long and honourable career in the Canadian ministry ought to know—that by the appointment of that semi-ambassador. of that so-called Minister Plenipotentiary, Canada sooner or later may be involved in grave international problems.

Mr. BURNHAM: May I ask the hon. gentleman—

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, you may not ask. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be discourteous to my hon. friend, but he will please put his question a little later on when I am through with this, my argument. My hon. friend thinks that everything will be very smooth; the British Ambassador will look after Great Britain's affairs, and the Canadian minister will look after Canadian affairs and will receive instructions from Ottawa, and Ottawa only; but at times during the absence of Sir Auckland Geddes, the Canadian Minister Plenipotentiary may sit at the desk of Sir Auckland, and may then carry on the affairs of Great Britain. Sir, is it not possible, does it not strike my hon. friend's mind, that conflicts of interests are likely to happen and to arise between even the Mother Country and Canada? Have they not arisen in the past, Mr. Speaker? I have here the life of Sir John A. Macdonald and I will not weary the House by reading the chapter concerning the Fisheries Treaty. My hon. friend probably knows by heart that famous despatch of Sir John A. Macdonald, when he told the Canadian people about his impressions of the British representatives who sat with him at the conference at Washington. They were very anxious to sign a treaty even though the interests of Canada were discarded. My hon. friend should remember the gloom that one morning descended over the halls of the Canadian Parliament when the Alaskan boundary award was known. On that commission the Canadian representatives were associated with a British representative appointed by the British Government. Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, that morning when the award was made known to Parliament? If we ever regretted an occasion and an association to discuss interests which were dear to the heart of Canada, it was that occasion and that association. We all know that Lord Alverston, who at first committed himself in favour of Canada, soon took another course and joined the American majority. No, Mr. Speaker, if you read the history of our difficulties, of our interests—as between Canada and the United States—you come to this conclusion that the best way to settle them is to settle them ourselves and not be associated with others.

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

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the point at issue?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman has risen to a point of order, will he please state the point?

Mr. BURNHAM: My point of order is that no debate can take place or no amendment be moved on an item in the Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know there is a rule of the House to the effect that there can be no debate upon an item in the Estimates, but I do not think the present amendment can properly be brought within the sphere of that rule. The debate, it is true, involves the principle of representation at Washington, in a measure; but the amendment calls for the production of papers and generally asks for delay. It is possible that there may be a certain amount of discussion which would infringe the rule referred to, but it does not seem to me that the substance and in the main, the purport of the amendment comes within the rule that the hon. gentleman has in mind.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Speaker, this is not an amendment to an item in the Estimates, it is an amendment before going into Committee of Supply.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Speaker, I think that Canada is liable to be involved in this game of pseudo-diplomacy. What will happen? My hon. friend says that the Canadian representative and the British representative, living possibly under the same roof in the same Embassy, will replace each other at different times. My hon. friend very well knows that cases like the one which occurred in the eighties are liable to happen at any time. My hon. friend will remember that the British Ambassador to the United States in the eighties, when Mr. Cleveland was a candidate in the presidential election, expressed his views about that election in a letter written to a friend. It created quite a hubbub in the United States. The incident occurred on the eve of a presidential election when, as my hon. friend knows, some Americans are very fond of twisting the Lion's tail. The British Ambassador

was recalled, and had to retire to Great Britain, and there was a state of excitement for a while. In such a case as that would the Canadian minister be also told to go back to his own country? My hon. friend can see that living together—the one acting for the other as he described this evening—Canada is liable to come to grief on many and many questions, some indifferent, some insignificant by themselves. My hon. friend asks what are we doing otherwise than the hon. gentleman himself —the mover of the amendment—did, when he went to Washington in 1911 and discussed not a treaty but a pact which was liable to be recalled at any time by the notice of either of the parties to it.

My hon. friend said, speaking of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, "You went to Washington." Yes, the hon. gentleman went to Washington, and ten years afterwards my hon. friend can smile over the campaign which took place over that visit. You remember, Mr. Speaker, how the hon. gentleman, with his late colleague, Mr. Paterson, was represented as being an old and feeble minister, who had lost all strength and could not carry the burden, the immense burden he had on his shoulders on that occasion. Well, ten years have elapsed and, judging from the speech which he delivered here this evening, the member for Shelburne and Queen's is still hale and hearty, Mr. Speaker. And what is most interesting is that those who made these foolish appeals against "truck and trade" with the United States; those who for a while played with fire, have since practically adopted that very policy. The policies advocated by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) under the head of reciprocity have been carried out by the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You were not in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, when reciprocity was first mentioned in this debate. Had you been in the Chair, I am sure that, knowing as you do by long experience that a word is sometimes as magic and may give rise to a long debate, you would have stopped my hon. friend who sits opposite. We have, my right hon. friend says, by secret correspondence and secret pour parlers settled the status of Canada. We have appointed a Minister Plenipotentiary, but we have no information to give to the House; the people's representatives are not entitled to full information. Then, turning to the mover of the amendment, he says: You did the same with the reciprocity treaty—which, Mr. Speaker, was not a treaty. I say to my hon. friend—

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no objection to referring to the manner in which the reciprocity agreement was negotiated. That is one thing, but it is quite a different thing to discuss the merits of reciprocity itself and its effect.

Mr. LEMIEUX: To be sure, Mr. Speaker, I will avoid that rock; I will not resurrect the issue of 1911. But my hon. friend says that all was secret in the proceedings with regard to reciprocity. If I remember well, we discussed it openly in the House of Commons. The agreement was laid on the Table; the House was dissolved in the old Liberal fashion and the people were called upon to pass upon the proposal. Moreover, the question was not a new one; it was as old as Confederation. My right hon. friend was not in the House in 1879, but he knows that Sir John A. Macdonald inserted in his famous tariff resolutions of 1879 a standing offer in the name of the Canadian people to the United States respecting reciprocity —an offer, you will note, made by the Tory party. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will leave reciprocity alone.

With regard to any item of expenditure, whether it be for a thousand dollars or a million dollars, the humblest member of this House has the right to move for a return asking that the correspondence, the statistics, the information, be laid on the table of the House. It can be made the subject of debate and under our Parliamentary procedure the ministers responsible are obliged to lay on the Table a return giving the whole of that information. But apparently the hon. gentleman has been so much accustomed during the last five years to govern in the old Tory fashion, at his own sweet will, without any regard for the people, that he thinks that the appointment of an ambassador to Washington, a change in the status of Canada, can be made without regard to the representatives of the Canadian people. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much about our relations with the Mother Country having been so greatly changed during the war; about a new status having been given to Canada, when still ringing in our ears we have the words of that master mind, perhaps the most marvellous student of parliamentary government, Mr. Asquith, who, answering the Prime Minister of New Zealand in 1911, stated in his own blunt English way that as regards foreign affairs the responsibilities of Great

Britain could not be shared with the dominions. Why, that is the A B C of international law. And, Mr. Speaker, lest my language should appear severe; lest my language should appear, perhaps, disloyal, let me once more read to my hon. friend the advice which was tendered to the Canadian people by one of the greatest men Canada ever produced; by that old statesman who during his last election uttered those remarkable words which carried him through to success: "A British subject I was born, a British subject I will die" —Sir John A. Macdonald. Speaking one day of all those imperialist apostles; of all those framers of new constitutions for Canada, he said in his own cynical and witty way:

> I am, so far as that question goes, up to the handle a home-ruler. We will govern our own country. We will put on the taxes ourselves. If we choose to misgovern ourselves—
>
> As we do now, unfortunately.
>
> —we will do so, and we do not desire England, Ireland or Scotland to tell us we are fools. We will say: If we are fools we will keep our folly to ourselves; you will not be the worse for it and we will not be the worse for any folly of yours.

Mr. Speaker, those words bristle with wisdom and with common sense. Do not meddle in the affairs of the Mother Country, and the Mother Country will let us govern ourselves. We have governed ourselves during the last seventy-five years according to British traditions; according to the best constitutional usages. Do not accustom the people to unwise words. Do not accustom the people to think that the ministers of the Canadian Government are viewing with a light heart the loosening of the moorings which bind us to the Mother Country. Speaking for myself, Sir, and for my electors in the old province of Quebec, I am satisfied with my lot; I do not care for any change brought about by the policy of Lord Milner and by a Tory Government. Let Providence shape our destiny; let us not get into entanglements for the pleasure of having, supposedly, a Canadian Minister Plenipotentiary, but which, as that Unionist paper, the Winnipeg Free Press, so well said, will be nothing more or less than a camouflaged chief clerk.

Rt. Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to take part in this debate, I frankly admit, because it seems to me that at this stage anything further need be said to make quite clear the futility of the proposed amendment and to make not only the members of this House but the people of Canada realize how hon. gentlemen opposite, failing entirely to find a basis for this amendment in any matter of fact, have been reduced one after another to struggling with their imagination in an endeavour to conjure up untold evils that we are to apprehend, because though there has been laid before the House in full the result of what this Government has done in co-operation with the Government of the United Kingdom and with the acceptance of the Government of the United States there is some failure to furnish needed information In this competition of imaginative powers I am sure the speakers opposite who have preceded me will find no fault nor complain that I am doing them an injustice, great as their achievements in the exercise of their imaginative powers have been when I award the palm to my very good friend the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). To lay the foundation of this edifice of terror which he has been at such pains to build up, the hon. gentleman had to carry us back—he is very fond of carrying us back—to the time in 1847—or 1848, was it?—when we had in this country a struggle for responsible government. That struggle for responsible government seems to haunt the hon. member's waking hours, and I often wonder whether it breaks in even upon his slumbers. He is so constantly in a state of terror, beholding this country on the brink of an abyss to which nothing is comparable but the condition and the danger to which it was exposed in 1847. He is living still away back in 1847, surrounded with the dangers of 1847, living in the Canada of 1847, the Canada that must have been so horrible a place to live in since it was perpetually haunted by that most awful of spooks, the Family Compact. The hon. gentleman is still in dread and terror of the Family Compact that went to its rest so very many years ago and that has long ceased to trouble the waking thoughts or the sleeping dreams of ordinary, sane Canadians who have grown up with their country and who have been conscious of their country's growth. The hon. gentleman says: Responsible Government is in peril. Why? Because the responsible Government of Canada, having advised His Majesty, as it is the proper function of responsible ministers to do, that the time had come when Canada might very properly transact herself by her own minister her business with her next-door neighbour, and having found that His Majesty's

Government said: "Why, certainly that is perfectly obvious; everybody recognizes that;" and that the Government of the United States said: "Why, certainly, your representative will be most welcome" —the Government, as I say, having given that advice and having met with that reception, has come back to this Parliament and told this Parliament the totality of what it has done. Therefore, he says, the constitution is in danger. Why, here is this responsible Government right before this Parliament, the representatives of the people. If, in doing that, this Government has done anything which the people's representatives do not approve, let the hon. gentleman calm his fears, we are here in the hands of Parliament which the people of Canada elected, and if the people's representatives do not approve this thing, clear and plain as it is on its face, of which they have been fully informed, let them exercise their constitutional authority, and neither the Parliament nor the people of Canada will be for one moment bound by anything that has been done. Where is the danger to constitutional Government?

The leader of the Opposition Mr. Mackenzie King) said that the great question involved was the supremacy of Parliament on the one hand or the autocracy of the Cabinet on the other. In that expression he ran the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) a very close second in evidence of powers of imagination. The autocracy of the Cabinet that stands here before Parliament to accept its judgment! Where is the supremacy? To-night the supremacy is in the hands of this Parliament to which we have told what we have done. If this Parliament thinks we have done right, well and good. If this Parliament thinks we have done wrong, it is in its hands to correct the wrong. Let me point this out. Hon. gentlemen have told us that they keep for another occasion their objectoins to what we have done; they will not to-night even question the wisdom of what we have done; they are satisfied to question the amount of information that they have received. It is a fair inference that on the information they have received they find no ground to question the wisdom of what we have done. It is true that while they have professed not to be questioning the wisdom of what we have done, they have wandered away—I think my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) was a particularly great sinner in that regard—from the subject of this sparsity of information and have indulged in some condemnation of the action itself.

But the amendment—they are quite right in that regard—does not raise the question of the wisdom of the action itself; it does not attack it; it does not question it; and I do not think it will be unfair if I suggest that they do not question the wisdom of that action, because they, like us, are absolutely satisfied that it will meet with the approval of the Canadian people. The hon. gentleman is worried about the whys and the wherefores. If the hon. gentleman does not know the whys and the wherefores which justify Canada attending to her own business, the people of Canada know all about them, and do not need to be told them over again. There are some things so obvious, there are some things so much a matter of common knowledge, that they do not call for repetition, and I am telling no secrets if I say that in the correspondence that did take place there is no discussion of why and wherefores. The thing itself in principle nobody disputes, and the Canadian people will not dispute it.

Now the hon. gentleman—and I should like to relieve his mind in this regard, because I would be sorry that he should lose his sleep to-night—is much perturbed by a ghost that walks often in his imagination, the ghost of somebody's mysterious efforts to create a system of imperialism that in some way or other is going to deprive us of our Canadian autonomy. He is so subject to the visits of that troublesome ghost that it comes between him and every step that goes to confirm and extend the outonomous powers of this country. Every time a step of that kind is taken, this ghost passes across the line of vision that intervenes between my hon. friend and his advancing country, and he sees imperialism; he sees something that is going to deprive us of our right to our own self-government, something that is going to involve us in freightful responsibilities, and then he winds it all up by seeing in the very same thing something that is going to loosen the bonds that bind this country to the Mother Country and hold together the great commonwealth of nations that we call the British Empire. Now I would, if I could, do something to allay his apprehensions in this regard. I would ask him if he were not making a speech, if he did not feel called upon to find words of condemnation of some action of this Government, but were engaged in the ordinary application of his common sense—I would ask him how he sees in the fact that Canada is going to provide a Canadian appointed by

His Majesty upon the advice of the Canadian Government to be the channel of communication between Canada and the United States, a danger to Canada's autonomy?

He has told us that this proposal is all camouflage, that Canada could not appoint a minister plenipotentiary, that none but an independent country could appoint a minister plenipotentiary. Well, now, Canada is not going to appoint a minister plenipotentiary, but His Majesty the King, who is the King of Canada just as much as he is the King of the United Kingdom, upon the advice of his constitutional Canadian advisers is going to appoint a minister plenipotentiary to be his representative at Washington, his delegate to the United States, so far as Canadian matters are concerned; and with all respect to the hon. gentleman's profound knowledge of international law, and the readiness with which he tells us that upon this side of the House we do not know the A. B. C. of international law I venture to say to him that he will find no competent international lawyer who will question the power of His Majesty the King to appoint a minister plenipotentiary in the right of his Dominion of Canada. May I also tell him, since he seems to be singularly oblivious of the things that have been happening under all our eyes, that at the Peace Conference His Majesty exercised that power and did the thing that the hon. gentleman says that anybody who knows the A. B. C. of international law would know he could not do. He did it, and those Canadian plenipotentiaries, in that quality of minister plenipotentiary, walked into the gathering of ministers plenipotentiary representing the states of the civilized world and were received and seated there on a footing of equality with His Majesty's ministers plenipotentiary representing the United Kingdom, with the ministers plenipotentiary representing the United States, with the ministers plenipotentiary representing France, Belgium, and all the nations of the earth. Yet the hon. gentleman says that if we knew the A. B. C. of international law we would know that Canada could not have a minister plenipotentiary. Now Canada has had ministers plenipotentiary. His Majesty named them upon the advice of his Canadian ministers, and His Majesty will name a minister plenipotentiary to go to Washington to be his representative there for the direction of purely Canadian affairs, and that minister plenipotentiary will be Canada's minister plenipotentiary, the hon. gentleman's profound knowledge of international law to the contrary notwithstanding. The A. B. C. of international law is away back in that past in which the hon. gentleman lives. It is prior to 1847, where dwell the spooks that trouble his days and his nights. It is very far back. Might I suggest to the hon. gentleman that he cast his eye on what I might describe as the X. Y. Z. of international law, on the latest developments, and then he will find to his great gratification that his country stands to-day in a position in which it is quite possible for her to have a minister plenipotentiary standing side by side with other ministers plenipotentiary on a footing of equality. I might say to my hon. friend, as he talks to us about the A. B. C. of international law, that this is not the only known case. When the German Empire was at the height of its power, Bavaria and several other countries had their distinct ministers. It is not at all an impossible thing that within one state, within one great international empire, you may have a number of nations, all capable of figuring in the society of nations.

The hon. gentleman is very apprehensive of what is going to happen, when there comes to be a conflict of interests, as he says there may be, and he imagines it may come at a time when the British Ambassador has gone home to England. During his absence there comes to be a conflict of interest between Canada and the Mother Country or some other portion of the Empire, and the hon. gentleman is appalled as to what is going to happen.

Why, I think he would give the Canadian representative, or the British Ambassador if he should be acting alone, credit for a little common sense; and most assuredly, if the hon. gentleman himself were representing Canada under those circumstances, I would have the most implicit trust in him that he would realize that in a conflict of interests it would be the duty of both ambassadors to refer the matter to their respective Governments. Then it would be for the Governments of the self-governing nations of the Empire to get together and give instructions to their respective representatives, and above all to give to the representative of the British Empire, the instructions that rest upon the conclusions coming from the consultation of all the nations of the British Empire. The hon. gentleman need not be anxious, I think, upon that ground.

Now, the hon. gentleman gave us grave warning about playing with fire. He is so anxious that we should attend to our own affairs and do our own governing, and he has a horror of the old Tory days of the

Family Compact and, I suppose of government from Downing Street. But what does he quote as a warning? What the London Times says.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Canadian correspondent.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, the Canadian correspondent of the London Times. He thought that we were playing with fire and that there were grave dangers—I do not remember the exact words—involved in playing at diplomacy. With all respect to Sir John Willison, we are not playing with diplomacy; and with all respect to the hon. gentleman who is now evidently so devout a follower of Sir John Willison—seeing that he hangs on the words of wisdom dropping from the knight's mouth—we are not playing at diplomacy at all; we are getting back to the very simple position that I mentioned at the outset where Canadian business with the American people, our next-door neighbours, will be transacted—in all the forms of diplomacy if you will, as it must be—through a Canadian appointed by His Majesty upon the advice of the Canadian Government. If that be anything else than a rounding out of our powers of self-government, I am at a loss to imagine what it can be.

The hon. gentleman sees us involved in grave international troubles. There once was a British Ambassador at Washington who wrote a letter about their elections that the American people did not like, and the British Government recalled him. Now, on the hon. gentleman's advice, because we run that frightful risk, we should drop this project at once, because perhaps at some time our Canadian representative may write a letter that the American people may not like! And notwithstanding, if I accept his own view, that he was at such pains to point out to us the different occasions upon which our interests suffered because they were in the hands of exclusively British representatives, we must be on our guard not to have any representative of our own. The hon. gentleman was at pains to recall the Alaskan arbitration board, and pointed out the change of view on the part of the British member on that board. To what end? To warn us to have no representative of our own. After pointing out that if we had not had two representatives of our own upon that tribunal we would have had no one to support our view, he says: You se, the British representative turned against Canada; the conclusion is, be careful never to be represented by any Canadian, always be represented by exclusively British representatives, because there have been British representatives who have abandoned Canada's interests. I am not going to discuss whether there have been such British representatives, but out of the hon. gentleman's own mouth, if his statement be correct, comes the most conclusive argument why we ought to see to it that we have representatives of our own.

The hon. gentleman made a great contrast between what happened on the reciprocity treaty and on this matter, how openly they acted upon that treaty—just as openly as we are here to-night discussing this agreement—after it was made they brought it in and submitted it to Parliament.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the correspondence.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, they brought in the correspondence, and if there had been correspondence here of a nature to be useful in connection with this discussion, it might very well have been produced. But there is the question: How is the correspondence going to affect the question whether what has been done was the right thing to do or the wrong thing to do. The thing we did, is here for the fullest and freest discussion by hon. members and the people of Canada, and that is the thing for which we are proud to be responsible and for which we are proud to be responsible, and for which we fear neither the verdict of this House nor the verdict of the people of this Dominion.

Now, the hon. gentleman is very much excited about what he calls the "hollow farce" of our status. No one has claimed that this particular arrangement has changed our status; it is the evidence of a change of status that has come as the result of a gradual growth. With regard to what happened during the war, I would say this—that the magnificent achievements of our soldiers, and the magnificent achievements of the Canadian people, did not change our status, but made manifest to the world, and commanded on the part of the world recognition of the fact, that we had attained a real national status. That is what has come: that recognition and the responsibility which accompanies it. This arrangement is another evidence of it. And yet the hon. gentleman talks about it as a hollow farce!

Why is it that hon. gentlemen are so frightened that the country should ever leave the maternal apron-strings? I presume they must be glad to see her growth, yet they do not want her to have the privileges and the responsibilities that come from growth; they are in a corner frightened at shadows, seeing on every side impending

dangers, and shrinking back from the manhood—if I may change the sex of our country for the moment—to which this country has attained.

What would any man think of his son who, having reached the status of manhood, would say: "It is true I am a man, with the developed force and reasoning power of a man, with the right of being consulted about matters in which I have an interest common with others that belong to the status of a man; but no, Mother, please let me keep a good strong hold of your apron-strings; because, you see, if I acknowledge manhood I might have to carry the responsibilities of manhood; there might even come a day when I might be responsible for some foolish letter that somebody wrote!" The hon. gentleman knows his country too well and loves her better than to believe that. He did not hesitate to tell us that we were not serious, that we were not sincere. He may from his point of view think that we are neither serious nor sincere, but I for my part will not throw that back at him. I do not doubt his sincerity, nor do I doubt his seriousness; but, knowing as I do the intelligence and the capacity of the hon. gentleman, it is a puzzle to me how he justifies that cowering attitude on the part of his country, that he is so frightened at her assuming the responsibilities of nationhood, that he is so frightened of it that he is even willing to forego the status and the privileges of nationhood for fear that we might be called upon to carry the proper responsibilities associated with that nationhood. What he fears is that somebody is plotting to carry this country into something he calls Imperialism. Upon this side of the House there is no less desire and no less firm purpose that there is on the part of my hon. friend that there shall be preserved to Canada for all time the untrammeled rights that she enjoys to-day and to ensure that she shall continue to be entitled to the recognition of her status as an equal nation within this Empire. That determination is as strong on this side of the House as it can be in his breast and nothing is being done here, or by this Government, otherwise than that which is in the direction of consolidating and confirming that autonomous status of our country. We have gone further because we are advancing farther than those who have preceded us. I do not say that they were not looking in the same direction but there is just as earnest determination to hold together this aggregation of nations, of which Canada is one—not an inferior one, not a dependency, but a nation standing on that footing of equality that fits her just as well to furnish the British Ambassador as representing the entire Empire as the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom is not herself alone the Empire. There is nothing incongruous in a Canadian minister being the representative from time to time, if not permanently for the matter of that, of the British Empire, if it be thought wise by the other component parts of the British Empire. It is only an additional evidence of the recognition of the equality of our status within the Empire but here we are as determined to stand by Canada's rights to her position as an autonomous nation within the Empire as the hon. gentleman can be and that she shall maintain and hold her place in the great aggregation, the great commonwealth, of equal nations that go to make up the British Empire. My hon. friend need have no fear that we are wandering away from the example of that great statesman Sir John Macdonald whose words he read to us.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): Before the minister sits down may I ask him a question? I see by the declaration that was made by the right hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) that the Minister Plenipotentiary is going to be appointed by His Majesty on the recommendation of the Canadian Government. Do I understand that this recommendation will go direct to His Majesty without first being submitted to the British Government. In other words, is the appointment to be made by His Majesty the King on the recommendation of the Canadian Government without the question being referred at all to the English, or Imperial Government?

Mr. DOHERTY: We have no doubt that His Majesty will not withhold from his British ministers his action in connection with the matter, but the statement is perfectly clear that the person to be appointed is to be appointed on the advice of his Canadian minister just as the Ministers Plenipotentiary at the Peace Conference were. I am not suggesting, and I do not know that there is occasion to suggest, that it is impossible, that, if the ministers of the United Kingdom see some reason why they should offer an objection, or possibly the ministers of other dominions see some reason for opposition, they can suggest it. I am not going into that. The proposed channel by which the advice gets to His Majesty does not alter the fact that it will be the advice of His Majesty's Canadian ministers.

Mr. BELAND: In other words according to the Government's understanding of the appointment of the minister at Washington the Canadian Government is not supreme as the adviser of His Majesty?

Mr. DOHERTY: As far as I understand it the Canadian Government is supreme as the adviser of His Majesty:

Accordingly, it has been agreed that His Majesty, on advice of his Canadian ministers, shall appoint a Minister Plenipotentiary who will have charge of Canadian affairs and will at all times be the ordinary channel of communication with the United States Government in matters of purely Canadian concern, acting upon instructions from and reporting direct to the Canadian Government.

I can see no room for suggesting even a doubt that the advice of the Canadian ministers is to be supreme as to who shall be the Canadian minister or Plenipotentiary.

Mr. BELAND: So that the recommendation will go direct to His Majesty?

Mr. DOHERTY: Whatever is the regular channel by which communications reach His Majesty.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear; that is very diplomatic.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): Mr. Speaker, like my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) I did not intend to speak on this amendment and I would not have risen were it not for the fact that the hon. the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) referred to Hansard of last year. I have found a few lines which my hon. friend has not read, to which he has not referred, and which might be of great interest to the House. When my hon. friend stated that the matter of the appointment of a Minister Plenipotentiary at Washington was fully discussed and approved by the Opposition last year he did not state really what happened. I am sure he did not wish to deceive the House, but if he did not wish to deceive, what has become of his usual power of observation?

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend has not quoted what I said to-night.. I said to-night that the question of the Canadian representative at Washington had been discussed in the House on the occasions I mentioned and that there had been no objection to the principle of that appointment.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Exactly. At page 1077 of Hansard of May 5, 1919—and if I remember well my hon. friend cited May 5—I find the following:

Mr. E. Lapointe: Has the Government brought down any legislation as regards this representation at Washington? I suppose the order in Council business is going to be closed up.

Mr. Rowell: The voting of the Estimate by the House would be all that would be necessary to appoint a representative at Washington. Next session, when the matter is more fully understood, and we know exactly the relations, it may be considered desirable to introduce legislation.

Do I understand that my hon. friend by legislation means Orders in Council? Or a resolution? What kind of legislation has been introduced in the House this session? Is it not a fact that it was an Order in Council, and that the Acting Prime Minister made an announcement to the House stating that a minister plenipotentiary was going to be appointed at Washington. Is that the kind of "legislation" my hon. friend referred to last year? But let me resume the quotation:

Mr. Archambault: Have we as a nation the right to appoint a diplomatic agent at Washington?

Mr. Rowell: We have no right, except with the concurrence of the Imperial Government, to appoint a diplomatic agent, but the question of the status of this representative is now a matter of conference between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Imperial Government.

Mr. Archambault: We should not pass this Estimate before having power from the Imperial Government.

Mr. Rowell: My hon. friend need not worry. We shall have an understanding with the Imperial Government, and we shall have a Canadian representative at Washington.

A question by Mr. McMaster and a reply by the President of the Privy Council follow. Then comes another question from myself:

Mr. Archambault: Have the Imperial authorities agreed to that?

Mr. Rowell: They have agreed that we should have representation at Washington.

Mr. Archambault: Is there any correspondence to that effect?

Mr. Rowell: There are certain confidential communications between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Imperial Government. Negotiations are not yet closed. As soon as they are closed I am sure the Prime Minister will lay the whole matter before the House, but he is conducting negotiations personally in Great Britain.

I was under the impression that negotiations were closed now. If they are closed, what becomes of the statement made by my hon. friend last year that when the subject would be closed the Prime Minister would lay the whole matter before the House? The Prime Minister spoke to-night, and he stated emphatically that he would

not lay anything before the House, that no publication would be allowed. May I ask what are the reasons for not divulging the communications which have been exchanged? Are my hon. friends opposite afraid that these negotiations will bring criticism from this side of the House? If they are not, why not disclose the facts? However, it is not the first time that we have been refused information here. When we asked very reasonable questions about the expense of the Canadian National railways we met with a point-blank refusal from the minister. I believe, Sir, that in pursuing this course we are departing from responsible government, and in my opinion the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's should be adopted.

Amendment of Mr. Fielding negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	King,
Béland,	Knox,
Boivin,	Lanctôt,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Bureau,	Leger,
Cahill,	Lemieux,
Cannon,	Lesage,
Cardin,	MacNutt,
Casgrain,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Chisholm,	McMaster,
d'Anjou,	Marcile (Bagot),
Déchêne,	Mayrand,
Delisle,	Murphy,
Demers,	Papineau,
Denis,	Pardee,
Desaulniers,	Parent,
Desiauriers,	Pedlow,
Duff,	Pelletier,
Ethier,	Power,
Euler,	Prevost,
Fafard,	Proulx,
Fielding,	Reid (Mackenzie),
Fontaine,	Ross,
Fortier,	Savard,
Fournier,	Seguin,
Gauthier,	Sinclair (Antigonish
Gauvreau,	and Guysborough),
Gervais,	Stein,
Hunt,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Johnston,	Trahan,
Kennedy (Essex N.),	Verville,
Kennedy (Glengarry and Stormont),	White (Victoria).—63.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Argue,	Butts,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Calder,
Arthurs,	Casselman,
Ballantyne,	Chaplin,
Blair,	Charters,
Blake,	Clark (Bruce),
Bonnell,	Clements,
Boyce,	Cooper,
Boys,	Cowan,
Bristol,	Cronyn,
Burnham,	Crothers,
Burrell,	Crowe,
Drayton (Sir Henry),	Mowat,
Edwards,	Munson,
Finley,	Nicholson
Foster (Sir George),	(Queens, P.E.I.),
Fraser,	Peck,
Green,	Reid (Grenville),
Griesbach,	Richardson,
Guthrie,	Rowell,
Halladay,	Sexsmith,
Harrison,	Shaw,
Hay,	Sheard,
Henders,	Simpson,
Hughes (Sir Sam),	Stacey,
Keefer,	Stevens,
Mackie (Edmonton),	Stewart (Lanark),
Mackie (Renfrew),	Sutherland,
McCurdy,	Thompson (Yukon),
McIntosh,	Tolmie,
McIsaac,	Tremain,
McQuarrie,	Tweedie,
Manion,	Wigmore,
Martin,	Wilson (Saskatoon).
Morphy,	68.

PAIRS.

(The list of Pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips).

Messrs.

Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Borden, Sir Robert,	Devlin,
Davidson,	McKenzie,
Ball,	Turgeon,
Brien,	Sinclair
	(Queens, P.E.I.),
Loggie,	Vien,
White, Sir Thomas,	Jacobs,
Middlebro,	Robb,
McGregor,	Pacaud,,
Chabot,	Lapointe,
Wright,	Michaud,
Wilson (Wentworth),	Boyer,
Whidden,	Lafortune,
Wallace,	Brouillard,
Charlton,	McCoig,
Bowman,	Truax,
Thompson (Weyburn),	Rinfret,
Thompson (Hastings),	Molloy,
Cockshutt,	McCrea,
Meighen,	Lavigueur,
Spinney,	Du Tremblay,
Steele,	Tobin,
Sifton,	Copp,
Allan,	Crerar.

Main motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

SUPPLY.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police—Amount to be voted, $4,674,066.40.

Mr. FIELDING: May I suggest to my right hon. friend who is leading the Government that he will require time to reflect on the situation and that we might now adjourn?

Progress reported.

On motion of Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster journed at 12.20 a.m.

Tuesday, May 18, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPARATION BY GERMANY—ALLIES CONFERENCE AT OSTEND.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. P. R. DuTREMBLAY (Laurier-Outremont): I see in the Montreal Gazette of this morning a despatch stating that it is rumoured that, following the conference held at Hythe, the Government of Germany will be called upon to pay to the Allies as an indemnity the sum of about £6,000,000,000. Would the Government tell us what portion of this sum is to be allocated to Canada?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to put that question on the Order Paper. It is one which requires notice and with respect to which there is no urgency.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: It is a question which requires the attention of the Government. The despatch further states that a special conference of the Allies will be held shortly at Ostend to consider financial questions among the Allies. I should like to know if the Government have been invited to attend this conference and if they will have a representative at it.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): The answer to my hon. friend's question is in the affirmative.

THE BUDGET.

ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT DELIVERED BY SIR HENRY DRAYTON, MINISTER OF FINANCE.

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that on the present occasion I shall have to ask the indulgence of the House as I shall have to address the House at considerable length. The fault is not mine; the financial position of the country at the present requires, I think, to be dealt with in considerable detail.

The conditions not only in Canada to-day, but the world conditions obtaining, are very different from the conditions which did obtain while the war was in progress. During this period the compelling necessity of the moment, the winning of the war, required raising large sums of money in the easiest possible way and with the least interference with the public or with business methods. It was absolutely imperative that there should be no check in production, no questions raised which might hinder that production or hinder the war effort. It was no time for the consideration of domestic politics, which in any way might distract the nation from a united effort towards the supreme end.

These conditions to-day are changed; the war is won; expenses are great; the cost of Government operations as well as the carrying on of every business of every character in the country has increased enormously, and over and above this the country, with other countries which took their part in the titanic struggle, is faced with a pyramid of debt. The task to-day is to aid the return to ordinary economic conditions to the extent that such return is at this time possible.

The duty to-day is not only to carry on the Government of the country without any additions to the debt, but on the other hand to promote measures which will reduce the nation's obligations. The task while heavy is nevertheless not as severe and difficult as the obstacles and difficulties which the country has gloriously overcome in the five years of war and stress. Indeed, were it possible for the country to again become as united and earnest as it was during the war period, if it were possible for each and all of us to sink all differences, class and sectional interests and jealousies into an effort towards re-establishing Canada as united and co-ordinated as that which won the war, the task would indeed be easy and simple.

Canada's soldiers during that period won for themselves and our country imperishable fame. "Their name liveth for evermore." But the productive efforts of Canada during that period were second only to their glorious record. For the five fiscal years ended on March 31, 1915, the excess of the country's imports over exports amounted to $825,521,490. For the next succeeding five years, ended on March 31 last, this excess of imports was not only overtaken, but our exports exceeded our imports by a sum of $1,803,442,233. It is plain in view of such a tremendous productive and industrial exploit, that if anything like the same effort is made to overcome debts, and by overcoming debts to bring about a proper deflation of prices, credits, and circulation, the task will prove well within our powers. Canada's trade while, as in the case of all countries, subject to periodical depression has steadily advanced, as the following figures will show:

Fiscal Year.	Total Trade.
1879	$ 149,489,188
1889	196,309,107
1899	304,227,339
1909	548,139,881
1919	2,185,194,620
1920 (unrevised)	2,351,174,886

The increase thus recorded is one which is contributed to practically by all of our productive agencies and is spread over a wide field. An increase in the basic industry of agriculture may be illustrated by the country's wheat production which has been as follows:

Year.	Bushels.
1870	16,732,873
1880	32,350,269
1890	42,232,372
1900	55,572,368
1910	132,077,547
1919	193,260,400

As indicating the development which has taken place in the production of our agriculture, forests, mines, and fisheries, and the growth of our manufacturing establishments, I desire to place on record the following statistics:

Agriculture Production—Canada.

Year.	Field Crops.	Other Farm Produce.	Total Production.
1900	$ 194,953,420	$169,953,446	$ 364,906,866
1910	383,366,856	279,982,334	663,349,190
1917	1,144,637,000	476,391,000	1,621,028,000
1919	1,452,437,000	523,404,000	1,975,841,000

Forest Production—Canada.

Year.	Log Products and Wood Pulp.
1881	$ 39,540,570
1891	55,266,368
1901	55,051,865
1906	72,878,051
1911	114,713,655
1915	79,767,938
1919	140,381,584

Mineral Production—Canada.

Year.	
1889	$ 14,013,113
1899	49,234,005
1909	91,831,441
1917	189,646,821
1918	211,301,897
1919	173,075,913*

*Subject to revision.

Fishery Production—Canada.

Fiscal Year.	
1879	$13,529,254
1889	17,655,254
1899	21,891,706
1909	29,629,169
1917*	52,312,044
1918*	60,243,429

*Calendar year.

Manufacturing Industries.

Year.	Capital Invested.	Employees.	Value of Products.
1881	$ 165,302,623	254,935	$ 309,676,068
1891	353,214,300	369,595	469,847,886
1901	446,916,487	308,482	481,053,375
1906	846,585,023	356,034	718,352,603
1911	1,247,583,609	515,203	1,165,975,639
1915	1,994,103,272	514,883	1,407,137,140
1917	2,786,649,727	692,067	3,015,577,940

Co-related with the above are certain financial statistics which are interesting.

Canadian Chartered Banks.

Year.	Paid-Up Capital and Reserve.
1888	$ 79,218,565
1898	91,197,340
1908	170,885,203
1918	225,508,222
1919	243,912,111

Year.	Total Bank Deposits by the Public in Canada.
1878	$ 71,900,195
1888	128,725,529
1898	248,572,085
1908	639,899,365
1918	1,669,597,617
1919	1,841,478,895

Amount of Fire Insurance Policies in Force.

Year Dec. 31.	Amount.
1878	$ 409,899,701
1888	650,735,059
1898	895,394,107
1908	1,700,708,263
1918	4,523,514,841
1919 (unrevised)	4,904,396,461

Amount of Life Insurance Policies in Force.

Year Dec. 31.	Amount.
1878	$ 84,751,937
1888	211,761,583
1898	368,523,985
1908	719,513,913
1918	1,785,061,273
1919 (unrevised)	2,187,833,396

If the progress of the past be but a fair indication of the future, the problems of to-day and to-morrow may be faced without doubt of a successful issue.

During the period covered by the above statistics an immense railway system has been built. In 1879 the mileage of steam railways in Canada was 6,484, and in 1919, 38,896.

Steam Railways of Canada.

	1879.	1889.	1899.	1909.	1919.
Miles in operation	6,484	12,628	17,141	24,104	38,896
Tons of freight	8,348,310	17,928,626	31,211,753	66,842,258	116,699,572
Gross earnings	$19,925,066	42,149,615	62,243,784	145,056,336	382,976,901

A great canal system has also been constructed from tide water to the head of the Lakes at a capital cost of $110,823,237.42 to the country. Large and commodious public buildings have also been erected, with the result that an investment has been made in Government capital accounts of $766,912,802.71, while the Dominion ledger shows Government investments amounting to $1,078,537,461.27.

National Debt.

The ledger as of March 31, 1920, shows the country's gross debt to be $3,014,483,774.12. The capital accounts referred to are not deducted from this debt but the ledger, treating investments as active, deducts them from the gross debt and discloses a net debt of $1,935,946,312.85. Beyond all question it is a matter of importance that the exact position of the country's debt should be clear. While the books are correctly kept and the entries properly made, in my opinion some of the investments cannot be characterized as active investments. They are shown as follows:

Investments, etc., included in calculating Net Debt. As of March 31, 1920	
Sinking Funds	$ 21,385,930.72
Canadian Northern Railway Co.	140,223,373.89
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Co.	95,345,469.19
Grand Trunk Railway Co.	1,148,533.33
Loans to Banks	101,065,725.00
Advances to Trust & Loan Cos.	3,850,000.00
Loans to Provinces (Housing)	11,740,000.00
Loans to Provinces (Farmers)	3,500,000.00
Imperial Government	171,710,168.19
Other Governments	34,336,117.75
Miscellaneous Investments.	39,314,000.45
Miscellaneous & Banking Acc'ts	175,039,622.61
Cash	173,984,342.34
Specie Reserve	103,597,849.90
Province Accounts.	2,296,327.90
	$1,078,537,461.27
Gross Debt	$3,014,483,774.12
Less above	1,078,537,461.27
Net Debt	$1,935,946,312.85

It is obvious that the advances to the Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk Pacific, and Grand Trunk Railway Companies cannot be treated as active assets. They are not at the moment realizable; further, no interest is being paid, and in some cases the principal as well as interest is overdue. As is well known, Canada is now the owner of the Canadian Northern, receiver for the Grand Trunk Pacific, and steps have been taken for the acquisition of the Grand Trunk. While the railways have potential value, at the present time the fact is that the country itself owns the Canadian Northern and is responsible for the operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific, with resultant heavy cost to the taxpayer.

Assets which are not readily convertible, as the specie reserve is, or are not interest producing, are not such assets as ought to be deducted from the gross debt. They are inactive, they are items of such a character as might well be placed in a suspense account. At any rate, whatever may be their future value, however great it may be, they are not assets of such a character as to directly reduce the gross debt any more than the other capital accounts of the country ought to be deducted from it.

I would therefore reduce the deductions made from the gross debt by the railway items already referred to, and on the same grounds after making a study of the amounts making up the $39,000,000 odd charged to miscellaneous investments, I would reduce that item by $11,015,951.20, and the item, miscellaneous and banking accounts, of $175,000,000 odd by the sum of $56,592,463.12. While the charge against the Imperial Government is correctly stated as of the above date, beyond all question there are further contra accounts of the Imperial Government which will approximately reduce this credit item by some $33,033,333.34. The result of providing for this contra account and of treating the inactive items as items that ought to go in suspense or capital account is to reduce the investments included in calculating the net debt by $337,359,124.07, and to increase the net debt as shown from $1,935,946,312.85 to $2,273,305,436.92.

Inflation.

There undoubtedly is in Canada as everywhere else inflation in the price of commodities, inflation in currency, and inflation in credits. Our total issue of Dominion notes on March 31, 1914, was $117,795,718. It reached a peak of $337,319,309 in November 1918 and on the 31st March last it amounted to $311,-932,791. Of this amount $128,366,066 is issued against gold. The amount of gold required under the Dominion Notes Act, as amended, to secure an issue of this amount is $90,866,066. Gold to the extent of $100,-286,280 is available. $26,000,000 of the remainder of the currency was issued for national purposes under the authority of the Dominion Notes Act 1915, and secured as therein provided. $50,000,000 was issued for the purpose of making advances to the Imperial Treasury and is secured by the pledge of approved securities, and $107,-566,725 was issued to the banks secured by approved securities largely consisting of Imperial Treasury Bills and our own Treasury Bills. As a result there has been an increase since March 31, 1914, in the circulation issued by the Dominion of $194,137,-073.

The banks' circulation on 31st March, 1914, was $96,848,384. In November of the preceding year a high point of $126,839,-620 was reached. On the 31st March last it amounted to $225,769,628. As against this increase, in the same period the holdings of the banks in cash reserves (gold and subsidiary coin) rose from $45,661,913 to $79,-990,836, and the deposit of Dominion notes and gold in the Central Gold Reserves, earmarked for the redemption of the bank note circulation, rose from $3,500,000 to $108,-200,000. In addition, the bank holdings in Dominion notes for general reserve purposes rose from $96,227,321 to $184,152,673.

Tabulating for purposes of comparison the combined circulation of the country as of March 31st, 1914, and the 31st March last, the result is as follows:—

	March 31st, 1914.	March 31st, 1920.
Dominion Note Circulation	$117,795,718	$311,932,791
Bank Note Circulation	96,848,384	225,769,628
	$214,644,102	$537,702,420
Less Dominion Notes held in Central Gold Reserves	3,500,000	97,700,000
	$211,144,102	$440,002,420
Gold Held.		
By Government	96,161,366	100,286,280
By Banks	45,661,913	79,990,826
In Central Gold Reserves	nil	10,500,000
	$141,823,279	$190,777,106
Per cent of Total Gold to Total Outstanding Circulation	67	43

As the statement shows, the combined circulation of the country amounted on March 31st last to $440,002,420 as against $211,144,102 on March 31st, 1914, a percentage increase of 108 per cent.

Comparing these increases with those of other countries, the Right Hon. Reginald McKenna recently stated that the circulation of Great Britain had increased 207 per cent between 1914 and the end of 1919, while the circulation of the United States, as given in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, shows an increase of 70 per cent from June 30, 1914, to the corresponding date in 1919. The circulation of other countries taking a prominent part in the war has increased to far greater percentages.

Unquestionably, the currency in light of former gold reserves is inflated. The fact, however, is that the world over currency to an ever-increasing degree is related to movement of commodities, secured by a national guarantee supported by approved securities. This trend was apparent before the war. The best illustration is perhaps afforded by the Federal Reserve legislation of the United States. Under that legislation, currency issued by Federal Reserve Banks requires a gold reserve of 40 per cent and no currency stands higher.

Under all the circumstances, bearing in mind that Canada before the war had to borrow abroad to finance her own requirements, bearing in mind that during the war and since the Armistice she has not only financed herself but has also extended credits to other nations, the situation of the country's currency is very remarkably good. The percentage of the gold reserves to the Dominion and bank note circulation is 43 per cent. The percentage of gold to

the total circulation of Great Britain based on 1919 figures is 26 per cent and of the United States approximately 55 per cent.

The circulation, large as it is, is all required. The greatest demand that actual circulation has to meet is the pay-envelope. In view of to-day's conditions the world over on a greatly increased wage scale, much more circulation is now required for this purpose. The increased prices of commodities mean that more money must be kept in the tens of thousands of shop-tills all over the country. The constantly increasing demands on the Mint tell their own story. In 1914, 11,770,108 pieces of coinage were turned out; in 1919, 35,906,003 pieces, and for last march, 2,677,874 pieces were coined as against 806,646 pieces in March, 1914.

Increased credits have contributed and contributed largely in the first instance to the abnormal increase in the cost of commodities, and to a lesser extent increased circulation contributed to the same result. The cost of commodities under new high standards once having been arrived at, however, if business is to continue in Canada under existing world conditions, both the inflated currencies and inflated credits are at the moment necessary to support it. The high prices in Canada could not be and were not made by Canadian action alone. They are the result of the general trend in the prices of commodities the world over, and to-day were it possible to suddenly deflate Canadian credits and circulation, with the general demand for commodities that to-day exists, the influence on the general situation would be negligible. Prices would continue high and the only result to the Canadian public consequent on the withdrawal of purchasing power would be stagnation of business, unemployment, and loss of production.

As stated, inflation of credit has more to do with increased buying power and therefore, with that increased buying power, has more to do with affecting the cost of commodities than circulation. It is true that in part these credits are increased by an inflated circulation, but the circulation deposited in banks from time to time plays but a small part of the total deposits. Every credit transaction, every advance made by a bank to a customer inevitably produces a corresponding deposit in the banks of that customer's creditor or creditors. The net result is to increase bank deposits by the extent of the credit and to increase the liabilities of the bank granting the credit without any corresponding increase in its cash assets. Obviously, if the money advanced is to be applied in a productive agency which would be carried on with a profit and result in a large gain of commodities to the country, there is no inflation. On the other hand, the business situation has been improved.

The credit basis which is more vicious than any other basis is that which is given for Government expenditure on non-productive objects and which does not result in any addition to the national production. Every loan for an unproductive purpose that the Government makes, no matter how successful it be, to some extent at any rate increases the credit inflation of the country. It either does it directly, as in cases where money is loaned to loan subscribers by the banks for the purpose of enabling them to take up the Government's securities, or indirectly by taking away from the productive agencies of the country savings which otherwise would be available for them, rendering it necessary for the banks to enlarge credits for essential purposes of production which otherwise would have been met by the savings of the nation. Government borrowing, in other words, has the effect of removing capital, the tool of industry, from its ordinary and legitimate purpose of industry and production. It ought to be noted that in Canada the loan situation is extremely satisfactory. Not only has the great bulk of our loans been subscribed to by our own people but in connection with all our large popular issues not one single bond has been subscribed to by the banks. Canadian banks are not loaded with governmental securities.

The increase in bank deposits which has been brought about in Canada is in a very similar ratio to that which has happened in other countries. Our total deposits on 31st March, 1914, amounted to $991,734,246, and on the 31st March last amounted to $1,855,131,598, an increase of 87 per cent. In England, according to Rt. Hon. Mr. McKenna, bank deposits increased 115 per cent from 1914 to 1919, while in the United States an increase of 80 per cent in total deposits occurred between 1914 and 1919.

In Canada it may be noted that the Government's war borrowings amounted in round numbers to $2,000,000,000 as against an increase in deposits amounting to $863,397,352. As a result, the increase in pub lic purchasing power gauged by the total currency in circulation and total bank deposits in Canada increased 91 per cent in 1919 over the figures of 1914. In England

the increase was 125 per cent and in United States 78 per cent.

The commerce of the country still requires ample credits. On the 31st March, 1914, the total of loans made by the Canadian banks amounted to $928,184,060, and on the 31st March last the loans amounted to $1,527,078,232, an increase of 65 per cent. This large sum does not include any advance to the Government. Although the business men of the country and those requiring accommodation are now enjoying this great increase in credits, the fact is that from available resources the banks in Canada as well as in all other countries ought not to meet the full requests made for further credits, apart entirely from the injurious effect credits still further increased would have on the general economic situation.

The situation is therefore one in which it is impossible by any direct Government action to bring about deflation either in circulation or in credits without great danger of economic disaster. Inflation can only safely be cured in this as in other countries, by the Government and Provincial Governments stopping further loans, and by all governmental institutions, including municipalities and indeed every individual whose circumstances permit it, reducing expenditure whenever possible and by an increased production in all our forms of productive industry.

While the trade figures of the country show advances in the value of our production and exports, and while these figures correctly show our standing and growth as compared with those of other nations, the fact must not be lost sight of that these figures are based on the inflated values today obtaining and that expressed in quantities the production of the country instead of increasing has actually decreased. Without wearying the House with statistics, it is sufficient to merely point to the best indicator of trade activities, that is, the amount of tonnage handled by the country's railroad system.

Those statistics show that in 1918 our railways handled 127,543,687 tons of freight. This indicates a remarkable activity particularly in view of the fact that many of the country's best workers were overseas and that relatively a very large proportion of our population was withdrawn from agriculture and industry. It is specially significant in view of the fact that in the year 1914, with our men at home, the freight handled only amounted to 101,393,989 tons. The tonnage handled last year, however, only amounted to 116,699,572 tons. Instead of decreasing our production the imperative necessities of the country required that it should be largely increased, not only to assist in financing and carrying on the country's operations but also to assist in bringing about that reduction of the present high cost of living which is so much desired.

Trade.

I have already referred to the aggregate trade for the past year and the favourable balance that has developed over the past five years. The results of the past year require a greater detail. Canada's external trade in 1919-20 resulted in a favourable balance of $220,000,000. The chaotic condition of foreign exchange during the year was not without its influence on our business abroad and tended to complicate the readjustment of international trade. In the United Kingdom—our largest selling market—the Canadian dollar was at a premium ranging from 1 to 22 per cent, while in the United States, where some 75 per cent of the national purchases are made, our dollar has been at a discount of from 2⅜ per cent to 17⅛ per cent.

The rate of exchange thus worked against Canada in her chief selling market as well as in her chief purchasing market. An appreciated currency assists national buying in any market, in which it is at a premium, while purchases are made proportionately the more onerous when made in a market where the currency is at a discount.

Our total imports from United Kingdom amounted to $126,274,000, which is $53,000,000 greater than in 1919 and very nearly, as expressed in dollars, equalled our pre-war trade with the Mother Country. Her purchases from us totalled $489,000,000, a decrease of $51,000,000 from 1919, the balance of trade being $363,000,000 in Canada's favour. While our exports to Great Britain have fallen off, it should be noted that the 1919 figures included about $170,000,000 for munitions and war materials. To the extent of $120,000,000, therefore, this transient trade has been replaced by trade of a more permanent character. The increase in imports from Great Britain has been very marked in recent months. They rose from a low point of $5,204,979 in April to $25,555,386 in March, the latter figure constituting not only a record but an extraordinary increase. Figures for the last six months have been as follows:—

October	$ 8,655,848
November	10,919,282
December	9,888,075

January	16,414,503
February	14,953,730
March	25,555,386

The increase in imports from the Mother Country is very gratifying and is very significant. The greatest previous volume of her monthly exports to Canada prior to the war was $14,395,740 in March, 1913. It is to be noted that the good old Mother Country very nearly doubled March last, the greatest amount of exports she has ever sent to this country.

Exports to the United States amounted to $464,000,000, increasing by $9,000,000, while imports from that country reached the unprecedented figure of $802,000,000 exceeding 1919 imports by $55,000,000. The year's trading, therefore, resulted in an unfavourable trade balance of $338,000,000. The volume of imports from the United States is all the more remarkable owing to the fact that for a considerable period of the year the adverse exchange rate which has obtained has added to the extent of the depreciation of our money in New York an additional cost to the Canadian purchaser. It is apparent that the mere question of cost has not weighed very much upon the Canadian buyer. Undoubtedly, the exchange rate is against the interests of our national buying from the United States. If practicable it ought to be remedied but it cannot be properly remedied by any artificial means. It will be remedied and can only be permanently relieved when sterling advances to its normal position and Canada's interchange of commodities with United States is reduced to a more reasonable ratio.

The following compilations indicate the trend of our trade both as to imports, exports, and total trade: (1) with all countries; (2) with the United Kingdom; and (3) with the United States, for the last three years and for the pre-war years of 1913 and 1914:—

	Canadian Trade—Merchandise Only.		
	Imports for Consumption.	Exports Domestic and Foreign.	Total Trade.
	$	$	$
Fiscal Year ended March 31st—			
1913	670,089,066	377,068,355	1,047,157,421
1914	618,457,144	455,437,224	1,073,894,368
1918	962,543,746	1,586,169,792	2,548,713,538
1919	916,429,335	1,268,765,285	2,185,194,620
1920 (unrevised)	1,064,516,177	1,286,658,709	2,351,174,886

	Trade with United Kingdom.		
	Imports for Consumption.	Exports Canadian Produce.	Total.
	$	$	$
Fiscal Year ended March 31st—			
1913	138,741,736	170,161,903	308,903,639
1914	132,070,362	215,253,969	247,324,331
1918	81,302,403	845,480,069	926,782,472
1919	73,035,118	540,750,977	613,786,095
1920 (unrevised)	126,274,365	489,151,552	615,425,917

	Trade with the United States.		
	Imports for Consumption.	Exports Canadian Produce.	Total.
	$	$	$
Fiscal Year ended March 31st—			
1913	435,770,081	139,725,953	575,496,034
1914	395,565,328	163,372,825	558,938,153
1918	791,906,125	417,812,807	1,209,718,932
1919	746,920,654	454,873,170	1,201,793,824
1920 (unrevised)	802,095,452	464,029,273	1,266,124,725

The following statement indicates the dislocation brought about by the war in our two chief markets, Great Britain and the United States.

(Expressed in percentages of the whole.)

	Pre-War.	Post War.	
	Year ended 31st Mar., 1914	Year ended 31st Mar., 1919	Year ended 31st Mar., 1920
Canada's Purchases.			
From United Kingdom	21·35%	7·96%	11·86%
From United States	63·96%	81·50%	75·44%
Canada's Sales.			
To United Kingdom	48·81%	44·20%	38·54%
To United States	38·85%	37·66%	38·94%

Revenue, 1919-20.

The revenue for the fiscal year ended 31st March last will when the accounts are finally closed reach approximately $388,000,000. This is the largest revenue that the country has ever collected. Instead of lessened receipts, as conditions at the time the last Budget was prepared seemed to indicate, the revenue of the preceding year has been exceeded by $75,000,000, and the country's revenue for 1920 was no less than $255,000,000 greater than that of the first year of the war. The chief sources of revenue were as follows:

Customs	$169,000,000
Excise	43,000,000
Post Office	22,000,000
Business Profits War Tax	44,000,000
Income Tax	20,000,000
Other war taxation	17,000,000

Expenditure, 1919-20.

The consolidated fund ordinary expenditure will be approximately $349,000,000. This sum of $349,000,000 includes $108,500,000 interest on public debt, $26,000,000 for pensions, and $49,000,000 for Soldiers' Re-establishment.

For investment and capital outlays, beyond the ordinary current expenditure of $349,000,000, an expenditure of $187,856,991 is estimated. The resultant total is $536,741,110 and represents the outlay of Canada for all purposes apart from war during the past year.

With a total revenue of $388,000,000 and an ordinary expenditure of $349,000,000, it will be seen that during the fiscal year 1919-20 the Government, after meeting all ordinary expenditure, including an increased amount for interest account and pensions over the previous year totalling nearly $39,000,000, has a surplus of approximately $39,000,000 over ordinary expenditure, to apply to capital expenditure.

The demobilization expenditures for 1919-20 will amount to $350,000,000, making a total outlay for the year of $886,741,110. Our total expenditure for the war, up to and including the 31st March, 1920, now amounts to $1,674,000,000, apart altogether from such expenses resulting from the war, as Pensions, Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Soldiers' Land Settlement, and interest on war debt.

Debt.

During the year just passed the country paid off a floating debt of $247,000,000 out of the proceeds of the Victory Loan issue of 1919. The floating or short date indebtedness of the country at the close of the year amounted to only $88,956,000. The addition to the debt during the year amounted to $395,000,000 and the position of the net debt has already been referred to.

Expenditures for 1920-21.

The Main Estimates for 1920-21 total $537,149,428 and Supplementary Estimates for $12,500,000 for bonus purposes have been tabled, with the question of Main Supplementary Estimates still standing.

In the above-mentioned Estimates already brought down certain considerable amounts classified as investments are included as follows:

Soldiers' Land Settlement Loans	$50,000,000
Loans to Canadian Northern Railway Company	48,600,000
For Railway Equipment purposes	17,000,000
Loans to provinces for Better Housing purposes	13,300,000

to which ought to be added $20,000,000 for shipbuilding programme included in the above Estimates as "Public Works (Marine Department), Capital."

The estimated expenditure on ordinary account for the present year is: Main Estimates, $328,500,000 and Civil Service bonus, $12,500,000. Of this, $140,000,000 represents interest on public debt, an increase over 1919-20 of $31,500,000. An estimated expenditure on capital account of $41,000,000 is also included in the total of $549,649,428. There will be no separate Act providing for demobilization expenses this year. The Main Estimates contain provision for $38,463,400 for this purpose and also cover distributed items to the amount of $1,745,624 for services paid out of the demobilization appropriation last year. In order to compare the expenditure proposed for all purposes apart from the war with that of the past year the amount then of $40,209,024 must be deducted from this year's Estimates. As these Estimates are also enlarged by an unescapable increase of $31,500,000 in debt interest, it will be found that for comparable expenditures, notwithstanding increased costs of service, a saving of $71,709,024 is indicated.

Probable income for the present Fiscal Year, 1920-21.

The revenue for the year ending the 31st March, 1921, estimated on the basis of existing fiscal legislation, and assuming that values of importations for customs purposes remain practically the same as for 1919-20, should amount to $381,000,000 as follows:

Customs	$167,000,000
Excise	43,000,000
Post Office	22,000,000
Government railways for 9 months	28,000,000
Business Profits War Tax	40,000,000
Income Tax	35,000,000
Other War Taxation	17,000,000
All other revenues	29,000,000

The revenue from the Government railways for 1919-20 is put at $42,500,000. For 1920-21 only $28,000,000 is taken into account on the assumption that at the end of this calendar year the revenue from Government railways will be under the control of the Canadian National Railways, and applied directly against the working expenses of such railways, which will be correspondingly reduced in our estimate of ordinary expenditures for the year.

Including the estimated revenue of $381,000,000, cash on hand and outstanding counts including balances due from Great Britain make a whole total of $720,441,752.88. In all probability the whole of these accounts will not be collected within the year and $571,000,000 will more accurately represent the actual cash resources for the year. No further loan, as already pointed out, ought to be made. In addition to the commitments already mentioned, certain floating obligations mature during the year. They are as follows:

Treasury Bills, Oct. 1st, 1920	$24,605,000
Treasury Bills, Oct. 15th, 1920	49,215,000
Debenture Stock, June 1st, 1920.	238,400
Total	$74,058,400

The revenue of the year and cash assets available should at least not only carry current expenditure but retire this debt.

Grand Trunk Acquisition.

The current expenditure, however, will be greater this year than that already indicated. Deficits on the railway system have been reported in the Main Estimates. These deficits during the readjustment period will be materially increased by the acquisition of the Grand Trunk. The primary object of the acquisition of the Grand Trunk was to render efficient and properly complete the National system. The country had a large railway investment with proper terminal facilities in the West, but, speaking generally, lacking them in the East. The railway burden was also largely increased by the failure of the Grand Trunk Pacific promoted and owned by the Grand Trunk. The country was faced with the necessity either of providing new terminals at great cost in eastern centres, leading to a still greater railroad duplication, or of acquiring the Grand Trunk system. The traffic centres of the East had to be opened to the National system if that system was to be put upon a proper basis and enabled to properly compete in all through-traffic. Over and above this, the Grand Trunk was acquired for the purpose of reducing existing duplication and enabling extensive operating economies to be made.

Over and above these considerations, the acquisition of the Grand Trunk was highly desirable in order to prevent the insolvency of the line and the consequent breakdown of railroad facilities in the districts served by that system. Railway receiverships in some instances do not carry with them serious consequences, but in the case of the Grand Trunk a receivership would be exceedingly objectionable owing to the fact that the company's system is composed of many separate railway corporations having in instances separate obligations and different creditors, rendering a re-organization as of a completed system very difficult. Such re-organization would be attended with still

greater difficulty owing to the fact that part of it would take place under the direction of United States courts and part under the direction of Canadian courts. The dislocation of business would have been exceedingly great and the inconvenience and loss to Canadian shippers and consignees and to Canadian business heavy.

Some economies ought to be effected in the near future, but with the arbitration pending it is improbable that full benefit of the Grand Trunk acquisition can be expected in the current year. It will be necessary to make advances to the company to cover past due operating obligations. These advances will constitute obligations of the company and as such must be taken into account in the arbitration. In addition to this, advances of necessity will be made to provide for this year's operations, including the acquisition of necessary rolling stock.

The abstract of the company's cash book as of February 21 last shows obligations overdue or shortly payable amounting to $18,710,588, made up in large part of unpaid vouchers, bank overdrafts, drafts held for acceptance and short date notes given for supplies. As against these debts the Grand Trunk has supplies on hand and certain capital accounts as against which no capital issue has been made. They are, however, not of a character which can be relied upon for the purpose of supplying cash to meet these liabilities.

The approximate amount to cover advances for the purposes above mentioned is $28,000,000.

Railway difficulties and overdrafts ought now to be at their peak. Proper co-ordination and economies will, just as soon as the Grand Trunk arbitration is over, be practicable and will be put into effect. The balance sheet, however, inevitably depends on the cost of carrying on business, which has been very greatly increased, and the general rate schedule. The serious drain made by the railways on the country's finances ought to be materially lessened.

As a matter of common justice to Canada it should be stated that the charges of unfairness levied against Canada by different shareholders at Grand Trunk meetings, are unfounded. The simple fact remains that if the Grand Trunk had not been taken over the shareholders in all human probability would have lost their whole investment. It is entirely untrue that the Government forced the company to pay a highly increased wage scale and at the same time prevented it from raising its rates either directly or through the Board of Railway Commissioners. The chairman of the Grand Trunk is reported to have made the following statements at the special general meeting of the company:

> I knew there were influential men in Canada who thought the policy the Government should pursue was to let us alone, and that the weaker we became the easier we could be dealt with —(hear, hear)—they knew we were being forced by the Government to carry on under impossible conditions—conditions over which we had absolutely no control. What were those conditions? That we should meet every order issued by the Canadian Railway War Board to increase wages by immediate compliance, notwithstanding that no increase of rates to meet the increased expenses was allowed.....
>
> In 1918 an increase of freight rates was granted on a great portion of the freight carried, something under 15 per cent in March and something under 25 per cent in August. Notwithstanding this, owing to a further serious increase of wages being ordered by the Canadian Railway War Board, without any corresponding increase in rates, there was an actual decrease in net profit for 1918. The gross traffic for 1918 amounted to £12,600,000, as compared with £9,800,000 in 1917, or a gross increase of £2,700,000, but the working expenses increased by £2,900,000, or a net loss of £200,000 for 1918.
>
> In 1919, the accounts of which are not yet complete, the gross earnings are estimated at £14,000,000, as against £12,600,000 in 1918, or an increase of £1,400,000. Owing, however, to another large increase in wages being ordered by the Canadian Railway War Board—again without any increase in rates—it is not expected there will be any increase in net profit, and consequently the company will only be able to meet its fixed charges. Thus, in each of the three years—1917, 1918, and 1919—in consequence of being compelled, by order of the Canadian Railway War Board, to grant increased wages without sufficiently increased rates, the shareholders lost on the average at least between £1,250,000 and £1,500,000 in each of those three years, which they ought to have received in dividends.

The direct imputation conveyed to the shareholders was that the Railway War Board was a governmental institution to whose orders railways were subject. It was not. That board was not a statutory body but was an organization formed by the railway companies (including the operators of the Intercolonial) for the express purpose of more perfectly co-ordinating their activities and for the purpose of dealing with large railway questions. The board was organized in 1917. The Grand Trunk's representation was as follows: Mr. Howard G. Kelley, a president, and Mr. W. E. Gillen, chairman of the Administrative Committee. Mr. Gillen subsequently retired and Mr. W. D. Robb, a vice-president of the Grand Trunk, was elected a member of the Administrative Committee. In 1919 the

board was reorganized as The Railway Association of Canada with Mr. Kelley this time as sole president and with Grand Trunk representation on every committee. The organization was entirely a railway organization. It was not a Government organization. The organization had, however, no control over railroad rates. The Grand Trunk has American lines as well as Canadian lines. It has traffic originating at American points for Canadian destinations. The rate for the shorter haul in Canadian territory cannot obviously be greater than the rates on the longer haul for Canadian destinations from American territory. Subject to this consideration, and just as soon as action was taken by the American Commission, every application made by the company for a general increased tariff during the whole of the war period was given effect to, and I am informed by the Board of Railway Commissioners that there is no general application for an increase of rates by the Grand Trunk Railway Company pending or refused, nor was any application of that character pending at the time the meeting was held. The highest dividend distribution of the Grand Trunk amounted to $4,736,241.22. The average dividend payments are much lower without deductions being made for deficits of the Grand Trunk Pacific (the subsidiary of the Grand Trunk and organized by it) which were met by advances made by the Parliament of Canada to an amount in excess of $50,000,000.

Luxury Taxes.

Not only is more revenue necessary but extravagant and luxurious expenditure ought to be checked. Just so long as expenditure on non-essentials and extravagant expenditure continues, just so much longer will the drop in the value of essentials be postponed. On those having income more than necessary for properly maintaining themselves and families, there rests a special duty of saving whenever possible and in this manner adding to the available financial resources for development and for industrial undertakings. Extravagant buying should stop. With this end in view, as well as for necessary revenue, it is proposed to levy on certain specified articles excise taxes which are to be paid by the purchaser to the vendor at the time of sale for consumption or use, or on importation for consumption or use other than resale. Upon certain articles of wearing apparel, such as boots, shoes, etc., in excess of $9 a pair, men's and boys' suits in excess of $45 each, fur coats and robes in excess of $100 each, women's dresses in excess of $45 each, women's suits in excess of $60 each, men's and women's overcoats in excess of $50 each; hats, hose, neckwear, shirts, purses, and gloves bought above specified prices, and on fans and opera cloaks, it is proposed to levy a tax of 10 per cent of the total purchase price. The women are given a little preference over the men because men's suits in excess of $45 will be taxed, whereas women's suits up to $60 will be exempt from taxation.

Mr. BUREAU: Where does the influence come from?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:: The same rate of tax is to apply to trunks in excess of $40 each, valises, suitcases, etc., in excess of $25 each; ivory handled cutlery, cut glass ware, velvet and silk fabrics, lace, ribbons, silk embroideries, and sporting goods.

Under the terms of the French Treaty silks, velvets, lace, and silk embroideries were given a preferential treatment. Not only was France interested in the Treaty but other countries making like importations received full benefits of the Treaty. These countries amounted to eleven in number, including Japan and Switzerland. The operation of the French Treaty ceases on the 19th June next and thereafter, subject to what further action may be taken when the tariff is revised, these articles will take rates from 30 to 35 per cent instead of the present rates ranging from 20 to 27½ per cent.

In addition to this, these luxuries will be subject to the above excise tax of 10 per cent on the whole of their purchase price.

A similar tax of 20 per cent of the total purchase price is to be levied upon such articles as cigar and cigarette holders and pipes in excess of $2.50 each, humidors and other equipment for smokers, hunting, shooting, and riding garments, fancy pocket knives, gold, silver, ebony and ivory toilet-ware, articles of silver adapted for household or office use, jewellery, fur wearing apparel (except as provided above), liveries, oriental rugs, expensive carpets and curtains, and chandeliers.

An excise tax of 10 per cent will also be payable at the time of sale by the Canadian manufacturer or when imported on boats, yachts, canoes, and motor boats (when used for commercial purposes refund of tax is provided for), cameras, candy and confectionery, firearms, shells or cart-

ridges, pianos, organs, musical instruments, and plated ware adapted for household use.

A like tax of 20 per cent will be imposed upon mechanical player pianos, graphophones and mechanical musical instruments and records used therewith. Articles of gold adapted for household or office use will be taxed to 50 per cent of the selling prices. A specific tax on playing cards is also provided for. On all cards selling at wholesale rates not over $25 per gross packs, the tax will be 25 cents a pack and in excess of $25, 50 cents a pack.

Excise Tax on Motor Cars.

A large revenue was received during the year from taxation on motors which totalled $12,962,365, of this amount $6,378,171 being from customs duties and $6,584,194 from excise. The taxation of motors would seem to be a reasonable and proper source of revenue. The field, however, has been always occupied by the provinces, and instead of taxing motors generally, it has been determined to increase the excise tax, which is chargeable both on Canadian and imported cars, from 10 to 15 per cent.

Beer, Wine, and Spirit Duties.

It is also proposed to increase the duties on beer, wine, and spirits.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is cruelty.

Mr. BUREAU: There is no more beer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I hasten to reassure my hon. friend that we do not class 2 per cent as beer, and it is therefore not subject to the tax. The proposals call for an increase in the duties on beer of 30 cents a gallon, on non-sparkling wines, 30 cents a gallon; on spirits, $2 a gallon, and on sparkling wines, $3 a gallon. These are in excess of the present duties both customs and excise.

Mr. BUREAU: That is the best prohibition law passed yet.

Sales Tax.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In view of the necessities of increased revenues, a tax of one per cent on the sales of all manufacturers, wholesale dealers, jobbers and importers is proposed. The tax will not include retailers as such but will include the goods manufactured or imported by any retailer although manufactured or imported by such retailer for r tail sale by himself. Consideration must also be given to the cost of essentials and on this account it has been determined that the tax will not apply to sales of meats, fresh, salted or pickled; butter, cheese; oleomargarine, margarine, butterine, or any other substitute for butter; lard, eggs, vegetables, fruits; grains and seeds in their natural state; buckwheat meal or flour; pot, pearl, rolled, roasted or ground barley; cornmeal, oatmeal, or rolled oats, rye flour, wheat flour; coffee, green, roasted or ground; tea, salt, cattle foods, hay and straw, nursery stock; fish, fresh, pickled, salted, smoked, dried or boneless; sugar, syrups and molasses; anthracite or bituminous coal; artificial limbs and parts thereof, or to goods exported.

The sales tax ought not to be used as a basis of further profits and must not, therefore, be included in the manufacturer's or wholesaler's costs on which profit is calculated. The tax when not absorbed by the vendor must then be included in his invoice as a separate item.

Stamp Taxes.

The existing tax on cheques will be continued, but the rate increased on bills of exchange and promissory notes so as to provide a 2 cent tax on all bills or notes of $100 or less and for every additional $100 or fractional part thereof 2 cents more. A tax of 2 cents for each share of stock transferred is also proposed.

The method of collecting stamp duties on patent and proprietary medicines and perfumery will be changed by having the stamps affixed by the manufacturer or importer instead of the retailer at the time of sale. The stamps are not to be included in the costs of the manufacturer or importer but if not absorbed by the seller are to be added in the invoice as a separate item.

Removal of Tax on Moving Picture Films.

Under existing legislation a special tax is collected on films used in moving picture theatres. The tax provided is a charge of 15 cents per film for each day upon which such film is used. It has been found that this duty has worked a hardship on small movie theatres. Many complaints have been received and it has become apparent that the tax in the case of the small theatres sometimes represents a charge of as high as 6 or 7 per cent of its total receipts, already subject to municipal and provincial taxation, while in the case of large theatres the tax amounts to less than 1 per cent of receipts. Undoubtedly the present tax is unfair in its incidence and it has been decided to remove it. Movie

theatres and other forms of amusement would appear in the first instance proper subjects of taxation, but it is felt that if these theatres are to be subject to further taxation, it ought to be done by an increase in the existing forms of taxation imposed by the provincial and municipal authorities, rather than by a new federal tax.

Income Tax.

The income tax rate was substantially increased last year, so as to bring it up to the increased United States rates. The increase was material as the following examples indicate:

On incomes of	$	5,000	from	$ 100	to	$ 120	an increase of $ 20
"		10,000	from	392	to	590	" 198
"		20,000	from	1,382	to	1,990	" 608
"		30,000	from	2,702	to	3,890	" 1,188
"		50,000	from	5,782	to	9,190	" 3,408
"		100,000	from	17,607	to	31,190	" 13,583
"		200,000	from	50,957	to	93,190	" 42,233
"		500,000	from	195,407	to	303,190	" 107,783
"		1,000,000	from	499,157	to	663,190	" 164,033

The corporation tax was in like manner increased from 6 to 10 per cent.

These large increases will be payable this year for the first time. It is anticipated that they will yield approximately an additional $15,000,000. That our measures of taxation must in view of our geographical situation have regard to United States legislation is a principle that has found general acceptance. I do not desire to question it. But revenue is urgently required and a difference of 5 per cent in these individual and corporation taxes will not deter immigration and the investment of outside capital so essential to our national development and growth. It is therefore proposed to increase these taxes on incomes of $5,000 and upwards by 5 per cent. The increase will be made effective this year. As a result the tax on a personal income of $5,000 will be $126 as against a levy of $100 last year, and on an income of $50,000, $9,649.50 as against $5,782 last year. In the case of a corporation with an income of $100,000, the rate this year will be $10,500 as against $6,000 last year.

Collection of Income and Profits Taxes.

These taxes are not collected with desirable despatch and under the existing Acts there is reason for vexatious delays. An assessment once made by the department stands. As a result any zealous officer makes no assessment until satisfied that he has made every possible check and has exhausted all avenues of information bearing on the taxpayer's income. In addition to this, the business profits tax requires an exhaustive inquiry into the company affected—an inquiry which covers the question of the true amount at which capital stock should be valued, often resulting in shares being valued considerably below their actual selling market value, and also covers the liquid and other debts and obligations, liquid and other assets, depreciation and maintenance. In many cases personal incomes depend on the ascertainment of business profits taxes. The result is delay, loss of interest, and added difficulties in finally collecting the tax. Delay is inseparable from the business profits tax. The situation can, however, be materially improved in so far as the ordinary income tax is concerned.

A Bill will be introduced making each taxpayer in the first instance his own assessor. For the guidance of the taxpayer a plain table will be either attached to or included in the form of return showing exactly what taxes are payable on incomes of various amounts. The taxpayer will with his return include his cheque, either for the taxes properly payable by him or for an amount not less than 25 per cent of that sum—the remaining 75 per cent to be paid in three equal bi-monthly instalments, the first of such bi-monthly instalments to be paid at the expiration of two months after the return is made, and so that the whole amount of the tax will be paid in six months after the return is made. Interest will be charged at the rate of 6 per cent on all payments made on instalments. The returns will be carefully checked by the department and in all cases where it is discovered that overpayment has been made by the ratepayer, a refund for the amount must be immediately made to him or applied on any instalment due or becoming due. If investigation shows that the taxpayer has misstated his income, penalties will be provided. A mistake of 10 per cent in income might well arise from bona fide error and no penalty is proposed, except that the further payment found to be due will carry interest at the rate of 10 per cent per annum. Where the actual income exceeds 10 per cent and does not exceed 20 per cent of the amount shown by the taxpayer's re-

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

turn, a penalty of 50 per cent will be provided, and where the deficiency is greater than 20 per cent a penalty of 100 per cent will be provided. These penalties will be calculated on the amount the returns are deficient. The proper tax with interest at 10 per cent must also be paid.

Business Profits War Tax.

Many representations have been made against the continuance of the Business Profits War Tax. The tax is charged with being largely responsible for the high cost of living. It is held that it is impossible to fairly collect and administer the tax owing to the different characteristics of different businesses and to the fact that what is a fair profit in one class of business is entirely inadequate in another, and further that the capitalization of companies differs very very widely in proportion to their activities and to their resultant profits, so that some companies are taxed on the same amount of income, derived from the same class of business, very much more heavily than others. It is attacked on the ground that it directly contributes to extravagance and places a premium on inefficiency, that in many instances companies in providing for the tax have advanced their costs in far greater proportion than was at all necessary to provide for these payments and still keep their business in a flourishing condition. It is further contended that much of the profits are represented by necessary plant extensions and by stocks of commodities on hand which have been bought and are valued at current high prices, so that 100 per cent of profits shown by the books are rarely if ever represented by cash.

Much undoubtedly can be said against the Business Profits War Tax. Under normal conditions it would indeed be hard to find any argument which would justify its continuance. We are not yet, however, under normal conditions. Supply has not yet caught up to demand, and in some lines of business activity, at any rate, the salutary effects of competition are, as a result, not in play, and whatever can be said against the Business Profits Tax, it at least has meant that a substantial sum of money has been recovered for the country out of large profits.

Business in 1919 was carried on under the existing Business Profits Tax and to the full extent that it was possible for companies to avoid the tax and pass the full incidence to others, that will already have been done. During the current fiscal year our business profits revenues will come from 1919 profits, the tax being levied under last year's Act at the maximum rates. It may possibly be that with another year, business will be more normal and that no Business Profits Tax ought to be levied. It undoubtedly is probable that some measure of deflation and retrenchment will have occurred, that there will be some decrease in the inflated prices of commodities, and it is in the interest of the country that business concerns should be able to make some provision for shrinking price lists and decreased buying power of their customers. Our Business Profits Tax is at a high rate. It makes no allowance for pre-war profits, however large they may have been, but fixes an arbitrary return of 7 per cent on the capital employed before the tax commences to operate. Unquestionably, with the higher return money to-day commands, 7 per cent is not a reasonable reward for commercial ventures. It has been determined that it is impossible to stop immediately the imposition of the Business Profits Tax, and a resolution will be introduced which will provide for the continuance of a tax of this character, but on a reduced scale, on the profits derived during the year 1920, the tax being payable in 1921. The present exemption will be extended from 7 to 10 per cent, the schedule of taxation to be as follows:

	Tax.
On profits in excess of 10% but not exceeding 15%	20%
On profits in excess of 15% but not exceeding 20%	30%
On profits in excess of 20% but not exceeding 30%	50%
On profits over 30%	60%

The present Act provides a different scale of taxation for the profits of businesses with capital of not less than $25,000 and under $50,000, being one-quarter of all profits exceeding 10 per cent on the amount of the capital employed. It is proposed to reduce this tax from 25 to 20 per cent.

It has been felt that the concessions made in the proposed amendments are sufficient for the purpose of enabling firms to set aside more of their profits to reserves or plant extensions and to put their businesses in a better position to meet the deflation period, while at the same time a check will still be held on abnormal profits.

Removal of Customs War Duty.

The general war customs duty of 7½ per cent was repealed last year in so far as articles of food, clothing, agricultural im-

plements, and fertilizers, as well as some other items are concerned. It, however, still obtains on a large part of our importations, approximately thirty million dollars of revenue accruing from this source last year. It is a tax which has been blamed, perhaps as much as any tax, with the exception of the business profits war tax, as a reason for the high cost of living. Notwithstanding the need for revenue, in view of the fact that it is impossible at the present time to intelligently revise the tariff and the further fact that the incidence of this tax, placed as it is in a general blanket way, works and maintains inconsistencies, it is proposed to abolish entirely this 7½ per cent war duty.

Minor Tariff Changes.

A very apparent anomaly exists in the present tariff which ought to be corrected and the correction of which can do no possible harm to any Canadian trade or industry. That anomaly consists in the tariff items which allow the importation free of duty of novels and other books (other than scientific works), when printed in languages other than English or French. It is proposed to remove the discrimination in favour of foreign publications by placing them in the same category as those published in English or French.

Owing to the fact that the blind population of Canada has been increased by the war, it is deemed a small measure of justice to remove the duty on books and other essentials for the blind which are not manufactured in Canada or which are only of special use and advantage to blind people.

Tariff Revision.

The following statement was issued on December 15 last on the subject of tariff revision:—

Since the signing of the Armistice a little over a year ago the Government and Parliament have been devoting attention to peace and reconstruction problems. Among the many questions that have received consideration is that relating to a general revision of the tariff. Dealing with this subject my predecessor Sir Thomas White, in his last Budget Speech is reported in Hansard, June 5 last, as follows:—

"It would not be practicable at this time to make a sound general revision of the tariff. International trade is most unsettled, still hampered by war restrictions and prohibitions and by exchange conditions, which are and may long continue to be subject to violent fluctuations. Prices are unstable, and labour conditions, internationally speaking, most uncertain. Until peace is restored and the world is upon a more stable basis with respect to capital, labour, prices, markets, and exchange, the tariff cannot be revised intelligently.

"It is my hope that within a year conditions will have become so stabilized as to permit of a general revision of the tariff, which is long, but, owing to the war, unavoidably overdue. Preceding such revision there should be a thorough inquiry conducted by the Minister of Finance and two or more of his colleagues representing the different geographical sections of Canada. Such inquiry should afford all interests, agricultural, industrial, fishing, lumbering, mining, commercial, and financial, producers and consumers alike, an opportunity of expressing their views and opinions and urging their particular needs and requirements. The result of such inquiry should be a body of information which will enable the Government to effect a general revision of the tariff fair to all parts of the community and effectually promoting the national welfare of Canada. This inquiry should proceed with its work just as soon as conditions are sufficiently stabilized to permit. My own view is that it might well be commenced about autumn of this year."

Unfortunately, international and economic conditions are not only far from normal but in many respects are worse than they were six months ago or at any time during the entire war period. International exchanges in particular are not only unstable but erratic. Tariff considerations of necessity have largely to be based on international and economic conditions and the result is that the different countries of the world are still refraining from any general tariff rearrangement, waiting until some appreciation may be possible of the future conditions, under which their tariffs will operate. Inasmuch, however, as any general tariff revision must be based upon as complete a knowledge as possible of the conditions and relations one to another of our various national industries and productive agencies, and as it is also desirable to obtain the views of as many persons as possible whose practical knowledge and experience would be most valuable, it is considered advisable to begin the collection of information relative thereto.

In order to obtain proper results from public hearings and in order to give all those interested the best opportunity of presenting their cases, it has been decided that the inquiry shall be started by written statements, which should cover each particular issue as each interested claimant for relief sees it. These statements ought to show the particular complaint in each instance, a full statement of the grounds on which that complaint is based, the remedy proposed, and a statement of the grounds leading to the conclusion that such remedy proposed is effective. The issue is really of course not merely a tariff issue from the standpoint of protection or otherwise but is also a revenue issue, and in like manner the submissions of those desiring reductions in tariff should at the same time show methods by which compensating revenues can be obtained from taxation or other sources. The preparation of these statements will necessarily require much careful consideration. Those desiring to make representations as to the problems involved are therefore asked to undertake the preparation of the same without delay and forward their statements addressed to the Minister of Finance at Ottawa. Upon receipt of the statements they will be systematically analysed and classified for the purpose of making them a basis of the general public inquiry to be held throughout the country as indicated by Sir Thomas White.

While unfortunately trade and economic conditions are yet unstable, the tariff inves-

tigation has commenced and public sittings will be held throughout Canada after prorogation. The investigation will be conducted by the Department of Finance with the assistance of such expert and other advisers as will be necessary to conduct a thorough inquiry. I am further of the opinion that not only should the investigation proceed but that information should now be given of the principles and policies of the Government in the light of which effect will be given in the tariff revision to follow to the evidence and facts developed in the inquiry.

Our policy calls for a thorough revision of the tariff with a view to the adoption of such reasonable measures as are necessary —(a) to assist in providing adequate revenues, (b) to stabilize legitimate industries and to encourage the establishment of new industries essential to the proper economic development of the nation—to the end that a proper and ever increasing field of useful and remunerative employment be available for the nation's workers, (c) to develop to the fullest extent our natural resources, (d) to specially promote and increase trade with the Mother Country, the sister dominions and colonies and Crown dependencies, (e) to prevent the abuse of the tariff for the exploitation of the consumer——

Mr. LAPOINTE: Some change.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —and, (f) to safeguard the interests of the Canadian people in the existing world struggle for commercial and industrial supremacy.

As a means of raising revenue, the tariff should be so adjusted as to place the chief burden upon those best able to bear it. Articles of luxury should be heavily taxed through the imposition of customs and excise rates. Food commodities and other necessaries of life, not produced or manufactured in Canada, should, if taxed at all, bear only such imposts as are necessary for revenue purposes. Those produced in Canada should be subjected to such customs duties only as may be necessary in the general national interest to be determined after strict investigation from time to time.

Apart from the question of revenue, the tariff should have regard to the maintenance, stability and prosperity of Canadian enterprise in the development of all our natural resources in lands, forests, mines, fisheries, as well as our agricultural and manufacturing industries. Consideration must also be given to the importance of creating and maintaining conditions that will afford to Canadian industrial workers opportunities for steady and remunerative employment. It is undoubtedly in the true interests of Canada as a whole that Canadian workers should not be forced to seek in foreign countries employment and opportunity denied them at home by reason of the export of the natural resources, primary products, and raw materials with which the Dominion is so amply endowed.

For the purpose of encouraging the fullest development of our natural resources the tariff should be so adjusted as to permit machinery and the implements of production to be purchased at prices that will compare equitably with those paid in other countries for similar articles. The revised tariff law should be so framed and administered as to effectively prevent any customs duty being used to facilitate the formation or maintenance of any combine, trust, association or agreement among manufacturers, dealers, or producers for the purpose, at the expense of the general public, of restraining trade, preventing competition, or unduly enhancing the selling price of any article of commerce. The principle of trade preference between the different members of the Britannic Commonwealth should be maintained and extended from time to time to such degree as may be found practicable and consistent with Canadian interests.

While a general revision of the Canadian tariff based upon the foregoing considerations is due, it must be recognized that, owing to the war, economic and commercial conditions the world round have been profoundly disturbed and that, as a consequence it is neither practicable nor possible in the national or public interest to undertake such revision until a thorough inquiry is made to ascertain the essential facts upon which tariff provisions must necessarily be based.

All the financial difficulties of the moment can be, and I have no doubt will be, readily met. I am confident that every hon. gentleman has the firmest belief and confidence in Canada—and that belief is well justified. Immigration and a reasonable investment of outside capital rendering our illimitable national resources available, but above all the national characteristics and strength of character of the citizens of Canada, will easily surmount the past. And Canada's situation to-day is indeed an enviable one. There is no country in the world that can offer greater inducements to the immigrant and greater inducements to foreign capital than Canada can. Prosperity is entirely relative. Our position relatively has

enhanced. We have finished borrowing, and notwithstanding the great increase in our debt, Canada's securities to-day stand as high, or higher, than those of any foreign country in what is to-day the great market for foreign securities—New York. Canada's world status is far greater to-day notwithstanding her losses and war debts than it was in 1914.

I crave the indulgence of the House, Mr. Speaker, for the length of time I have spoken before introducing these resolutions. I wonder if before reading them I might not say just one or two words more. You know, some people to-day think, and apparently believe, that the country is in a bad state; I do not. Some people to-day think, and apparently believe, that the job ahead of Canada is a bigger job than Canada can look after; I do not. I wonder if we are not altogether too prone to forget what Canada has done; I wonder if we are not entirely too prone to forget the amount of hard work, of sacrifice and of devotion that the Canadian people showed themselves capable of sustaining during the war period.

Are we not a little too apt to forget that it was the soldiers of Canada who formed just a few short months ago the spearhead of the forces of righteousness? Are we not a little too apt to forget that we have got the same spirit and the same blood in Canada yet? Are we not a little too apt to forget that their magnificent achievements never could have been and never would have been possible had not the men behind and, indeed, the women, too, seen to it that the soldiers were supported, that reinforcements were sent? Yes, the war record is a glorious record; but there were other war activities. Why, there is no better record than the record of the Canadian Medical Staff; no better record than the record of Canada's production; no better record than the record of Canada's transportation facilities, which remained at a higher point than did those of any other country engaged in the war.

Does it not seem rather ridiculous for any one to seriously think that a nation that has done so much will not now be able to look after its own business; that a nation that has done so much for Europe and the world is not going to do something for Canada—something for that Canada which is so dear to every Canadian, something for that Canada which is to-day so infinitely more precious and glorious by reason of the sacrifices made by her fighting men than she ever was before, something for that country which the very best of us in consecrating his services to her is compensated by the thought that it is impossible for any Canadian to do too much for Canada?

RESOLUTIONS.

I beg to give notice that upon the House resolving itself into committee I shall move the following resolutions:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, and to provide:—

1. That the following excise taxes be imposed, levied and collected on the total purchase price of the articles hereinafter specified, and on articles of clothing the said tax may be imposed upon the combined selling price of materials and cost of manufacture when sold separately:—

(a) A tax of ten per cent on,—

Boots, shoes, pumps and slippers of any material (not including shoes or appliances made to order for persons having a crippled or deformed foot or ankle) in excess of $9 per pair;

Hats, men's and boy's in excess of $5 each;

Caps, men's and boy's in excess of $2 each;

Hose or stockings, silk, men's and boy's, in excess of $1 per pair;

Neckties and neckwear and scarfs, men's and boy's, in excess of $1.50 each;

Clothing consisting of coat, vest and pants or coat and pants, men's and boy's, in excess of $45;

Cloth overcoats, men's and boy's, women's and misses', in excess of $50 each;

Waistcoats, men's sold separately from suits, in excess of $5 each;

Shirts, including night shirts, men's and boy's, in excess of $3 each;

Hats, bonnets and hoods, women's and misses', in excess of $12 each;

Hose or stockings, silk, women's and misses', in excess of $2 per pair;

Kimonos, petticoats and waists in excess of $12 each;

Nightgowns in excess of $3 each;

House or smoking jackets or bath and lounging robes;

Pyjamas and underwear in excess of $5;

Fans;

Purses and pocket-books, in excess of $2 each;

Shopping and hand-bags in excess of $6 each;

Umbrellas, parasols and sunshades in excess of $4 each;

Trunks in excess of $40 each;

Valises, travelling bags, suitcases, hat boxes and fitted travelling cases in excess of $25 each;

Gloves, except fur in excess of $3 per pair;

Dresses, women's and misses', in excess of $45 each;

Suits, women's and misses', in excess of $60 each;

Opera cloaks;

Coats and robes, the component material of chief value being fur, in excess of $100 each;

Ivory handled cutlery;

Cut glassware;

Sporting goods, such as tennis rackets, nets, racket covers and presses, skates, snowshoes, skis, toboggans, canoe paddles and cushions, polo mallets, baseball bats, gloves, masks, protectors, shoes and uniforms, football helmets, harness and goals, basket-ball goals and uniforms, golf bags and clubs, lacrosse sticks, balls of all kinds, fishing rods and reels, billiard and pool tables, chess and checker

boards and pieces, dice, games and parts of games (except playing cards and children's toys and games), and all similar articles commonly or commercially known as sporting goods in excess of 50 cents;

Plated ware not otherwise provided for in this resolution adapted for household or office use;

Velvets, velveteens, plush and silk fabrics;

Embroideries of silk;

Lace, including collars or collarettes of lace and all manufactures of lace;

Ribbons of all kinds and materials;

(b) A tax of twenty per cent on,—

Cigar and cigarette holders and pipes in excess of $2.50 each;

Cigar and cigarette cases, ash trays and match boxes of gold or silver;

Humidors and smoking stands;

Hunting and shooting garments and riding habits;

Hunting and Bowie knives;

Gold and silver handled pocket knives and pencils;

Gold, silver, ebony and ivory toiletware;

Articles of silver not otherwise provided for in this resolution adapted for household or office use;

Silver or gold deposit ware;

Wearing apparel, not otherwise provided for in this resolution, the component material of chief value being fur;

Liveries, livery boots and hats;

Oriental rugs;

Carpets in excess of $3 per yard;

Curtains, including tapestry curtains, in excess of $7.50 each;

Chandeliers, except for churches;

Articles commonly or commercially known as jewellery, whether real or imitation, for personal use or for adornment of the person.

(c) A tax of fifty per cent on:—

Articles of gold not otherwise provided for in this resolution adapted for household or office use.

2. That the excise taxes as imposed by the preceding resolution shall be paid by the purchaser to the vendor at the time of sale for consumption or use, or on importation for consumption or use other than for re-sale, in addition to the duties of customs already imposed, and by the vendor to His Majesty in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed.

3. That the following excise taxes be imposed, levied and collected on the articles hereinafter specified, namely:—

(a) A tax of ten per cent on:—

Boats, yachts, canoes and motor boats. Provided that on satisfactory proof being furnished that these articles will be used only for trading or commercial purposes a refund of the amount paid under this resolution shall be granted;

Cameras weighing not more than 100 pounds;

Candy and confectionery;

Chewing gum or substitutes therefor;

Fire-arms, shells or cartridges for use other than for militia purposes;

Pianos and organs (other than pipe organs); musical instruments not otherwise provided for in this resolution;

(b) A tax of fifteen per cent on:—

Automobiles adapted or adaptable for passenger use.

(c) A tax of twenty per cent on:—

Mechanical piano players, graphophones, phonographs, talking machines, music boxes and records used in connection therewith or with any musical instrument.

(d) A tax on playing cards for every fifty-four cards or fraction of fifty-four in each package; when selling at $25 or less per gross packages, twenty-five cents per pack; when selling in excess of $25 per gross package, fifty cents per pack.

(e) A tax of thirty per cent on:—

Patent and proprietary medicines including medicinal or medicated wines, vermouth and ginger wine containing not more than forty per cent of proof spirit.

(f) A tax of two dollars per gallon:—

On rum, whiskey, brandy, gin, wines containing more than forty per cent proof spirits, cordials, liqueurs and spirituous and alcoholic liquors not otherwise provided for in this resolution suitable for beverage purposes;

On lime juice or fruit juices, fortified with or containing more than twenty-five per cent of proof spirits;

On spirits and strong waters of any kind, mixed with any ingredient or ingredients, as being or known or designated as anodynes, elixirs, essences, extracts, lotions, tinctures or medicines, or ethereal and spirituous fruit essences, not otherwise provided for in this resolution;

On alcoholic perfumes and perfumed spirits, bay rum, cologne and lavender waters, hair, tooth and skin washes, and other toilet preparations containing spirits of any kind.

(g) A tax of thirty cents per gallon:—

On ale, beer, porter and stout;

On wines of all kinds, except sparkling wines, containing not more than forty per cent of proof spirits.

(h) A tax of three dollars per gallon:—

On champagne and all other sparkling wines.

(i) A tax of fifty cents per gallon:—

On lime juice and fruit juices, fortified with or containing not more than twenty-five per cent of proof spirits not otherwise provided for in this resolution.

4. That the excise taxes as imposed by the preceding resolution shall be payable in addition to the present duties of excise and customs at the time of sale by the Canadian manufacturer or when imported, but shall not apply to such articles when exported, and shall be accounted for to His Majesty in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed.

5. That every person selling or dealing in the articles upon which taxes are imposed as prescribed by the foregoing resolutions, may be required by the minister to take out an annual license therefor, for which license a fee not exceeding $2 shall be paid.

6. That the provisions of the said foregoing Resolutions shall be deemed to have come into force on the 19th day of May, 1920, and to have applied to all goods mentioned therein imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption on and after that day, and to have also applied to goods previously imported for which no entry for consumption was made before that day.

7. (a) That a tax of one per cent in addition to the present duties of excise and customs be imposed, levied and collected on sales by manufacturers, wholesalers, or on importations;

that the purchaser shall be furnished with a written invoice of any sale, which invoice shall state separately the amount of such tax, when not included in the purchase price; that such tax must not be included in the manufacturer's or wholesaler's costs on which profit is calculated; and the tax shall be paid by the purchaser to the wholesaler or manufacturer at the time of such sale, and by the wholesaler or manufacturer to His Majesty in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed, and such wholesaler or manufacturer shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding $500, if such payments are not made, and in addition shall be liable to a penalty equal to double the amount of the excise duties unpaid.

(b) That the minister may require every manufacturer and wholesaler to take out an annual license for the purposes aforesaid, and may prescribe a fee therefor, not exceeding $5, and the penalty for neglect or refusal shall be a sum not exceeding $1,000.

(c) That any such tax, costs or penalties may, at the option of the minister, be recovered and imposed in the Exchequer Court of Canada or in any other court of competent jurisdiction, in the name of His Majesty.

(d) That this tax on sales shall not apply to sales or importations of meats, fresh, salted or pickled; butter; cheese; oleomargarine, margarine, butterine or any other substitute for butter; lard; eggs; vegetables; fruits; grains and seeds in their natural state; buckwheat meal or flour; pot, pearl, rolled, roasted or ground barley; corn meal; oatmeal or rolled oats; rye flour; wheat flour; coffee, green, roasted or ground; tea; salt; cattle foods; hay and straw; nursery stock; fish, fresh, pickled, salted, smoked, dried or boneless; sugar, syrups and molasses; anthracite or bituminous coal; artificial limbs and parts thereof or to goods exported.

(e) That the provisions of this Resolution respecting a tax on sales shall be deemed to have come into force on the 19th day of May, 1920, and to have applied to all goods imported or taken out of warehouses for consumption on and after that day, and to have also applied to goods previously imported for which no entry for consumption was made before that day.

8. That a stamp tax of two cents be imposed, levied and collected on promissory notes and bills of exchange of the value of one hundred dollars or less, and that a tax of two cents additional be imposed on every one hundred dollars or fractional part thereof in eexcss of one hundred dollars.

9. That a stamp tax of two cents be imposed, levied and collected on each share of stock transferred.

10. That the provisions of the said Act relating to stamp duties on bottles and packages containing a proprietary or patent medicine or perfumery requiring that an adhesive stamp be affixed to such articles by the person selling the same, or by the importer, the manufacturer or producer, be amended to provide that the said provision shall remain in force as regards the stock of such articles in retail stores remaining unstamped on the 31st July, 1920, and such stock may be sold in accordance with such provisions until the 31st day of December, 1920, but on and after such last mentioned date every such article must be stamped before being exhibited or offered for sale. The stamps shall be affixed to all such articles on or after 1st August, 1920, by the manufacturer or importer thereof, or by such person as the minister may prescribe.

11. That respecting bottles or packages containing wines, sparkling and non-sparkling, manufactured or imported previous to the nineteenth day of May, 1920, stamps as set forth in the said Act shall be affixed thereto under regulations made by the minister.

12. That the provisions of the said Act relating to moving picture films, and all the other provisions of the said Act inconsistent with these Resolutions, be repealed.

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Income War Tax Act, 1917, and the amendments thereto, and to provide:

1. That the taxes and surtaxes, including the tax upon corporations and joint stock companies, leviable and payable under the provisions of section four of the said Act as enacted by chapter fifty-five of the statutes of 1919 shall each be increased by five per centum on incomes of five thousand dollars and upwards, such increases to apply to all taxes and surtax leviable for any income received during the calendar year nineteen hundred and nineteen or the income of any accounting period ending in nineteen hundred and nineteen, as the case may be, and for each calendar year or accounting period thereafter;

2. That each person liable to taxation under the said Act and the amendments thereto for the calendar year nineteen hundred and twenty or any accounting period ending in the year nineteen hundred and tweny and for each calendar year or accounting period thereafter shall deliver to the Minister of Finance, with each annual return of his income prescribed by section seven of the said Act as amended, an amount equal to at least one-fourth of the amount of the tax and surtax, if any, payable by such person according to such return, and shall pay the balance, if any, of such tax and surtax in not more than three bimonthly instalments theretafter, together with interest at the rate of six per centum per annum from the date prescribed for making such return up to the time of the payment of such instalment;

3. That any person making a return of income less than the correct amount shall pay the additional amount of tax and surtax due and in addition interest at the rate of ten per centum upon such amount until the same is paid.

If such deficiency exceeds ten per centum but is under twenty per centum, such person shall also pay an amount equal to one-half of the amount of such deficiency in addition, and if such deficiency amounts to twenty per centum or more such person shall pay an amount equal to the amount of such deficiency in addition.

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, and the amendments thereto, and to provide:

1. That the profits earned in any business during any accounting period ending in the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty which do not exceed ten per cent per annum upon the capital employed in such business shall be exempt from the tax prescribed by the Act;

That upon any such profits exceeding ten per cent per annum and not exceeding fifteen per cent per annum there shall be paid a tax equal to twenty per cent of such profits;

That upon any such profits exceeding fifteen per cent per annum and not exceeding twenty per cent per annum there shall be paid a tax equal to thirty per cent of such profits;

That upon any such profits exceeding twenty per cent per annum and not exceeding thirty per cent per annum there shall be paid a tax equal to fifty per cent of such profits;

That upon any such profits exceeding thirty per cent per annum there shall be paid a tax equal to sixty per cent of such profits;

That in the case of a business owned by an incorporated company with a capital of not less than twenty-five thousand dollars and under fifty thousand dollars employed in such business, there shall be paid a tax of twenty per cent of the amount by which the profits earned in such business during any accounting period ending in the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty exceeded ten per cent per annum;

2. That in respect to any business liable to taxation under the said Act having a capital of less than fifty thousand dollars the rates of taxation set forth in section three of the said Act as amended by chapter six of the statutes of 1917 shall apply in respect of the 1917 and 1918 accounting periods, if twenty per cent or more of such profits have been derived from the manufacture or dealing in munitions of war or materials or supplies of any kind for war purposes;

3. That the period during which the said Act is to be in operation be extended for one year, and that section twenty-six of the said Act be amended by substituting the word "twenty" for the word "nineteen" in the third line thereof, and by substituting the word "seventy-two" for the word "sixty" in the fourth line of the proviso in the said section.

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to amend Schedule A to the Customs Tariff, 1907, and to strike thereout tariff items 172 and 483, the several enumerations of goods respectively, and the several rates of duties of customs, if any, set opposite each of the said items, and to provide that the following items, enumerations and rates of duties be inserted in said Schedule A:

Tariff Items	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
172	Books, viz.:—Books on the application of science to industries of all kinds, including books on agriculture, horticulture, forestry, fish and fishing, mining, metallurgy, architecture, electric and other engineering, carpentry, shipbuilding, mechanism, dyeing, bleaching, tanning, weaving and other mechanic arts, and similar industrial books; bibles, prayer-books, psalm and hymn-books, religious tracts, and Sunday school lesson pictures.	Free.	Free.	Free.
483	Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids of books, and bases and matrices and copper shells for the same, whether composed wholly or in part of metal or celluloid.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
698a	Typewriters and writing appliances specially adapted for use only by the blind, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue.....	Free.	Free.	Free.

2. Resolved, that it is expedient to amend Chapter 3 of the Acts of 1915 and Chapter 47 of the Acts of 1919, and to strike thereout Section 3 of Chapter 3 of the Acts of 1915 and Sections 3 and 4 of Chapter 47 of the Acts of 1919.

3. Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the provision of the foregoing resolutions shall be deemed to have come into operation on the nineteenth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and twenty, and to apply and to have applied to all goods mentioned in the foregoing resolutions imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption on and after that day, and to have also applied to such goods previously imported for which no entry for consumption was made before that day.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, while we can hardly be expected to agree with all that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) has said, I am sure that I can speak for my friends on this side of the House as well as for myself when I offer him my very sincere congratulations upon the manner in which he has performed, coming to him as it does for the first time, the duty of presenting that annual statement of our financial affairs which we call the Budget Speech.

At all times the preparation of the Budget is a matter calling for painstaking labour. It is a matter of large responsibility which any Minister of Finance must necessarily take very seriously, and that responsibility has fallen on my hon. friend at this time under circumstances of more than usual difficulty. There is a notion in some minds that the Government during the war had a hard time, and I am not sure but that my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), may have had the idea that he particularly had a hard time. That is

all a mistake. The Government did not have a hard time during the war. The burden of carrying a load is not to be measured merely by the weight of the load; one has to have regard to the condition of the highway over which it has to be carried. A light load may be heavy where the road is rough and the grade hard. In the case of a heavy load, if the road is smooth and the grade not steep, the yoke is easy and the burden light. So it was with the Government during war time. There was a condition of the country unusual, it is true. My hon. friends opposite had to deal with some new and unusual problems, but if they had to deal with new problems they found a new spirit abroad in the land to meet those problems. The patriotic spirit of the country, stirred as it should have been, and was, by the war, stood behind the Government during the whole period of the war. The Government had the support of Parliament to an extraordinary degree. Did they want appropriations? Tens and hundreds of millions of dollars were voted to them promptly, unanimously, and with less inquiry than will be made to-day on a $1,000 appropriation. Did they want men? Until a little unpleasantness occurred towards the end of the war, they had the men almost tumbling over each other in their desire to volunteer and participate in the war. Did they want loans?—The hon. Minister of Finance had only to issue his proclamation, and the people responded with an enormous sum of the public money. In all these things the way was easy. The Prime Minister and his colleagues had only to ride on the crest of the wave. But now is the time of trouble. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance of to-day has the heavy end of the load. The difficulties are coming to-day and there have been no such difficulties in the past, as some persons have too hurriedly imagined.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has taken hold of the Government's enterprise at the present time under certain circumstances of difficulty, but in one respect he has been highly favoured, and he is to be congratulated. The hon. gentleman came into office just about the time it became necessary to float another loan, and the response that was made to his demand in that respect, I am sure, must have been gratifying to him, as it was to the country generally. It is very gratifying to know that the Canadian people responded so liberally to that demand, and I think that perhaps my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) may look on the situation with a little of envy, because the present Minister of Finance received his $670,000,000 without offering the bait of tax exemption. So I am inclined to think my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance may look on the Finance Minister of to-day with a little of envy, and perhaps feel that if he had had more courage he might have had a similar experience. It is, of course, gratifying to know that this money has been obtained, and yet there is a thought which we cannot put aside when we are reminded that of about two billions of dollars of these loans floated, $1,380,000,000 are exempt from taxation. A bargain is a bargain. The Government of the day agreed that these should be exempt, but I have never concealed from myself the fact that that exemption is going to be a continuous source of trouble. I am afraid it will be one of the things which will tend to increase the discontent which unhappily prevails. But the contract was made, and there is no use complaining of it. I know there were some reasons which tempted my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) of that day to offer the loan in that way, and I am not saying that he was wrong. But looking back over it, I think he will agree that it is a pity he did not have more courage and ask the people of Canada to present this money to the Treasury without offering the bait of tax exemption.

I remember meeting a distinguished visitor to Canada several years ago who had been here in former years, had gone away and returned. He was noting the many things in which Canada had made progress and when somebody said, "Yes, Canada has become known to the world," "Ah, yes," he replied, "not only has the world discovered Canada, but Canada has discovered herself," and that he thought was a good thing. Well, in the matter of finance, surely we will all say that Canada has discovered herself to a surprising and a gratifying degree.

I think I am right in saying that the largest loan ever offered by the Dominion of Canada before the war was a loan of $30,000,000, or six million pounds sterling. It was offered in England, and I remember it was with fear and trembling that we asked so large a sum; and when it was suggested to the financiers of London that perhaps it might be expedient to increase the amount to $50,000,000 instead of $30,000,000 they gravely shook their heads and said, "Oh dear, no; that is too much." So that

$30,000,000 was all we dared then ask from the financiers of London. Yet, here in this country, our own Canadian people were prepared to put their hands into their own pockets and in so brief a time to bring out $2,000,000,000 to meet the demands made upon them. And at one fell swoop the Minister of Finance found them offering him $670,000,000, the amount of the last loan. All that is very gratifying in some respects; but there is no rose without its thorn, and there are some things in connection with that loan which we may as well frankly recognize.

There is one feature which, while well known to the inside circle of finance, has not been made known in any marked way to the Canadian public at large, and I think it is time that the Canadian people knew something about it. If you take up the last volume of the public accounts, for the year ending March 31, 1919, you will find a couple of interesting items. There is a later volume than that but we have not got it. For that period, however, any hon. member will discover in the statement of receipts and expenditures an item called "Bank of Montreal Loan Trading Account,"—a very interesting account. Hon. members will read the item therein contained and will discover that the Government paid out on that account the sum of $7,450,000 and got back $5,177,904, so that on that account, whatever it means, the Government of Canada—in other words, the people of Canada—lost $2,272,000. Now, what does that mean? It means, to put the matter plainly, that the Government have been trading on the stock exchange with the money of the people of Canada. That is the plain way to put it. I know what will be said by hon. gentlemen opposite; I anticipate the explanation and will give it voluntarily myself. We have no returns for the year just closed. But I venture to say that in all human probability the loss on that trading account during the last twelve months was even much greater than it was in the previous year. Now, it will be said on behalf of the Government that this has been done to stabilize the loan. The Government will say—reasonably and with some force—that they were looking forward to putting other loans on the market, and were concerned with keeping up the price, and therefore made this arrangement with the banks for them to buy bonds in order to prevent depreciation. That, I think, was the object in view.

Mr. CURRIE: You are all wrong.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend will pardon an interruption, I should like to point out that he is entirely wrong on the so-called trading account. In the year 1918 the Government not only did not lose money but made money. The stabilization did not cost the Dominion Government one cent.

Mr. FIELDING: I am exceedingly glad to hear that statement from my hon. friend, but the public accounts show——

Mr. CURRIE: You are wrong.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. FIELDING: I give the items as they appear in the public accounts: "Bank of Montreal Loan Trading account." This item shows that the bank received $7,450,000 and that there was paid back into the Treasury, credited on the other side, $5,177,-904, so that there is apparently, between the receipts and the expenditures, a difference, roughly, of $2,272,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Represented in bonds which were taken in—cancelled.

Mr. FIELDING: The item is charged up on one side as expenditure and on the other side as receipt, and I cannot see any other explanation than that I have given. I recognize, of course, that the object of the Government was to stabilize the loan in order to prevent depreciation, and there is this to be said, that war time conditions must necessitate war time methods, during and even after war. I am not saying that there was absolutely no justification for the ground which the Government took; on the contrary, I admit the force of the argument that may be advanced. I can understand that the minister, anxious to have the support of the financial houses, would offer them a guarantee and assurance that if they would invest their money in the bonds they would be protected against loss. I can understand that there would be a temptation to do that, and I think I am stating fairly the reason which the Government had in view. All I desire to say, however, is that if you want to understand that transaction completely you must apply to a private corporation the principle which it involves. An individual owner of shares, —a director owning shares,—would be justified in spending his own money to support stock in the market; but if a corporation had issued a block of securities at a certain price and sold them to the public, and if, with a view to keeping up the price, they then took the money of the company and went out to buy the shares in order to keep up the market, that would not be considered a very sound financial trans-

action. Indeed, I think that would be a transaction which, if it occurred in connection with a private corporation, would be very severely criticised. Well, what is sound business in the case of a private corporation may, to say the very least, be usefully applied to the operations of a government. I quite appreciate the object which the Government have had in view, and I am not sure that any other Minister of Finance would not have been tempted to do the same thing. At the same time, however, I regard this as a financial measure which is open to grave question, and at all events it would be wise on our part to advise the Minister of Finance not to do the same thing again if he can help it. If he has given assurances to the financial houses he must keep faith with them, but it would be well that he should avoid in the future a method such as this. I find that the same question has arisen in the United States. Various efforts are being made there to give an artificial and fictitious value to United States bonds, and a measure was introduced in the United States Congress for the purpose of attaining this end by exchanging one form of bond into another, issuing a new bond which was of a more attractive character, the probable result being that prices would be kept up. The matter came before the Secretary of the United States Treasury who was asked to give his opinion thereon, and Secretary Houston wrote a letter, of which I shall read only a part:

> As the Treasury views it, the present depreciation is due chiefly to the fact that of the 20,000,000 Americans who patriotically subscribed during the war large numbers have not been willing or able to exercise such control over their personal expenditures as would enable them to retain their bonds after the cessation of hostilities.
>
> Many patriotic people who bought Liberty bonds under the impulse of patriotism have been unwilling since the war was over to continue to lend their money to the Government and have forced their holdings on the market more rapidly than others could save funds to invest, with consequent depreciation in market prices. The remedy is for the people to work and save, to keep their holdings of Liberty bonds as investments and to purchase additional Government securities with their savings.
>
> The present prices of Liberty bonds are causing no loss to real investors, who are holding their bonds as permanent investment; they are not suffering because others see fit to sell their bonds now for less than they are worth, and neither these investors nor those who wish to sell their bonds have any ground for expecting a donation from the United States in the form of additional tax exemptions or other privileges.

I think that opinion of the United States Secretary of the Treasury might usefully be applied in Canada. If it has been necessary to do these things in order to stabilize bonds and to give them an artificial value it is a policy that we should get rid of at the earliest possible moment consistent with the obligations that have already been assumed.

There is another feature in relation to the loans which we must present, not by way of complaining, but merely that the public may see all sides of the question. It is, as I have said, a very gratifying thing to find that the people of Canada are able to subscribe so handsomely to these loans It is a grand thing to know that we have this immense sum of money in Canada, and I warmly congratulate the Minister of Finance on his success in obtaining it; but at the same time there is an old, homely proverb that you cannot eat your cake and have it. This vast sum of money which has been absorbed for the purposes of the Government has been withdrawn from the ordinary fields of industrial and other activities in Canada. It is money which, if the Government had not taken it, would have remained in the pockets of the people until they could find a convenient investment for it in some of the forms of industrial or commercial activitiy. If you take that vast sum away from the people you diminish to that extent their ability to carry on the ordinary business of the country—that is clear enough.

There was no immediate effect and for the reason that at the first stage of these operations no actual money passed. The man who subscribed for bonds gave a cheque on his account in the bank and handed it over to the credit of the Minister of Finance. It went to the credit of the Minister of Finance and there was really no actual passing of money. It was only as time passed and when the Government began to absorb this money that we began to feel the effect of it. What is the effect of it? We are beginning to see to-day that in consequence of the withdrawal of these large sums of money the banks are finding themselves a little harder up. The usual story put forward in the public and financial press is that the banks are contracting their credits. They will have to contract their credits because as fast as money is paid or used for the purposes of these loans it passes away and the banks do not have it any longer. It will be seen that we are beginning to feel now some of the effects of the withdrawal of this vast sum of money from the ordinary fields of activity.

We feel it too in another way. There is the housing problem all over Canada to-day. Certainly, housing is one of the chief needs in all big cities and towns. It is partly because during the war there was less activity than usual in mortgage and building operations, partly because building materials are high in price, but it is largely because there is no longer money available to lend to people who want to buy property and build houses. When the Government are offering 5½ per cent on a gilt edged security, the finest security that exists in the world perhaps except British consols—when the Government are offering 7 per cent for money in New York, when they are borrowing money to-day under the guise of the National railway in New York at 7 per cent; when the Government are offering these large rates of interest to the public, what is more natural than that the funds of the people shall flow into the treasury of the Government and that they shall not be available for various other purposes? I believe that the housing difficulty to-day is to some extent—to a considerable extent—the result of that policy. Mind, I am not complaining; the Government had to have money and they got the money which it was absolutely necessary they should get, but we should remember that in getting it for the purposes of the Government it is not available for other purposes.

The lesson that I would draw is this: It is a great thing to be able to get our capital in Canada when you have to get it. It was a great thing to be able to get money in Canada when the money markets of London and New York were closed against us. It was a great thing that in a condition of emergency we could get the money. But it is just as well to remember that Canada is a comparatively young and a compartively undeveloped country. Canada is a country which will need capital and therefore it is exceedingly desirable that the Government should gradually get its finances into a condition which will enable it to go when new loans are needed—let us hope they will not be needed right away—to the money markets of the world. If they need new loans it is most desirable that the Government, if possible in the financing of Canada, should appeal for those loans to the ordinary money markets of the world. In order that local capital may be made available for the development of local interests, housing enterprises and other activities I trust that when the moment comes for another loan the conditions will be such that the Minister of Finance will not have to raise it at home but will get it somewhere abroad.

The Minister of Finance certainly has, as I have said, an exceedingly difficult task. I wonder if the public really understand it. I do not think they do. If you strike a man a little blow he knows what hit him and he perhaps measures the pain. Hit him a little harder blow and you simply knock him speechless and he does not know what happened. I think that the man in the street has had such a hard blow in regard to these big questions of debt that we talk so much about, that he is knocked out. The figures are so large that they are rather beyond his comprehension.

I wonder if the public really understand the financial position of Canada to-day. The Minister of Finance has very fairly put it before the public and I am anxious only to help him in the matter. I am anxious that the people should appreciate the situation to-day, I do not speak of this matter in any complaining spirit, or in any party spirit, but I am anxious that they should actually understand the tremendous burden that they are taking upon themselves and the share of the burden that they must carry in order that the finances of Canada may be made sound and that the credit of Canada may be upheld. I want to offer a few comparisons, not as between the administration of on Government and another, not as between the period of one party and another, but as between a year before the war and a year after the war. I cannot expect to offer anything that is new but I will merely to put one or two things in striking contrast—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend does not wish to commence a new subject at this time we might call it six o'clock.

Mr. FIELDING: Very good; thank you.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING (resuming): The Minister of Finance, in his speech which we had the pleasure of listening to this afternoon, very properly gave us a mass of statistics on the business of the country which we shall have the pleasure of seeing in Hansard. The figures can be better

examined then, and I presume they will be found useful for the purposes of reference.

My hon. friend in very general terms expressed a note of hope and wholesome optimism, and desired it to be understood that he had great faith, great hope and great confidence in Canada. I sympathize with all those sentiments and I am glad to be able to say that I also have not less confidence than has my hon. friend in the ultimate judgment, success and prosperity of the Canadian people. I think they are about the sanest people on earth; I know of the people of no other nation who are more sane and very few that I would say to-day are as sane as the Canadian people. I feel confident that when they fully understand things they will appreciate the difficulties which the Government, and every man in public life, has to face; that they will make all due allowances for those difficulties and that they will be actuated by the desire to assist the minister and the Government to bring about satisfactory results. That will be accomplished all the quicker, and all the more certainly, if we endeavour to give them a clear appreciation of what the situation is.

I mentioned before you left the Chair at six o'clock, Sir, that I was afraid the ordinary individual—as we say, the man in the street: the man who makes no special study of public affairs and yet is an interested and patriotic citizen—I expressed the fear that he has failed to appreciate the seriousness of the position. I do not say that in any party sense. No matter what Government might be in power it would be a very serious position, and I am anxious that the people generally shall come to understand it fairly and well.

When a Minister of Railways, a few years ago, came into this House with a deficit on the operation of the Government railways of perhaps six, or seven, or eight hundred thousand dollars, there was a keen appreciation of what that meant. There was keen questioning, there was sharp criticism, there was wide inquiry; the people understood, and could appreciate a deficit of such an amount in the Government railway operations. But this year the Minister of Railways comes in and frankly acknowledges that the deficit on the operation of the Government railways during the last year was $47,000,0000. Well, that is an illustration of what I described before as the "knock-out" argument; the thing is really so big as to be beyond the comprehension of the ordinary man.

I was about to make a few comparisons, not as between party and party, or as between government and government, but merely between a year before the war and a year afterwards, in order that by some simple and sharp contrasts I might help the Minister of Finance to have the public clearly understand the great change that has taken place. Now, let us take the year 1914. The year ended 31st of March, 1914, was a year before the war, and the year 1920, ended a few days ago, was a year after the war. With respect to the first period the public accounts, of course, are available. With respect to the second period the volume of public accounts is not out—the year only closed a few days ago. But the minister has, both in his speech and elsewhere, furnished us with information which gives us a general idea of the operations of the year 1920. Now the revenue for the year 1914 was $163,174,394.56. I come now, for the purposes of comparison, to the estimate for the year 1920, and here I find a little difficulty. The minister to-day, I think, stated that his estimate of the revenue for the year 1920 was $388,000,000. Well, there have no doubt been reasons for a very recent revision of my hon. friend's figures, because only a few days ago, before the end of the year, in answer to a motion for returns, my hon. friend's department issued a statement showing that in their judgment the revenue for 1920 would be $325,000,000. If, in the few days that have elapsed, my hon. friend has had reason to enlarge his estimate of the revenue I am very glad of it; but I shall have to make the comparison which I am about to make on the basis of the figures which he supplied a short time ago. According to those figures, in 1914 we received a revenue of $163,174,394.56 and for the year 1920, $325,000,000—which the Minister of Finance has now enlarged to $388,000,000. Well, if there were nothing but the revenue statement to look at, that would be a very gratifying situation. According to my hon. friend's latest figures the revenue has more than doubled. Let us convert it into revenue per head of population for convenience of comprehension. In 1914 the revenue per head was $21.12; in 1920, according to the first figures given to me by my hon. friend—which would have to be enlarged a little now—the revenue per head was $36.11.

As I said, if we had only the revenue side to look at, that would indicate great progress and flourishing finance; but when we turn to the expenditure side we find a

pretty serious state of affairs. The total expenditure in 1914 was $186,241,047.63. When I speak of total expenditure, I am disregarding the question of the consolidated fund or capital expenditure or anything of that sort. It is what Mr. Mantalini calls the "demnition" total, and that is what we have to provide for. So I am merely presenting the total. As I say, the total expenditure in 1914 was $186,241,047.63. When I come to the total expenditure for 1920 I have another difficulty. My hon. friend to-day said, I think, that his estimate of the total expenditure for 1920 was $556,000,000. Could my hon. friend tell me from memory whether that is correct?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid I cannot.

Mr. FIELDING: I took the figures down at the time. But I am now confronted with this difficulty, that the previous statement which my hon. friend was kind enough to furnish me, in connection with a return I asked for, placed the total expenditure for 1920 at $675,125,000. That is the amount contained in a return presented by the hon. minister, and which he gave as the estimated total expenditure for 1920. My hon. friend's statement to-day shows a large reduction in this amount. While I was glad to find from his figures that there has been a great increase of revenue, I should be equally glad to find that he has a diminished expenditure, but again I have had to make a few calculations based on the figures he gave before. So $675,125,000 I take as the total expenditure for 1920. Converting that into expenditure per head for simplicity of understanding, we have this result, that in 1914 the total expenditure per head was $24.11; in 1920 the total expenditure per head, according to the figures previously given to me, would be $75.01.

Now, that is a contrast which should make our people think for a moment. If we had in 1914 before the war what we thought a large expenditure of $24.11 per head, and to-day we are expending $75 per head, that is a very striking comparison which should suggest to every Canadian the gravity of the situation.

Let us turn now to the extent of the debt. I take the gross debt of 1914 as stated, at $554,391,368.86. The population, as estimated at that time, was 7,725,000. So that works out the gross debt of 1914 at $71.75 per head. We have no absolute close estimate of the population to-day, but I understand for all practical purposes the officials of the Government are treating it as around 9,000,000; and we shall all be delighted to find that is correct. Taking that as correct, the gross debt of 1920, the year just closed, according to the figures supplied to me in the return I have referred to, was $3,014,483,774.12, which works out per head at $334.90. Again I ask the House, but still more I ask the country, to note those figures,—that in the year before the war our gross debt per head was $71.75, while it is now $334.90. That is an immense debt, and surely reflection on these figures will make us all realize the gravity of the situation.

I come now to the net debt. In 1914, with a population of 7,725,000, our net debt stood at $335,996,850.14, or $43.49 per head; turning now to 1920, and taking our population at 9,000,000, we find that the net debt is placed at a little less than two billion dollars—$1,935,946,312.85, or $215 per head.

Let us reflect a moment on those figures. In the year 1914 we had a net debt of $43.49 per head. What did that represent? How did it come about? We had the accumulations of debt from the older provinces before Confederation; we had all of the various public works that were carried on through the fifty odd years of Confederation; we had built three transcontinental railways; we had immense outlays in connection with our canals and other public works; we had built extensive terminal facilities, for we had been carrying on down to 1914 what was regarded as a big progressive policy; and as the total of it all we found that we had rolled up what was considered the large net debt of $43.49 per head. But if we make a comparison of it with the net debt now, we find it has advanced to $215 per head.

Again, I say my only purpose in making these comparisons is merely to awaken, if I can, in the public mind a keen sense of the real seriousness of the situation. I do not use these comparisons for any party purpose or for any alarmist purpose; I use them simply to help my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to bring the country to realize the seriousness of our financial position.

When we talked of our debt in days gone by and up to a recent period we usually spoke of our net debt as the real measure of the obligations of Canada. We ascertained that net debt by taking the gross debt—all obligations of every sort, deducting what we called our "assets," and striking a balance, which balance

was called our net debt, and that term has been generally used by all our public men to represent the real debt of Canada. I was glad to hear my hon. friend the Minister of Finance frankly point out to-day that we cannot rely on that statement of net debt as telling the whole story. Our assets have at all times contained some items to which, on careful examination, exception may be taken; but while our assets did not bulk very largely that perhaps was not of so much importance. However, our assets, according to the latest returns, have gone from about $77,000,000 in 1899, or about twenty years ago, to the immense total of over a billion dollars to-day, and when they run into such big figures it becomes necessary to give them a more critical examination.

I am glad the Minister of Finance looked at the matter frankly to-day. I had a statement made as to the earning power of those assets for a series of years, and the interesting fact was disclosed that the earning power last year was higher than before. That struck me as rather remarkable, and naturally I made some further inquiries. The explanation is that at present there is a large item in the shape of the debt due from the British Government, which is actually a sound asset, and on which the interest is computed. But that is an entirely temporary affair and will be closed out in a short time, when we shall have before us what may be called our statement of assets. But that ordinary statement of assets is becoming weaker now by certain factors to which attention was called to-day by the Minister of Finance. These assets, so called, include the obligations of railway companies which have paid no interest, and from which we can expect no interest. Indeed, here is a specimen. When my hon. friend dealt with the same point to-day I think he quoted from different data. I find among interesting specimens of our valuable assets what are described as Grand Trunk Pacific loan account, $51,000,000; and my hon. friend gave as of a later date a larger sum; then there is another item, the Canadian Northern railway, $108,000,000, and I think again my hon. friend gave the figures as of a later date and a larger sum. These are not assets that we can count upon getting much from. I have heard of a man who gave a note of hand and when he had signed it, he said: "Thank God, that debt is paid." We are doing a little better than that in this statement. We are giving our note of hand, for that is what the Canadian Northern Railway Company is doing and we are the Canadian Northern Railway, and we are not only saying "Thank God, that debt is paid," but we are putting this amount in a statement of assets and saying that it goes to reduce our obligations. I am glad to know there is no difference between the Minister of Finance and us in that regard. One of these days there will have to be a revision of that balance sheet and we shall probably not differ as to what will have to be done. I mention these things merely to show by sharp contrast the tremendous change that has taken place in the short period between 1914 and 1920.

With all the economy that the minister can manifest, with all that he has manifested in his present estimate, and with all that he is likely to manifest in the future, a very serious financial situation will still confront us, and it is well that we should understand it, face it, grapple with it courageously, with a conviction that the mass of the people in some shape or form have to provide the vast sums of money necessary for the carrying on of this increased burden.

My hon. friend has presented estimates for the coming year, which estimates are certainly very large. As he has pointed out to-day, they show a considerable reduction from the estimates of the previous year, and I am sure that if he makes a comparison between the sum which he is asking for and the sum which he was asked for by the various departments, he would be able to show a very much larger diminution, but, he has made an effort in the right direction. I think there is one thing we could do to help the minister in this matter. We ought to stand between the minister and our constituencies in these demands that are made upon him. Economy is a fine word to apply to your neighbour's constituency; it is not a very pleasant word to apply to your province or district. I read in a newspaper the other day a long article which was piously calling on the Minister of Finance to exercise the widest, the most careful economy, and in another part of that paper I found an article which demanded the immediate construction in that community of public works which would cost many millions of dollars. We are all prone to do that sort of thing; we are all apt to be advocates of expenditure with respect to the district from which we come, and I want to say frankly that every member of the House, in face of this situation should help the minister by telling his constituents plainly that many of the things they ask for, good,

useful though they may be, are not of the most urgent character and ought not to be pressed upon the attention of the Government at this time. We all owe that to the minister and we should give him that help. But we must ask him to be fair; if modest applications in one region are refused and those who are interested in them and who are refused, discover that very lavish expenditures are going on in some other direction, there will naturally be discontent. The minister, his colleagues, supporters and friends should be willing to adopt what I may call a self-denying ordnance in these matters and see that we practice a real policy of economy, so far as such is possible.

Canada cannot stand still, we are living in a progressive age; there are urgent things which will come before the Government; there are public services which must be rendered; but I want to ask the minister to see that in the various demands that are made upon him only those that are necessary and that are not only meritorious in themselves, but of the most urgent character, shall receive the benefit of his approval. There is no other way by which we can better the unhappy condition which exists; there is no royal road out of this present trouble. The solution is national economy and individual economy and only by those means can we hope to meet the difficulty, and I trust my hon. friend will be supported in every legitimate effort he makes to that end.

The minister stated to-day—and I was glad to hear him state it—that his hope and expectation is that during the coming year he will be able from his revenue not only to provide for the ordinary expenditures, but to take a substantial step towards paying off the public debt. We should make such an effort even though that involves heavy taxation; we should endeavour to grapple with the question as it was grappled with the other day by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England who said that they were preparing immediately to make a long step towards paying off the public debt.

The tariff question is always with us; it figured in the discussion to-day, being mentioned by the minister towards the close of his address. While it is true that at all times for many years all our tariff discussions have been more or less tinged with the question of free trade, there has of late been a revival of what I may call the free trade movement, and the free trade question is now thrust to the front of our tariff discussions in a larger way than it has been in recent years. That, I take it for granted, is because our farmer friends attach so much importance to the matter and have pushed it into their platform. With all due respect to them, I take the view that free trade is not a practical question in our tariff discussions of to-day. There are some things that we should do well to remember. In the first place, it may be well simply to remember that there never has been in the Dominion of Canada such a thing as free trade. There is not anything of the kind now, and with all due respect to those who may be described as extreme free traders, I think it is no wild guess to assert that there will be no absolute free trade in Canada within the lifetime of any man who sits in this House to-day. It is not practicable, and that is not to say that free trade principles are not sound.

If I had to engage in an academic discussion on the question of free trade versus protection, I would hold up my hands for free trade. I think free trade—I say this reverently—is part of the divine order of things; at all events, it is part of the law of nature. I say this reverently. In all parts of the universe, an all-wise Creator has given the capacity to produce something which, properly understood and developed and handled, will minister to the comfort of the rest of the world. The ice-bound region of the North has its mission no less than the warmer lands of the sunny south. In every section of this world, there is some wealth; it may be hidden, but it is there. No land was ever created by an all-wise Providence without having some purpose. I believe it is part of nature's intention that man shall discover, develop and utilize this wealth in every section of the country for the carrying out of the great work of civilizing the world. That is free trade. But it is quite possible that the best of principles may be carried too far; it is quite possible that men who believe in the general principle of free trade must recognize that there are conditions under which it cannot be applied. There is great merit in that statement, hackneyed, you may call it if you will, which is often credited to Grover Cleveland: "It is a condition and not a theory which confronts us." If we were the men of the Mayflower just landing at Plymouth, or the men of the grand army of Champlain pitching their tents at Annapolis Royal and Quebec, we might be able to have free trade. But three cen-

turies have passed since then and many things have occurred which restrict the freedom of those days, which make it difficult if not impossible for us to-day to carry out to the full extent the principles which we may cherish.

I am going to ask my farmer friends and my free trade friends—because I know I have been criticised sometimes during my tenure of office as a minister for not following out as rigidly as they would desire the principles of free trade—to let me take a couple of cases by way of illustration of what I may call exceptions to the free trade rule. I am going to take a couple of cases within the experience of the Government of which I was a member, cases for which I am largely individually responsible, cases for which I know I have from time to time been criticised by many friends who pressed the doctrine of free trade further than I would. Let me take first the question of the anti-dumping law, which is a radical departure from free trade principles. What is the anti-dumping law? It is a special duty to be applied in certain circumstances with a view of keeping goods out of the country, and that is certainly not free trade. Manufacturers would come to the Government asking for an increase in the tariff, and we would ask them to show us reasons, and very often they would say: "Well, we could do very well under the tariff, you know, but our American neighbours have a dumping system; they will at certain times send over their surplus goods and sell them here at any sacrifice price and destroy our business." The thorough going free trader, the man who is more thorough going than I am on that question, would say: "All right, send the goods along; the more the merrier; if they are willing to send in goods for less than cost, thank them for that and tell them to send along some more; cheapness is everything." That is the view of many of my free trade friends. I pointed out to the manufacturers that this dumping condition was after all not a continuing condition but one which, according to their statement, would arise from time to time. I pointed out to one of them: "Don't you see that when you ask us to give a large increase in duty you are creating a machine which is to be of a permanent character in order to deal with an evil— if it be an evil—which is of but a temporary nature? From our point of view, you are going to penalize the people of Canada twelve months of the year to meet a difficulty that may arise once or twice, or perhaps thrice, in the course of a year." I thought that that was a fair stand to take in objecting to the manufacturer's attitude. I had a call one day from a manufacturer who informed me that he had no complaint in regard to the tariff. He said he was satisfied with it and as a matter of fact was doing fairly well in his business. Indeed, he said, he was contemplating an expansion of his business, and he felt that in view of the large trade he was then doing and the larger business he was planning to do in the future he could afford to sell to the ulti mate consumer at a little lower price, and so he had scaled down the price of one article of importance in which he was dealing. I remarked that that was gratifying, but he said: "Wait a moment, I want to show you a letter I have;" and thereupon he placed on my desk a letter written by an agent of an American manufacturing concern which engaged in making in the United States a similar commodity to his and shipping it into Canada. This agent wrote to the man of whom I am speaking: "Why do you cut the price? You can just as well get the larger price and there is no reason why you should not. If you reduce your price we will have to reduce too. We will meet your reduction and we will do more than that; if you are going to start reducing prices we will meet you and keep on reducing, and no matter what price you name we will cut below you." Ah! that was a new light upon the question of dumping. Again, I suppose my free trade friends would say, "All right, let him send his goods in; let them come in; so much the better." Well, if we could have got a bond from those manufacturers in the United States that would compel them to send their goods forever at sacrifice prices it would have been an excellent thing to have adopted the course suggested in this hypothetical quotation. We could afford to close our Canadian factories and buy American goods if we could have got a bond from across the border guaranteeing us their goods for all time at a sacrifice price. But who imagines that the American had any intention of doing that indefinitely? His avowed intention was to cut prices and sell at a sacrifice just long enough to close the other man's business. That was the clearest thing in the world. My manufacturing friend visiting me asked me what he was to do. I said to him: "'What do you think of the situation yourself?" He replied: "Well, I suppose I have to go back to the old price or shut

up shop;" and I told him that I could not blame him; I said we would have to think the matter over. We did consider the matter and the conclusion we came to was embodied in the dumping duty. We came to the conclusion that if big manufacturing concerns in the United States could come here and close up Canadian manufactring interests it was right that there should be a special duty to meet that condition. It was considered by some as a piece of freak legislation, but I am glad to know that it has been copied in other countries, and the present Government have paid us the compliment of continuing it on the statute book. It is the law to-day.

And if my extreme free trade friends ever came into power I think on due reflection, they would make up their minds that it was the part of wisdom to keep the dumping duty to apply to special circumstances whenever the evil was found that called for its application. Now, I do not believe that my free trade friends will be persuaded even now that I am entirely in the right, but it is only fair that we should ask them to consider some exceptional circumstances, in which men who believe in the general principle of free trade may very possibly agree that some departure is necessary from the broad doctrine they hold. Take another case in which I know our Government have been criticised—a case in which I know I have been criticised. I am going to consider the question of iron and steel bounties, and I shall do so without the slightest reference to any present question which may be in contemplation. If any one has any bounty claim afloat now I know nothing about it and I have no desire whatever that anything I say now shall be construed as being intended to bear upon any question of bounty, current now, or hereafter to be raised. Bounties on iron and steel originated with the Conservative Government in the days of Sir Charles Tupper. The operations under them were not large. There was a small operation in the province of Quebec and another in the province of Nova Scotia. I have not the figures but I think no very large sum was paid out until after our Government took up the question. When I was Premier of Nova Scotia a question arose regarding the operation of the coal mines of the province; there was a feeling that the coal mines, which were natural resources, should contribute largely to the revenue. The Government informed the managers of the companies that the royalties would be increased, and the managers complained, alleging that business would not stand it and that mining could not be carried on. They said we would ruin their business. No doubt they were sincere. We were able to come in contact with an American gentleman of great business enterprise, Mr. Henry M. Whitney, of Boston, whom I regard as a benefactor of Nova Scotia, and we were able to induce him to take up the enterprise of consolidating a number of these companies. That is a merger, I imagine some one to say; and mergers, I know, are not popular. But there may be good, and there may be bad, mergers. In this case we were able to induce that enterprising American gentleman to arrange to consolidate a number of mines. We made some changes in the mining law, costing the Government nothing, and gave that gentleman facilities to carry on his work; and in consideration of those facilities we required that he should pay not only the royalty then imposed, which the other men could not pay, but even a higher rate. The other men complained of a royalty raised from 7½ cents per ton to 10 cents. We required Mr. Whitney to pay 12½ cents. That arrangement was the means of starting the development of the coal business down there. Soon after that business got established it was my lot to come to Ottawa, and shortly aftrward, Mr. Whitney came to Ottawa to interview our Government. He made representations as to what he had done to organize the coal industry of Nova Scotia, and he said that he could build up a steel industry on top of that if he had assistance. He stated that he had great faith in that enterprise, but he represented that if he had to obtain capital he must have inducements to bring in other men. In short, he wanted some help from the Government; he wanted a bounty. At that time—and even before and since—there was a good deal of talk about assisting infant industries. Now, I would be always willing to help an infant industry if I were sure that when the infant grew up it would accept the full responsibility of manhood; but when it grows up and begins to knock the old man around the house and feels that it controls the whole thing I think the case is different. I repeat, I would willingly help an infant industry, and as between protection and bounties, I think I would prefer the bounties. Why? When you give a bounty you know what you are giving; every one sees it, and if you don't like it you can stop it.

But if you increase a duty there is often great dispute as to what is its effect. At all events, we were willing to aid Mr. Whitney, with this proviso: We said that we would not help him if he insisted on bounties as a permanent thing, but if he was prepared to accept them for a short or a moderate period, with a distinct understanding that they should be gradually reduced, and wipe themselves out, there would be reasonable ground for considering his proposition. He acquiesced in this view. thereupon the bounty scheme was adopted on a sliding scale for a period of years. After several years we checked the slide and gave them a year or so longer. At all events the time came when the bounties automatically ceased, and to-day no bounties are paid. What was the result of that? Was there anything in the result which would justify that departure from free trade principles? I am afraid my farmer friends will not agree, but I believe it is susceptible of proof that every dollar that was paid out by way of bounties on iron and steel, and millions were paid out, came back to the Dominion treasury in the form of excise and customs duties on the new business created as the outcome of that policy. I think that can be established as a pure financial question, but there is more than that. There has been the making over of Eastern Nova Scotia. What happened? Let me take first the statistics of the coal trade. In the twenty years up to 1893, before these transactions to which I refer began, the increase of the coal output in Nova Scotia—not the total output—was 604,000 tons. That was before the days of Mr. Whitney's operation in coal, iron and steel. In the twenty years which followed, from 1893 to 1913, the increase was not 604,000 tons, but within a few tons of 5,000,000 tons. That was the increase in the coal trade under the operation of the scheme to which I have referred. If there were nothing more, surely that is some vindication of what I considered an exceptional circumstance. But there was more than that. Small villages down there developed into towns, and towns developed, shall I say, into cities. Nova Scotia is no longer a province of one city. Where the little town of Sydney of 2,000 or 3,000 population existed, there is to-day the splendid city of Sydney with 25,000 people, and in the neighbouring towns and villages the same story is told. There is the town of Glace Bay, big enough to be a city. On the other side of Sydney harbour, you have the towns of North Sydney and Sydney Mines, both flourishing towns. The whole eastern part of Nova Scotia was virtually made over under these new conditions. And not Nova Scotia only. The benefits of that transaction extended to the neighbouring province of Prince Edward Island, to New Brunswick, and even to some parts of the province of Quebec, and possibly to some parts even farther away. I do not want to insist that these departures from free trade are absolutely right, but I put them before my friends who are extreme free traders, as facts which I believe can be sustained. I believe they justify a departure from free trade principles under certain conditions. If those conditions can be limited, if we can get anybody to start any new industry under the circumstances under which these were started, then I think myself that would justify a departure from the abstract principle of free trade.

The tariff question continues to be a large one. It is going to be the biggest question, I suppose, in the next campaign. What, then, is a sound and sane and sensible and safe tariff policy for Canada? To what quarter shall we look for such a policy? Not, I am afraid, to the Conservative party, even when they state their case in a camouflaged way, as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance did at the conclusion of his speech to-day. He gave, if I may say so without offence, what seemed to me to be a fine example of steering north by south. At all events, we know that the historic policy of the Conservative party is a policy of protection, and protection for protection's sake—a policy of high tariff for the sake of the tariff. Without arguing on the merits, though I know that a great many of our best citizens believe that that is a sound policy, I am going to be content with saying that the trend of public opinion is not that way, and I do not believe it is any use to look to my Conservative friends for a sound tariff policy. Where, then, shall we find it? Not from my Conservative friends, not even from that section which my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) represents. He has on several occasions lately spoken of a moderate tariff. Moderation is always a good thing. In nearly all things it is wise to be moderate, but the meaning of the word "moderate" depends largely on the viewpoint of the man using it, and I am afraid that if my hon. friend were permitted to frame a tariff which he would call moderate, it would be deemed very immoderate by some of my hon. friends

who sit further down the House. So I do not expect we can get a sound and safe tariff from him.

Where, then, are we going to get it? Shall we get it from the platform of our farmer friends? Sir, I do not think their platform if carried out would give us the sound policy which I desire, and I hope to be able to show them—at all events I hope they will find that it is wise to modify some of their views. Much in their platform is entirely in harmony with the views I am prepared to support, but I rather think they press the doctrine a little too far. I am less alarmed than many are about a farmer government. I do not think the country would suffer dreadfully if my farmer friends were to come in and form a government in this country. I know that if some of their views were pressed, they would make some trouble, but the farmer is not a dangerous man. His associations with the soil, whether it be as owner or as land-worker, create, shall I call it, a natural conservatism—with a small "c." He is naturally a conservative in all business matters. He is going to stand for law and order. Now, responsibility generally sobers men, and I think if our farmer friends came into power in all probability they would modify their views a good deal and would probably be able to carry on government with fair satisfaction. But is there any likelihood of that? My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) made a speech the other day at one of the outlying towns, I forget where, in which he said that the farmers had no expectation that they would come into power at the next election, but they did think they would have an increased body in the House. I think that is a fair guess; I think he was right. If we had a general election right now, some things are not clear, but I am afraid if there is anything clear, it is that my hon. friends on the Treasury benches would be soundly beaten, and I rather think they believe it themselves. But it is not quite so clear to me, as to some of my hon, friends around me, that the Liberals would be in a position to control the House. There will be a large farmer party. I think the Liberals would be the largest group in the House. They might even have a majority, but I am troubled by the thought that they would not have a large enough majority to carry on the Government. Our farmer friends say they do not expect to win, but that they do expect to come here in increasing numbers. What for? Two years ago in a discussion in the House of Commons I ventured to suggest—I do not presume to offer advice—to my farmer friends, that so long as they pursued a policy of isolation they could not expect to accomplish much. Well, much water has gone under the bridge in two years. The Farmers' party is larger and stronger than ever, and it naturally feels less willing, I suppose, to look at things outside of its own political platform. Nevertheless, I am going to suggest to my hon. friends that if they want to do any constructive work they cannot do it by a policy of isolation. They can be a strong party, a critical party. They can make an opposition, but there will be no need of their opposition. If I am mistaken in my view and hon. gentlemen opposite come back to power there will be a strong opposition over here, you can make up your mind about that; and if hon. gentlemen on this side of the House move across, I am willing to admit that there will also be a strong opposition in the House by my hon. friends opposite. Therefore, it will not be necessary for the farmers to create an opposition; there will undoubtedly be one. The farmers want to be constructive. I do not believe the farmers of this country, earnest and sincere as I know they are, want men in the House merely for the purposes of faction. They have ideas and they want to do things, but so long as they stand alone they cannot accomplish their aims. I therefore hope that events will so shape themselves that these gentlemen will find it their duty to associate themselves with some other men in the House who, though they may not go all the way with them, will go quite a long way with them.

While I would not fear dangers from a Farmer Government, I do not think myself, as things are going now, that we can look to that party for a sound tariff policy so long as they stand alone. What then? I do not even think we can expect to get a sound and safe tariff policy by a too rigid adherence to every line and every letter of the Liberal tariff platform. I think myself that we will find that we are all prone in framing platforms to put things perhaps a little more strongly than is wise and we all find when we come to the responsibilities of office that we may have to modify our views. If we are to get a sound and sane tariff policy where shall we look for it? Where shall we find the guide posts which shall direct the people into right lines at this time of trial?

Turn back to the policy of 1911, the policy of the Liberal party, the tariff as it stood

at that day, with the amendments that were contemplated when they went out of power, and in this you will find the elements of a sound and sane tariff policy; not the finished edifice but the ground work and the frame work of a sound tariff policy. Some conditions have been changed since and we will have to meet them, but I believe that if men will look back to the policy of 1911 as it stood at that time, and to the tariff of that day plus the proposals that were then being put forward, they will see that they can accept it as a basis, as the ground work, the frame work, of a fair tariff, although not the finished edifice.

But some people will say: "That is the National Policy." My Conservative friends are much given to the practice of saying that the Liberal policy isthe National policy, and once in a while an unthinking Liberal is found who will listen in silence to that retort. The Liberal policy of 1897 was not the old National Policy. If you want evidence of it turn to the records and you will find that the Conservative leaders and the Conservative press denounced the Liberal policy of 1897. It was not the old National Policy. They said it was going to tear down and destroy the old National Policy. But as the years rolled on and as they found that policy was winning success and the country was prospering, they swung around and said: "That is our policy."

Let me picture the situation as seen on a race course, say, at the hospitable city of Toronto, when the Ontario Jockey Club is preparing for one of the great events such as the King's plate on the 24th May. There are two horses entered, a Liberal and a Conservative. The bell rings and the horses come to the stand. The owner of the Conservative horse says: "Judge, you are not going to make my horse run against that animal; he is not in our class; take him out; I will not permit my horse to run a race against a poor, miserable, spavined, knocked up thing like that." But the judge says: "This horse is entered for the race and you have to run against him." They start the horses and in twenty seconds time there is a considerable space between them. The Liberal horse pulls out in front and as they speed down the back of the course is seen to be far ahead. He increases the lead and as they come around the track he is found to have left the other far behind. Finally the Liberal horse crosses the line a winner and the other is left away back in the distance. What does the owner of the Conservative horse do? He rushes out and says: "Do not give the prize to that fellow; that is my horse that he is riding; that is a splendid horse!"

That is about the attitude of our Conservative friends when they talk about the Liberal policy of 1897 being the old Conservative National Policy. You can prove that it was not the old National Policy by taking the facts and figures during the period of the Liberal Government. Taking into account the actual savings in customs duties and comparing the duties paid then with what would have been paid if the old tariff had been in force, and taking into consideration the savings that were made by the reduction in the prices of home manufactures, you will find that the change made represented hundreds of millions of dollars in the pockets of the people of Canada. It was not the old National Policy. It was the policy which made this country grow and prosper. For many years we were able to look back with pride and satisfaction to the results which followed the adoption of that policy. What were those results? I do not want to dwell too long upon this point because I want to hasten to a conclusion, but I am going to call a witness to testify as to the fruits of that policy, and as to the situation that we turned over to the Minister of Finance of that day, now the hon. the member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White). We left him in the happy position that he could bring down to Parliament the last volume of the Public Accounts that were not ready when we went out of power, showing a surplus for 1911 of $30,000,000. We left him an overflowing treasury and a fiscal system which, being allowed to continue for another year, placed him in the happy position of coming down to Parliament with a surplus of $38,000,000. We left him, I repeat, with an overflowing treasury. What was his testimony as to the condition of the country generally? I am going to ask you to listen for a moment to a statement made by my hon. friend which appeared in his Budget Speech of May, 1912. My hon. friend had the pleasant duty of describing the condition of the country then as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance of to-day (Sir Henry Drayton) has had the duty of describing to-day. He was talking not merely of incidents of Government but he was describing the condition of the country as it was at that time when the Liberal Government had just gone out of power. What was the condition of Canada? I quote from the Budget Speech of Sir Thomas White in 1912:

9 p.m.

It will, as I have said before, be gratifying to all that the material prosperity with which we have been so highly favoured still continues to be our portion. Despite the serious vicissitudes through which the western wheat crops has passed and the unusual heat experienced in the province of Ontario during the past summer, the field crops of Canada show a bountiful yield and with the high prices prevailing for practically all its products the great basic industry of agriculture continues in a flourishing condition. Almost every department of trade and commerce shows expansion. Our mines are wonderfully productive. Our coast fisheries, notably the Atlantic, have enjoyed a good catch and high prices. Our manufacturers are thriving and new industries are springing up throughout the whole Dominion. Railway construction, especially in the west, proceeds apace, preparing a way for settlement in districts not yet opened up and for trade with other markets than we now enjoy. Our increased bank deposits, clearings and circulation, the amount of public and private building evidenced in municipal and business structures, extensions to manufacturing plants and residences in almost every part of the country, all attest that the general prosperity of Canada at the present time is very great.

Our Dominion continues to be the land of hope and promise to the home seeker. During the last year, as before shown, our immigration from Europe and the United States reached an average of nearly a thousand a day, bringing their capital, their intelligence and their energy to assist in the great task of developing the resources of Canada and building up her nationality. Much has been said in the past with which I am in accord as to the selection of immigration as far as possible with an eye to the quality and character of our future citizenship. Notwithstanding the large stream of immigration, labour conditions are good and extreme poverty, from any reason other than incapacity or direct misfortune, is hardly known.

Under the favourable conditions which I have described, and with every prospect for their continuance, the future of Canada looks bright indeed. In the enjoyment of peace, plenty and prosperity her energetic, loyal and patriotic people look forward with hope and expectation to an ever great and greater future.

That, Sir, is the story of fifteen years of Liberal fiscal policy as described by my hon. friend: fifteen years of peace and plenty, fifteen years of blessed peace, fifteen years of joyous plenty, fifteen years of splendid progress, fifteen years of wonderful prosperity! Let us frame and glaze this statement; let us post it on the walls of the country; let us frame and glaze it and put it into every household, and office and factory, so that men may look upon it and say, "Ah, yes, that is the story of the good old days. Pray Heaven that it may come back again."

An hon. MEMBER: And come back pretty soon.

Mr. FIELDING: The Minister of Finance to-day gave us some tariff changes which we shall be better able to understand when we read them in detail in Hansard. Let me say, however, that I am sure there must be deep disappointment on the part of a great many members of the House who were, or are, supporters of the Government, to find that the tariff reform which they are getting—if you call it tariff reform—is of such a moderate character. We must not forget that the Government have for the last two years been, shall I say, coquetting with this tariff question, jollying their friends along and promising that something was going to be done. If I might use a quotation:

> "They promise, prepare, propose, postpone,
> And end by letting things alone."

Last year the Minister of Finance gave us a very positive assurance that there would be a tariff inquiry in the interim, and a tariff reform measure at the present session—a measure of general tariff revision. If the Minister of Finance is not able to make that tariff revision he is, of course, disappointing his friends; but I think there is another reason why we should have a larger measure of tariff reform than we are getting. There is unrest in this country to a degree which must be disturbing to us all. There are various causes for that. Part of it is world-wide; some of it probably might be dealt with in a better manner. There is a widespread opinion in the country—with that portion of the community which is easily susceptible to, shall I say, the movement of unrest—that the Government and Parliament—we may as well count ourselves in—are not doing much to meet the situation. The high cost of living is pressing upon people severely. It presses on all classes. Those whom we for convenience call the working class—although we are all members of the working class in Canada—those whom we speak of sometimes as the working class have been able to protect themselves in some degree by the increase in wages which they have obtained, although I think there are few cases in which the increase in wages has been equal to the increase in the cost of living. But there is a very large class of unorganized working people in Canada who are feeling this pressure very keenly. The clergymen, the public school teacher, the college professor, the clerk in an office —who is paid a fixed yearly salary and not wages by the day—a large class of people—and the Civil Service may be included in the number, although they have received some little aid—but there is a large unorganized class of people in Canada who feel the situation to-day regarding the cost of living very, very keenly, and they do

not say much about it. They are the class of people who bear their burdens and say nothing about it. For the sake of these people, and for the sake of others, I think it is a pity that we do not make some effort to show them that we are doing something—or at all events trying to do something—to meet the difficulty. What have we done? We have appointed a Board of Commerce. We had a committee last session to inquire into the high cost of living. That committee worked hard, and I am quite sure had every intention of doing something; and in the end the committee, in part, and certainly the Government, got to be panicky, and suddenly they resolved that they would pass this Board of Commerce Act. They were warned that a measure of such importance, rushed through in that way, would probably get them into trouble. However, they felt that something must be done and so they rushed the legislation through. What has happened? They appointed three able men to the board, and I have no doubt these gentlemen sincerely desired to do the best they could. But what has happened? The board has been paralyzed almost from the beginning. I think at the start the fact that such a board was in existence had a tendency to check profiteering,—if there ever was a tendency of that character—but before the board got very far it found itself paralyzed. Doubts arose as to whether it had the power to do anything. In the most important step it ever took it was immediately vetoed by the Supreme Court of Canada; and today a case is before that court asking the court to tell the board what their powers are. The chairman of the board resigned some time ago, and the members of the Government are permitting the paralysis to continue. They are afraid to appoint another chairman, and the board is doing next thing to nothing. I am sure the members of the board desire to help all they can, but whatever the cause may be the public at large do not feel that relief has come. Now we think that something should be done—some effort should be made even though it be not very successful. I think that something should now be done in the way of reducing the tariff upon the necessaries and the comforts of life—some of the things which the average man requires from day to day. I do not overestimate the value of tariff reductions in affording relief from the high cost of living, and the people may expect too much therefrom. There is a curious thing about tariff taxes. Increased taxes always reach the consumer the next morning. If my hon. friend were to-day to add five cents a pound to the taxation on sugar every shop-keeper in Canada who gets a newspaper would tomorrow morning add not five but six cents to the price. That would reach the consumer instantly. But when tariff reductions are made it is a slower process. Then the shop-keeper says, "You see I had to buy these goods under the old tariff, and I cannot reduce the price." The process of reduction is slow; the process of increase is rapid. Therefore I grant if you make tariff reductions now you may not get as much relief from them as perhaps is desirable. I do not overestimate their value, but I think it would be desirable that an effort should be made; and in doing so, at all events, we must give to the country some assurance that we are trying to meet the difficulty. I think we are doing less in this direction than has been done in Great Britain, and less than has been done in the United States.

I therefore conclude my remarks by moving, seconded by Mr. King:

That all the words after "that" to the end of the question be omitted, and the following inserted instead thereof:

"the Minister of Finance, in the Budget Speech, in the session of 1919, gave assurance to the House that during the ensuing parliamentary recess there would be a public inquiry by the minister and one or more of his colleagues into the operation of the customs tariff, with a view to a general revision of the tariff at the following session.

"That the promised public inquiry has not taken place, and the expected proposals for tariff revision at this session have not been submitted to the House.

"That in view of the continued increase in the high cost of living, of the greatly increased burden of taxation, of the hardship which many of the people suffer from these causes, and the unrest naturally arising therefrom; and in view of the desirability of adopting measures to increase production and effect such relief to consumers and producers as may be within the power of Parliament, the House is of opinion that, pending a wider revision of the tariff, substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation should be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance; first, diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; second, reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country."

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, before going into the subject matter of the remarks which have been made by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) who has just taken his seat, I may be allowed a personal allusion. It gave to me personally, and I

am sure to hon. members on this side of the House, a peculiar and particular pleasure when on the rising of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's he was received with such evident marks of goodwill and approbation by the hon. gentlemen who sit behind him. I allude to this because personally I feel something of the same pleasure which I imagine my hon. friend felt when he received that acclamation from his own side of the House and evidence of goodwill from this side as well. It is a pleasing thing to the elder brethren in political life who are at a stage a little before their hair completely whitens and the westering skies have closed over their journey that the younger and more vigorous and ambitious elements on both sides of the House seem to have a feeling of fairly deep respect and—shall I say—of friendship towards those who have long borne the burden and heat of the day. And I reciprocate and join in the kindly demonstrations that were made to my hon. friend by both sides of the House when he rose to speak.

I am also greatly pleased with the speech which my hon. friend has made. But before saying very much with reference to that I wish to add to the note which was struck by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) in one portion of his speech this afternoon, and which I would like to emphasize, and if possible, to prolong. It was that note in which he vindicated the fine effort made by Canada during the five years of the war we waged and upheld in unity and co-operation on both sides of the House in defence of justice, and of right—principles which have long animated the British Empire. He called upon that same spirit of co-operation and sacrificial effort to prolong its action and so to unite us in the common duty—not simply the duty of one party or another of the various parties which have their being at this time in Canada—of healing the wounds and repairing the waste of war.

The work which is upon us to-day is preeminently the work of Parliament and of the country and not of party or faction. It is the extension and consequential entailment of a war which was our common war and which was upheld by this country in co-operation and with a large spirit of unity in all its parts. The very same spirit, the very same qualities, the very same efforts, ought to be projected into the co-operation necessary, as I have said, to repair the wastage and heal the wounds of war. What my hon. friend has done in this Budget presentation to-day ought not, I think, to be lost sight of in its general and broad lines.

Before we get into the discussion of details and travel off into individual paths where we may lose sight of the principles which have been the ground bases, so to speak, of the presentment, it will be well to tabulate them for a moment so as to keep them clearly in mind during the subsequent discussion. And may I say that if we can maintain throughout the debate the spirit which has animated the speeches which have been already made, if we can forget the individual in the general, and forget a portion of the partisan in the patriotic, we will make this discussion memorable in itself in this Parliament and of very great benefit to the cause which weighs so heavily upon us for a fair and speedy adjustment of conditions following the war. That spirit has been eminently well displayed to-day.

Now, what are the guiding principles or points, so to speak, in the presentment which has been made by my hon. friend in his speech this afternoon? There is first a laying bare, down to the very bone and marrow of the truth, just what the condition of Canada is to-day, financially and economically, in its domestic relations and its relations with other countries. I look upon it as a fine contribution to the discussion which has now been begun—that there was no attempt on the part of the Minister of Finance to camouflage the position. He was frank, open and truthful in his presentation of our financial and economic condition, and he well merited the compliment which was paid to him by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding).

There was no concealment of the amount of debt that this country is now bearing upon its shoulders; there was no attempt to minimize that burden by counting in assets which were not properly to be considered as live assets; and a distinction was made with a corresponding addition to the net debt that we carry by a diminution of those assets which could not be looked upon as being live assets. We might collect our assets, say under three headings—the quick, the dead and the purgatorial. The quick assets we can very easily pick out, and there are many of them. The dead asset we have picked out and laid aside; we respect it for its memories and for the associations which it had in the past; but we have laid it away, and we

do not propose to unseal the tomb. The quick assets we have defined; the dead we have cast aside. And we have taken cognizance of those assets which are neither quick nor dead, but which still remain in optimistic and, maybe, joyful hope of a resurrection by-and-by to a future of great usefulness and profit. That very fairly designates the three kinds of assets which we have. Do not let us disparage the first. The quick assets of Canada are grand assets; no other country in the world has better—assets more capable of development, more illimitable and inexhaustible in their quantity or of better quality than those of Canada. We can stand here with that burden of debt upon us and all those economic and business difficulties that face us and yet we can feel that we have a background of quick, living and developable assets which inject optimism into our minds and stimulate us to enterprise and action for the future, to work out, under difficulties and through long periods, the burden which is upon us, into a future where the burden will be laid aside. And as churches sometimes have festivals to burn the mortgages which have long weighed upon them, some time a day will come in Canada when we shall have a great national festival; we shall burn the old mortgages and we shall emerge into the new life of a country vastly more developed than it is at the present time. There is hope; there is optimism; there is stimulus to effort and to enterprise in the splendid background of our quick and developable assets in this country.

Do not let us disparage, either, those assets which to-day are not revenue producers. If we are serious and honest in our statements with regard to our country's possibilities, these assets, which to-day are burdensome in several ways, in the burden of interest that they place upon us, in the deficit that they call upon us to fill with appropriations of ready money, lie in and through the very heart of the country, about the future of whose developable resources we have the optimism, hope and sincere trust that we have over and over again declared and which we stand to declare during future years. If that be so, as development takes place and grows; as production pours in from the bases not now developed but which are going to be developed; as our mines pour forth those treasures which are concealed within them; as our cultivable areas, rich beyond possibility of calculation and but a fringe of which at this moment is under productive use, are brought under cultivation; as our fisheries develop; as our water-powers add their forces to aid the forces of man power and so work out their splendid part in the development of the future, and as productivity blossoms and brings its fruit along all those lines of rich endeavour in the future, these assets which to-day are burdensome, will become, if you take our railroad transport system through and through, not burdensome but in the main utilizable and of great advantage. And in the end, if we are true to ourselves and wise in our administration they will become assets which will pour their treasures into the coffers of Canada and make more certain the burning of that old mortgage some day and the emergence of a time when we shall be less crippled with burdens of debt and when our future will therefore be more open and free.

I like the tone of the speech of the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) for another reason. He not only frankly stated the position: There were the burdens; here was the background of realizable assets and there was our work as a united people to put our best efforts forth to bring about an adjustment of present difficulties and to develop all these rich resources. These he emphasized.

But he emphasized another thing which I should like to mention, viz.: the distinct and decided trend towards economy of administration which was a distinguishing feature of the address made and the policy propounded by my hon. friend to-day. I wish just at this moment to thank my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Fielding), as one of the trusted leaders of the party opposite and one who, I believe, speaks the mind of that party in this respect, for having not only promised his support, but put in a very efficient impulse towards its fulfilment in the concluding part of his speech, to help forward the idea of national economy of expenditure as regards the Government and the public service. That thought is to-day in the minds of members on both sides of the House. Hon. members on both sides, and particularly hon. members on the Government side, always have been and will be subject to pressure from their constituents. Yet it is not always to be declared that it is an improper thing that pressure should come from constituents, because constituents lie back yonder amongs those developable and rich resources of our country; they see needs for improvements and aid in different por-

tions; they go to their members, and the members come to the Government. That is a fair thing to do, and it ought not to be frowned upon in the least. If I may be allowed just a simple piece of counsel, might I suggest that it is for the member himself not to be simply the open medium through which every demand that is made upon him from his constituency is pitched into the lap of the Government with his backing behind it? It is for the member, in the exercise of his good sense, wisdom and knowledge, to act first as a sort of sieve through which these demands may be sorted out; and when he comes to press upon the Government for what he thinks ought to be done for the different parts of his constituency, it is for him to give a reasoned and modified translation of the broad, general and very generous demands which are made upon him by his constituents. That is just a word of counsel from the elder brother to the younger members of the House.

That should be the watchword. Now we can aid that in two ways. May I be allowed to suggest how my hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queen's and his friends behind him may assist in carrying out the programme in that respect? When they go back and talk over with their constituents what this Government has done, it will be a great help to the Government in the line of economy if they will take the ground that economy is a necessary thing, and that it must be practised by the Government and upheld by Parliament. Let them not say to their constituents: "You did not get this thing and that thing because there is a Union Government in power,"—leading them to think that if the Union Government had not been in power, but in its place that improvisation of a coming government so beautifully portrayed by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's they would have had their wharves and their docks and other public works constructed. That is just the wrong way to encourage economy in the Government or in Parliament.

Let my hon. friends, when they go back to their constituents, tell the people plainly: "It is time for economy, and the Government is right in exercising reasonable and even rigid economy, and we must support them so far as that is concerned."

Then, members on both sides of the House can help the Government in another way, and that way is to ponder very carefully what the Government after looking very carefully into the condition of things here on the Hill and outside in the country in its different services consider might be done without any diminution of the efficiency of the public service but with a distinct gain in lessened expenditure on that service, and let hon. gentlemen back up the Government in its measures of efficiency and economy in the Civil Service all through this country. When I speak of economy in the Civil Service I do not simply mean that we should have regard to the personal emoluments and salaries of a certain number—about forty thousand or fifty thousand—of men and women. The Civil Service is a great organism through which the Government carries out its measures of enterprise and administration, and millions of dollars can be wasted and spent uselessly through an inefficient Civil Service system through the country, which millions can equally well be saved through efficiency, economy, organization and thorough co-operation of the members of the Civil Service. That duty has not all been done. That work has not all been accomplished by any manner of means, on the Hill or outside of Ottawa in great lines of Civil Service administration, and I who say so now know it. Business organization goes forward with a bound, but administrations make changes slowly. They have the accretions of years around them. They are like ill-built cities, which have grown up on no plan at all, but simply a house here, then an adjoining house, then a hut, then another building, and with crooked streets and no lookout. So the Civil Service system and the administration of Governments grows up by little and little, and you wake up some day to find out that while the great business houses which are putting themselves forward in the great race of enterprise and work are organized on business and scientific principles, the Civil Service of many, nay of almost all countries in the world, have yet to make adequate and efficient organization, and have yet to adapt efficiency and economy and scientific principles to the work which they are carrying on. We have something to do in Canada in that respect, whereby millions and millions of dollars may be saved. So that economy which is a distinct plank in the utterance of my hon. friend to-day, and in which he is backed by the Government, is something to the commendation of the Minister of Finance.

The Finance Minister has make another notable declaration, a declaration on the line of the best business thought of Canada to-day. What is it? Though the burdens are

heavy, though the country has untold unexpected liabilities and obligations which have to be met,—and we intend to meet them, though those liabilities are very pressing and very onerous,—the Finance Minister has stated, what business people believe to be right, and what we around these benches believe to be right,—that for this year, and if possible next year and the years after, Canada shall not incur further debt. We may be obliged to carry for years the debt which we have at the present time, but that we should from this time on, so far as we can, balance our accounts and make our revenues tally with our expenditure. Taking that into account, the other fact must also be taken into account, that it is not possible to do everything we would like to do because of the heavy burden of carrying the war debt of the country,—that $2,250,000,000 of net debt that we have to carry. At the same time, the promulgation of the principle that no loans are to be made at the present time, but that we must out of our own resources meet our own liabilities year after year, is a great step forward; and if Parliament and the country will stand behind the Government in that declaration and in trying to have it fulfilled, we will come all the sooner to the time when inflation and big debt charges, and all the discomforts and disorganization resulting therefrom, will be mitigated, and gradually we will emerge from the mists into the sunshine of liberty and prosperity so far as economic and financial considerations are concerned. I think that is a healthy principle to instil, and a healthy determination to make, both here in Parliament and outside in the country. Let us pay our own way.

Another thing that has been done by the Finance Minister is this: He has made a courageous attempt to devise and to impose methods of taxation which shall help to square our accounts and bring us up to the position to which I have just alluded. I say that is a courageous attempt, and it deserves our support here in this House. It is not popular. As I was passing out to-night I heard a member who does not belong to this side of the House express a view which I am quite sure will be often expressed. Speaking of the taxation schemes of the Minister of Finance he said, "It is going to make the Government very unpopular. There are women voters now, and the Government is not going to gain many of their votes by taxing women's dress and women's jewellery." There, again might I be allowed to suggest how my hon. friends on the other side of the House can help mightily towards the readjustment of things financial and economic? It is in this way. When you visit your constituents do not go back on your promises and principles of to-night and do not say to the electors, as you meet them: "Are you going to keep that Government in power?" Do not say to the woman voter: "What is this you have around your neck—a fur? The Government put 20 per cent on that fur. Have you a vote? Then, when the next time for voting comes around don't you vote for that Government or a representative of it." Be careful and not stultify yourselves by saying that you will take the duty off if you get in, though you may make that promise with impunity for the prospect is far in advance. But if you do not do that you will greatly assist in bringing about the payment of those dues which are absolutely necessary if we are going to pay our way and reconstruct and readjust our economic and financial affairs. I know it is a courageous thing for the Minister of Finance or the Government to put on new forms of taxation, but there are some blessed and good features in the direct form of taxation; and one lesson which cannot be taught too quickly and which cannot be brought home to the people too strongly is that the burdens of the country are to be borne by the country itself and that the people must stiffen their backs and strengthen their courage and double their endeavours in order to bring the country out of the position in which it is to-day to a better economic and financial basis.

Every one must realize the fact that there is a duty to be done, and that it is not by the indirect method, only that it shall be done. We have had two systems of taxation, one almost entirely predominating up to the present time, and that is the method of indirect taxation, by which the people paid heavily and did not know when they were doing so. All sorts of assertions have been made as to the amounts they paid,—assertions which of course would partake of the particular power of imagination of the man who made them and of his boldness of speech. All kinds of assertions have been made, many of them grotesquely exaggerated; but nevertheless one of the features of indirect taxation is that you pay out not knowing how much you do pay. I doubt if that system of taxation, altogether imposed upon a country, is a good school teacher to that country and does finally eventuate in what is best for the interests of the people. I think that a judicious mix-

ture of the two, by practice made necessary and by practice gradually worked out without too great a wrench, is a mixture that the body politic should be asked to take, and if they will do it we shall place no stamp or excise duty upon the administration of that mixture. So that now we are working up along the line of direct taxation every year a little further, and yet not by too violent advances that would produce—I was about to say a revolution, but that word does not convey my meaning—but a reaction against that principle of taxation. We have now a judicious mixture, I think, of the two kinds of taxation. In our business profits tax, in our income tax, we have examples of the direct method. We add to these now our sales tax on luxuries and other articles. By the methods of taxation adopted we bring it to the mind of the purchaser that this is a tax which is paid by the person himself or herself, and which is not added to by the profits of the middleman, the man between the manufacturer and the retail counter. By bringing this fact home to the purchaser at the time of the purchase, we adopt, I think, a practical way of inculcating in the body politic a real interest in and solicitude for the good government and economic administration of the country.

I shall not follow that line of thought any longer. These are just some of the views I place before the House with its kind permission. Now I desire to come to the speech delivered by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and I hope he will not think, if I disagree with him in certain particulars, that I am at all detracting from my general admiration of his speech. Just on that point let me say that it has been to an eminent degree non-partisan in character. The hon. gentleman drew a line of comparison between 1914 and 1920, and he did that with his long experience behind him, not for the purpose of a partisan appeal, but rather to inform the country itself, as a man of his experience and length of public service could well do, to put before them the duties of the present as compared with the duties of the past, the obligations of the present as compared with the obligations of the past, and to show the sacrifice and effort which would be necessary on their part in the future as compared with the standard of necessity in these respects that existed in the past. That is a good thing to have done, and I congratulate my hon. friend on having done it. He paid a compliment to the Minister of Finance, but it was rather left-handed, in that in paying a compliment to one minister he somewhat took away from a complimentary reference to another minister. He said that it was easy in war time for Finance Minister No. 1, but it was hard in peace time for Finance Minister No. 2; and he thought that if Finance Minister No. 1 had had a little more foresight and a little more courage he might not have done some of the things which he did do. Ah! those afterthoughts! How they plague us, and pursue us, and chastise us; but they never remedy the thing that was done before the second thoughts came. They have no power of salvation for an error or an act committed before they were brought out from the misty depths of thought or imagination and applied in their sober secondary condition. Now, you have to put yourselves in the position the man was in when the thing under consideration was done, and if my hon. friend will put himself in that position I think he will revise his opinion and say that during the five-year period of the war the task of the ex-Minister of Finance No. 1 was a hard one.. He may well say that in peace times finance minister No. 2 will have a hard task. I have collaborated with both and I think I have a pretty good idea of what has been done by the former Finance Minister and what so far has been done by the present Finance Minister. I do not envy them the work they had to do but I give my tribute, and I give it most willingly and unreservedly, to the able management of the finances of the country by Finance Minister No. 1 during the trying period of the war. There were difficulties which had to be surmounted. Some things were made easy because of the buoyancy of the feeling of patriotism and service which was then at its height. But there were other things that were awfully hard, tremendously grinding, and that worked into the very vital sap of the man who had to bear the responsibility of it and work out in practice and in administrative system what there was to be worked out. But let us give due credit to each.

Afterthoughts! Yes, my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's has had afterthoughts. But they did not rectify the errors of the past; his primary action which probably would not have been taken if he had taken time for the afterthoughts. There was a time when my hon. friend—lest he think too highly of himself I just want to suggest it to him—prophesied that the Grand Trunk Pacific could be built at a

cost to the country of only $15,000,000. After thoughts would have told him that it would cost $200,000,000. It would have relieved him and relieved the shoulders of the present Minister of Finance if my hon. friend had only had after thoughts before he took the action itself. It is just one sample. You can go through the list of all governments, all ministries and even all individuals, and you will find this brooding nightmare of after thoughts coming to plague and pursue them.

What was the position of my hon. friend on loans? I followed him with a great deal of interest and, really, I could not quite follow him. Although years have passed over him, as they have passed over myself, he is yet agile in body and agile in mind and in spirit. And he did skate most scientifically around that business of the loan domestic or the loan foreign. What his idea was it is difficult to say, but I analysed his position like this: Glad in a way that we received a lot of money in our own country when we could not raise it in any other because there was no other country we could go to that would give us a dollar, outside of the United States and they would give us very little. In fact, we had to loan to outside countries instead of borrowing from them. Glad, then, that Canada showed that she possessed such resources that she was able to raise a billion dollars to prosecute the war; yet finding when we come to the readjustment that the money which has been wasted in war is not available in the banks or in the pockets of the people to go into the business and industry of the country, and he moans and bemoans that fact. But there you are; the money was there, the money had to be raised. We raised it and if it was blown away on the battlefield it is not in the banks to-

10 p.m. day nor in the pockets of the people to put into business enterprises. We must dig up other money, and the way to dig it up is to stop strikes, stop holidaying, stop doing half work, stop wasting, and set ourselves to the business of honest toil and honest production. That is the only way we can replace the money so spent. I wish my voice could penatrate to the heart of every man and woman in this country and impress upon every heart this message and keep it there like the message on a film: "Stop wasting; go to work; produce; stop grouching and grumbling; and we will soon get back to an atmosphere that is bright and happy and hopeful.

My hon. friend had something to say about a stock transaction. I am sure he would not have said what he did if he had had the facts before him. I propose to place just the bare facts before him, and these facts are amply proved by the documents and accounts. What did my hon. friend say?

> There is one feature which, while well known to the inside circle of finance, has not been made known in any marked way to the Canadian public at large, and I think it is time that the Canadian people knew something about it.

Here we have a mystery. The hon. gentleman's words go out to-morrow morning in the papers and the public will scent a mystery. Something has taken place. The public ought to know it because the ex-Minister of Finance says it is so. What is this thing? Some more rascality of the Union Government! He goes on to say:

> If you take up the last volume of the Public Accounts for the year ending March 31, 1919, you will find a couple of interesting items.

Interesting! The public cocks up its ears again! A mystery; an interesting mystery! The ex-Minister of Finance says so! He had thirty years' experience; he had that solemn oracle, the Public Accounts, in his hand, and he backed up his statement with the Public Accounts! What is this interesting mystery?

> If you take up the last volume of the Public Accounts for the year ending March 31, 1919, you will find a couple of interesting items. There is a later volume than that, but we have not got it.

More of a mystery, more interesting facts to come out in volume 2! For the time being my hon. friend contents himself with volume 1:

> For that year, however, any hon. member will discover in the statement of receipts and expenditures an item called "Bank of Montreal Trading Account"—a very interesting account. Hon. members will read the items therein contained and will discover that the Government paid out on that account the sum of $7,450,000 and got back $5,177,904. So on that account—whatever it means—the Government of Canada—in other words, the people of Canada—lost $2,272,000.

Now that is the statement. I am sorry to say, on his own account, that my hon. friend is altogether mistaken in coming to that conclusionô and I take the occasion to put the proof before the House so that it may, come out on the wings of the same press which takes that interesting mystery propounded by my hon. friend on its plumage to carry abroad to the reading public. Now, what are the facts of the case? In brief, they are these: That the Government expended $10,950,000 for the whole

completed transaction. It got back out of that transaction $11,074,088, and instead of losing $2,272,000 it made a gain of $124,088 for that whole period on the bonds of the Victory Loan of 1917. This transaction was closed on September 7th, 1918.

Mr. FIELDING: Will my hon. friend allow me to ask from what public record he is quoting? Where does it appear in the Public Accounts?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It will be found in an Order in Council which I propose to lay on the Table.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. TRAHAN: An Order in Council!

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Well, now some hon. gentleman, as I should judge, has expressed a bit of dissent—a little bit of dissent. What do my hon. friends want? Will they take the Auditor General's authority? Will they take the report of the Auditor General? My hon. friend holds up a book, and he reads from that book two sets of figures, but he makes his own deductions. That book does not show that $2,272,000 was a loss accruing to the country; it simply gives a statement of an expenditure and an income in an unfinished account. My hon. friend's fault was that he did not state what was in that book when he told the people of Canada that this Government has been trafficking and has lost $2,272,000. The latter statement was an inference of his own and it was absolutely incorrect.

An hon. MEMBER: Another dark secret exploded.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Now my hon. friend went on to the tariff question, and there I sat in blissful amazement. Looking over the thirty years that have passed and the controversies that have taken place between my hon. friend and myself, and between his party and the party on this side of the House I felt almost like saying, when he had finished, "Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace;" and the question forced itself upon me. "Has the tariff millennium come?" The whole party behind my hon. friend never voiced opposition to what he said; they could not; they dared not. They do not like to admit, what in their hearts they know to be the truth—that is repugnant to them; yet if they were all as honest as the ex-Minister of Finance they would get up and say the very same thing. Now, after these confessions—not of an opium eater, but of a virile, experienced public man—after this candid confession, let me say to hon. gentlemen opposite: "Do not let us hear anything more of camouflaged assertions from that side as to free trade being the doctrine which is dear to your hearts and embodied in your policies. You cannot put it into your policy now. I do not think you ever meant to put it into your policy to carry out as a reality when you got into power. That was done once before in the history of this country, and the lesson is to be read in the records of Canada. O, don't I know all about it? Didn't I go through all those campaigns preceding 1911 when from the highest authority down to the lowest there was this universal declamation against the principle of protection; that it should be eliminated from the tariff—not be allowed to lurk in corners and by-places, but to be eliminated. To-day what have we? We have the ex-Finance Minister standing for an anti-dumping clause—when circumstances require it; standing for a substantial aid to industries—when circumstances require it; standing for mergers—when circumstances require it; aye, and even more, standing for the protected infant industry while it was an infant industry, until it had attained years of maturity; standing for all these—when the circumstances of the case seemed to require it. Where is the free trade doctrine, and where is the difference in principle between myself as a moderate protectionist and my hon. friend as a now avowed protectionist, the principle to be adapted and adopted—as circumstances require it? That was always the doctrine on this side of the House. We never worshipped protection as a fetish; can the same be said by hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to free trade? We have always believed that the circumstances of the time should dictate the financial and tariff policy of the time. And my hon. friend's confession to-night has amply justified the policy advocated during thirty years by Liberal-Conservatives in all parts of Canada.

Now, what is to be said hereafter to our friends who compose the Farmers' party? Oh, my friend from Shelburne and Queen's is a youthful wooer yet; was there ever such a Romeo? Was there ever such a Juliet, looking out of a window embowered in vines and flowers, for a Romeo that attuned so sweet a note, so persuasive a love ditty, as my hon. friend has sung to-night? It did my old heart good, and I felt almost like making love to something myself. I

know I never before could have done it as well, and with this example before me I may try yet again. But, alas, for the Juliet, when it came to that prosaic allegory of the horse race! My hon. friend then forgot the party that he wooed so ardently. The only two horses allowed on the track are the Liberal and Conservative. The Progressives are counted out. My hon. friend says to them in effect; you may be good for some purposes, but when it comes to the real race you are out, you are scratched, there is no chance for you.

Then my hon. friend starts off on a quest of his own, it is like the quest of Japhet in search of a father. Where shall we find the proper policy? We cannot find it in the Liberal-Unionists; we cannot find it in Meighen's vocabulary; we cannot find it in Crerar's vocabulary; cannot find it in Clark's vocabulary. Where shall we find it? And the answer to the weary seeker comes from the member for Queen and Shelburne. "Here is the embodiment of the plan leading to proper tariff policy. I have just repudiated the errors of the past. Come with me, and I will take you to the Promised Land." Jordan and the desert may be between, it is true, but to-night he forgot Jordan and the desert, and was almost in the Promised Land, with the Farmers tagging behind him as beneficiaries of all the grapes of Escol and the other fruits of that delectable country.

I will not continue further and will now resume my seat.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member proceeds, I desire to state that the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) was submitted in my momentary absence from the Chair. A strict application of the rules of debate would demand that the discussion be confined to the amendment before the Chair; but I think it would be most undesirable that we should have a debate upon the amendment, to be followed by a debate upon the main question. I therefore suggest that it would suit the purpose of the House better to have a discussion general in terms upon the whole question, as would be the case if the amendment were not submitted.

Mr. FIELDING: If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I was quite aware of the point, but I understand it has always been the practice in the case of the Budget debate that though an amendment was moved the whole question remained open. It was because of that understanding I made my motion.

[Sir George Foster.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is my recollection, too.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been so in practice, but the rule I have stated remains, and it was to avoid any question arising on the point that I mentioned the circumstance.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I intend to make some rather extended remarks upon the subject under discussion, but as the hour is now late and the evening has been full of enjoyment, I beg to throw myself upon the fraternal atmosphere engendered by the remarks of the last speaker (Sir George Foster) and, with the consent of all, to propose the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my hon. friend is very earnest in his desire I suppose we should not object, although we should like very much to make progress. Perhaps he will be content to go on for twenty minutes or half an hour. But I will not press him to proceed.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Speaker, there are a great number of resolutions which I think it would be wise for us to look over carefully, and I am going to take advantage of the kind offer of the Prime Minister.

Motion agreed to and the debate adjourned.

SENATE BILL—SECOND READING.

Bill No. 134 for the relief of Albert Graham Elson.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

On motion of Sir Robert Borden the House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

Wednesday, May 19, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

MOTION RESPECTING PRIVATE BILL.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS (Strathcona) moved:

That Bill No. 133 (from the Senate), for the relief of Edith Sarah Bell, be placed on the Order Paper among private Bills for second reading on Friday next.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

Mr. FOSTER (York):

1. Is it the intention of the Government to take action in the near future upon the report made by the commission which has held an investigation on technical education?

2. Is it contemplated to give any assistance to the Toronto Technical School which is now being used by the Government as a base for the retraining of returned soldiers?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. Action has already been taken by the passing of the Technical Education Act on July 7, 1919.

2. For the year ending March 31, 1920, the sum of $36,100 was granted by the Ontario Government to the above school, one-half of which amount will be paid by the Dominion Government out of the funds provided under the said Act.

BRANT MILITARY HOSPITAL, BURLINGTON.

Mr. ANDERSON:

1. Has the Government completed the purchase of the Brant Military Hospital at Burlington, Ontario?

2. If so, what amount of real estate is included with the building, and what was the price paid?

3. How much was paid for the furniture to the owner?

4. What was the cost of remodelling and repairs to the building?

5. How many soldiers have been treated in it?

6. What is the cost of maintenance per annum?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. No.

2. (a) Approximately 6½ acres expropriated; (b) award not yet made by the court but an advance of $120,000 was paid pending the decision.

3. $11,465.86.

4. $349,933.54.

5. The Brant Military Hospital was taken over from the Invalided Soldiers' Commission on March 25, 1918, and transferred to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment on the 31st October, 1919. Between these two dates, 2,562 patients were treated.

Up to March 31, 1920, 572 ex-members of the Forces had been provided with treatment in the Brant House Hospital as patients of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. There are at present 246 patients of the department undergoing treatment in that institution.

6. Incidental repairs from 25-3-18 to 15-9-19, $6,636.44; water, fuel, light and telephone from 25-3-18 to 15-9-19, $20,207.52; total $26,843.96. Rate per annum approximately $18,000. This hospital was placed under the control of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment on the 15th October, 1919, since which date expenditure on account of maintenance has amounted to $14,791,82.

SEED GRAIN ADVANCES.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

How much was overdue and owing to the Government on account of advances made to purchase seed grain for use in the Prairie Provinces on the 31st of December, 1919?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: $1,493,121.11.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. WIGMORE:

1. What are the names and respective salaries of the employees of the Parliamentary Library?

2. How many are graduates of any college in Arts or Library Science?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to make any more appointments to the said Library of persons who have not taken a library science course in some recognized college?

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Who are the publishers of the Montreal Gazette?

2. What amounts have been paid to the Montreal Gazette Publishing Company for each of the last five fiscal years by the Dominion Government for (a) advertising, and (b) job printing?

Mr. STEVENS:

1. What is the total amount of sick mariners dues collected from shipping entering Canadian Ports for each of the years 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918 and 1919?

2. What amount has been expended by the Government in assistance to sick or distressed mariners during each of said years?

3. How many officials of the Marine Department in Ottawa have been engaged exclusively on duties connected with collection, distribution and administration of sick mariners dues?

4. How many officials of Marine Department have been transferred to Health Department in connection with sick mariners dues?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Mines in Ottawa?

2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment in Ottawa?

2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Public Archives in Ottawa?

2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Labour in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Railways and Canals in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Naval Service in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Auditor General in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Indian Affairs in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Immigration and Colonization in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of the Secretary of State in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Public Printing?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many employees are there in the Post Office Department in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries do they draw?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many employees are there in the Department of Justice in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Militia and Defence in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Marine in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

[Mr. Hocken.]

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Finance Department in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of the Interior in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Agriculture in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Public Health?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Trade and Commerce in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many persons are employed in the Department of Public Works in Ottawa?
2. What are their names and what salaries are they paid?

VICTORY LOANS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): May I ask my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) if he will be kind enough to lay on the table of the House a copy of the Order in Council which he read in the course of the discussion yesterday, touching the question of Victory Loan transactions?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I certainly will. I thought that had already been done.

THE BUDGET.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON THE ANNUAL STATEMENT PRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

The House resumed from Tuesday, May 18, the debate on the motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Mr. ANDREW ROSS McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, my first words must be those of thanks to the Prime Min-

ister for having kindly consented to adjourn this debate in order to give myself and other members of the House an opportunity to examine the very important matters contained in the speech of the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) delivered yesterday.

Before considering the speech of the Minister of Finance, there is another speech which might perhaps be dealt with. As we listened last night to the two ex-Ministers of Finance, one who adorns the Conservative, and the other, no less adorns the Liberal side of the House, we were reminded of that ancient saying, "Old books to read, old wood to burn, old wine to drink, and old politicians to listen to," because nothing could have been more agreeable than to listen to the remarks of these two gentlemen (Hon. Mr. Fielding and Sir George Foster), whether one agreed entirely with them or not.

Now, let me take up the remarks that, after all, were of a somewhat light nature which were made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce yesterday. I cannot attempt to follow him into his figurative or imaginative finance. I am an unworthy member of a church, Mr. Speaker, that does not believe in purgatory, and I have got an idea that our claims or assets are either good or bad, and I am afraid that our bad assets do not give room for any doubt as to their worthlessness. The minister (Sir George Foster) mentioned the trend towards economy. After all, it is delightful to know that a man who is approaching the milestone of four score can see in the Estimates of this year any trend towards economy. My eyes have not served me for so many years, but I have discovered no trend towards economy at all, and I am afraid that my hon. friend was then simply calling upon his poetic imagination, as he did later on in the discussion.

Then there was his criticism of the Civil Service. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, the Civil Service has many aspects in which it might be better. But does any severe criticism of it lie in the mouth of the Minister of Trade and Commerce? He has been associated with the public life of this country for very many years. Under him for many years the Civil Service grew up, to a certain extent at any rate; and if the Civil Service is badly organized it appears to me that a leading member of a government that has been in power for the last eight years—too long a time—and for eighteen far too long years some time ago has got to share to a very considerable degree the responsibility. Then we had the Minister of Trade and Commerce acting as a sort of Greek chorus to whatever the Minister of Finance said. "We must have no more loans," says the Minister of Finance; echoes the Minister of Trade and Commerce: "No more loans." What a splendid policy! No more loans. "We must pay our way," the Minister of Finance tells us; the refrain is taken up by his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce: "We must pay our way." Of course, we must pay our way; of course we must have no more loans. But is not that sort of preaching rather the preaching of an apostle of the obvious? There was one point to which I listened with a certain amount of amusement, and that was the credit and praise which my hon. friend (Sir George Foster) bestowed upon the Minister of Finance for his being truthful. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance belongs to the profession to which I belong—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McMASTER: And we do not have to be praised for telling the truth. We are truthful: Cela va sans dire. Then we had some talk about the methods of taxation; there was direct taxation and indirect taxation; and, if I may without impropriety attempt to do so, I may suggest that we had Dr. Foster's judicious compound of taxation, both direct and indirect. We shall examine that mixture later on, but for the time being I merely direct attention to that part of the right hon. gentleman's speech. I will not attempt to follow my venerable, learned and honourable friend into the realms of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet or into the more prosaic field of horse racing at the Woodbine track, Toronto.

But I purpose now to take up what I might call the more serious part of the mental pabulum afforded the country and the House by the Government yesterday. The Minister of Finance, at the outset of his discourse, pointed out that there were two objectives to which this country should bend its energies: first, the resumption of ordinary economic conditions—the economic conditions which prevailed, I presume, before the war;—and, second the endeavour to reduce the debt. Now, what did he mean by ordinary economic conditions? If he meant conditions which obtained before the war, then I say that those conditions are such that we should not try to resume them, because before the war mankind was suffering through the conglomeration of great quantities of wealth in the hands of the few, and a great deal of the hardest, the most unpleasant and the most

essential work of the world was badly paid for. We certainly do not wish to continue, but rather to correct as far as possible, such conditions if they have persisted. As to the reduction of the debt, we all agree with the Minister of Finance that it should be reduced; but when he asks us to sink all our differences, I suppose he can only mean that we should all adopt his view as to what is best, and that is something which I believe we cannot, should not, and will not do. We cannot all agree upon the economic problems which confront this country, but what we can do is to discuss fairly the questions which are before us, to listen to the debate with an open mind, and to put the matter to the vote at as early a date as possible and abide by the verdict of the majority.

I am somewhat at a loss, Sir, to understand completely the import of the very large mass of statistics which the Minister of Finance placed before us yesterday. They were of interest no doubt. But when he compared figures of years ago with figures of to-day his old professional habit of mind reasserted itself and he was compelled to tell us that, of course, comparisons should not be made because currency had become so inflated that comparisons of to-day with ten years ago in dollars were not worth much; and he was frank enough to tell us that when you examine the other criteria of comparisons, such as the amount of tonnage moved on the railways and matters of a similar character, you would find that production had not increased but had rather decreased in this country. I was very much interested in listening to the minister's remarks in regard to the inflation of our dollar bill. I had been at some pains a year ago to stress this fact somewhat in the remarks which I made upon the Budget. It seems to me, not only from the experience of this country, of the United States, and of Great Britain, but also from the experience of the rest of the civilized world, that the increase of paper currency as compared to the backing of gold guaranteeing that currency has a tremendous amount to do with the inflation of prices. I think that the House will bear with me when I quote some figures, which are really extending those given by the Minister of Finance.

The world's paper currency, since the beginning of the war, has increased no less than 600 per cent, while the gold reserves back of that paper has increased by only 40 per cent. The four central powers, Germany, Austria, Bulgaria and Turkey, in 1914 had $1,200,000,000 of paper money outstanding. That had increased about tenfold by 1918,—some $12,300,000,000; and by 1919 it had increased to $18,770,000,000, while the ratio of gold to notes had dropped from 49.7 per cent in 1914 down to 5½ per cent in 1918 and down to 1.7 per cent in 1919, thus explaining in a very large measure the depreciation of the German mark and the Austrian kroner. The eighteen allied countries suffered in the same way, though not to the same extent. In 1914 the Allied Countries including Russia had issued $4,900,000,000 of notes, and the ratio of gold to notes was 76.6 per cent. They had increased by 1918 to $25,000,000, with a ratio of 20.9, and in 1919 there had been a jump to $30,000,000,000, and the ratio of gold to notes had fallen to 17.1 per cent.

Before the war, with one dollar you could go into the bank and get about five francs. If you go into the bank to-day I think you can get almost twelve francs for your dollar. If you went into the bank before the war with a dollar bill they would give you 5.18 lire; now they will give you 14 or 15. If you went into the bank with a dollar bill before the war and asked that that bill be changed into marks, they would give you 4.19 marks; now they will give you over 60 marks. While the Swiss franc has kept its place, the pound sterling which, before the war was worth about $4.86 is now worth —I do not know the exact rate to-day—but I think it is in the neighbourhood of $4. For the purposes of my argument I will take it at $4.

Now I come to what I started out with, the practical application of the information, known of course to most of the members of the House, which I have just given. The Government has aggravated the exchange situation and it has done it in this way: When a merchant imports, let us say, from France, a bill of goods amounting to $100, the customs house authorities first change that $100 into francs, or rather the francs into dollars, not at the present rate of exchange, but at the rate of exchange prevailing before the war. What does that mean? It means that the rate of duty on goods coming in from France has been raised between three and four times; whereas, if a bill of goods comes in from the United States, where our currency is at a discount, the American dollar is taken as of the same value as our Canadian dollar and the duty is imposed on that basis. The effect of this is that we discourage imports from those countries in

which our dollar is worth more than their denominations of currency. Imports are discouraged from France, Great Britain and other European nations and they are encouraged from the United States. How does it work out? Goods similar to those of typically French production are manufactured in this country and that means that the manufacturer of these goods is given a protection three or four times as much as he previously enjoyed. The same thing applies to goods which usually come from Italy or goods which came from former enemy countries. But more than that, and overshadowing all these other considerations, this system penalizes goods coming from Great Britain because goods coming from Great Britain, in view of the exchange situation and the manner in which it is handled by this Government, pay far more duty than they should pay and far more duty than was intended when the tariff schedules were prepared.

What is the object of all this? There are only two explanations for this conduct—either that the Government does not understand what it is doing or that it is giving to its protectionist manufacturing friends a double dose of protection. It is either one thing or the other. The Government is on the horns of a dilemma; it may choose whichever horn it wishes to sit upon but neither will be comfortable. The United States do not do that sort of thing. The United States, when they come to levy duties on goods coming from Europe and elsewhere, take the current rate of exchange, taking the basis upon which their currency is being accepted with the Italian, French or Belgian currency and levy duties accordingly. The fact of the matter is that our foreign trade, our chance of doing business with these people, is being seriously affected by the action of the Government. Not only that but before we can have a satisfactory world to live in, before we can have normal trade conditions, Europe must resume its pre-war conditions in so far as trade is concerned. Imports from these countries ought rather to be encouraged than discouraged because so long as Europe cannot sell to us, as long as we have to buy from the United States, we are likely to see our dollar bill reduced in value as compared to the American currency because the rate of exchange is not governed merely by the relations of trade between the United States and Canada but between Canada and the rest of the world, and European business has an effect on the rate of exchange with the United States. The net result is that trade with the United States is being artificially encouraged and trade with Great Britain, France, and the rest of Europe is being artificially discouraged.

The minister went on to speak about the deficit with which this country is faced for the year to come. There are three ways of making both ends meet. The first is to increase one's revenue, not always possible; the second is to decrease one's expenditure, generally possible though often very unpleasant, and the third is to do something along both lines; that is to increase one's revenue and to decrease one's expenditure. I have examined with care the Estimates for the coming year for the purpose of discovering that trend towards economy so eloquently spoken of by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce last night. Running over the Estimates—and, Mr. Speaker I do not wish to weary the House with a mass of figures—I find that there are a number of services which I think it would be difficult to reduce—I do not say impossible, but suggestions for their reduction could only come after the most careful examination and after one had full information which I believe only those in charge of tthe departmeent, or who had made a special investigation of the department, would be able to give. I do not propose to criticise at this time the expenditure on civil government, administration of justice, penitentiaries, legislation, agriculture, immigration, pensions or superannuation, but when I come to the question of Militia and Defence, when I see that we have a proposal to expend at the close of a war which was to end war, $12,498,506, an increase of over $4,000,000, I must ask again: Are the people of Canada sane folk or are they continuing the mad race which has been carried on in Europe when we see Poland spending about six times her national income on her army and when we see France spending as much on her army as she did before the war and when it would seem as though the lesson of the war had not been learned.

What was the lesson of the war? The lesson of the war was that what was known as preparedness or military expenditure was no security for the countries which incurred that expenditure. During the years before the war, Mr. Speaker, those responsible for the military and naval expenditure in different countries went to the taxpayers and said: What you are paying for these services is merely by way of insurance. Give us another army corps, give

us some more dreadnoughts, and you will be safe. I know it was difficult when one great nation had set the pace for other great nations to refrain from keeping step —I realize that. But that nation that set the pace has suffered for the setting of the pace—it lies prostrate to-day. What reason is there, unless other nations are imbued with the same miserable, proud, arrogant, selfish, aggrandizing militarisms which cursed Germany—what right is there for a continuation of that policy to-day? And are we to follow in its footsteps? Canada was one of the most unmilitary nations of the world. I suppose our expenditure on military and naval services before the war, compared to our size, was as small as that of any other nation in the world. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, was there a nation when it got into the struggle that did better? Did our young men who came from the farms, and the counting-house, the warehouse—did they do as well or did they do better than men who had spent three or four years of their life as conscript soldiers? I ask the House to agree with me that we can save at least $4,000,000 on our expenditure on military services this year. Let the boys who fought for four years overseas enjoy their summer holiday this year in some other way than in camp. I am sure that often when they were overseas they thought of the happy times they had spent in Canada on lake and on river, or in the woods. If the need arises again—please God it will not—they will do their duty once more; but let us lead the way in peace—as we led the way on this continent in war—towards reasonable retrenchment and a stopping of this mad race of armament, this mad race of militarism. I say in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, that the great standing armies which were supposed to be the bulwark of the safety of the different nations which supported them were sources of danger rather than sources of protection. I say this: That if one-tenth of the expenditures which Europe devoted to military armament and military services had been expended for the purpose of trying to organize international friendship and peace the war would never have come. I say that militarism has shown that it is a ghastly failure and a stupid mistake, and I ask the people of this, my country, to show the way to cut down that expenditure and to save the money of the people—aye, and perhaps save the future of Canada.

[Mr. McMaster.]

When I spoke like this some months ago the then Minister of Militia and Defence said: We do not fear another war but we have internal unrest in the country. That is one reason why we propose doubling the permanent force in Canada. To that I made reply then, and I make reply now: That is not the way to keep peace in Canada. Restore free speech; restore a free press; let the people know that the destinies of this country are to be decided by votes—by ballots and not by bullets. If there is unrest in the country give the people an opportunity to select the governors that they wish to have govern them, and you will have no necessity to increase the permanent force.

Now we come to another phase of the question. I find that Railways and Canals, chargeable to capital are responsible for a very large sum of money. My advice to the Government would be that we should save on everything; we should refuse to take on any expenditures except those that are absolutely necessary. Mr. Speaker, you are connected with a large business. If you had a deficit staring you in the face of something like half your ordinary revenue, would you propose to enlarge your plant? No one would do it in private life; no one should do it in public life. I find that the Hudson Bay railway is responsible for $100,000. The Hudson Bay railway I know is dear to the hearts of some of my Western friends, but I would be recreant in my duty if I allowed that fact to weigh with what I have to say. I think that perhaps we are over-built with railways in Canada just at the present moment, and I can see no harm in postponing the expenditure of that money. We propose to expend five and a half million dollars on the Welland ship canal. Well, surely the present canal system can take care of the business that is offering this coming summer, with this tremendous increase in the debt of the country. The Trent canal is responsible for $400,000. Surely that can also be postponed. It has been suggested that men who represent counties in this House are always willing to suggest economies for the neighbouring counties. Well, "Let the galled jade wince, my withers are unwrung." I have not been very long a member of this House, but I have never asked for the expenditure of one dollar in my county, unnecessarily—not one dollar for a public work—and I doubt if I have asked for the expenditure of one dollar for any purpose, in the constituency. I would raise my voice

in unison with the voice of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I would ask him to go even further and see whether he cannot cut out some of these trade commissioners whose reports, when they are read, show that they must spend a good deal of their time holding down their chairs.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is not the right representation of their work.

Mr. McMASTER: Well, that is what one would gather from some of their reports. At any rate, my hon. friend can look into the matter; he can promise consideration in his usual considerate manner.

We now come to Railways and Canals, chargeable to income, $50,000,000. Surely there is something to be saved there. Oh, that I could revivify in the soul of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that passion for economy which he showed between 1896 and 1911!

We now come to Public Works, chargeable to capital $6,400,000. We find Esquimalt dry dock, $500,000; Port Arthur and something else, $600,000; Quebec harbour, $150,000; St. John harbour, $1,250,000; Toronto harbour—and oh, it would be gratifying to have the amount of tonnage which clears from that interesing place year by year—$1,700,000; while the breakwater on the Island—that pleasant place dear to the hearts of Torontonians—calls for an expenditure of $200,000. Then we have Public Works chargeable to income; and here Mr. Speaker, I would draw your attention to the fact, that the Amherst drill hall calls for $25,000. Surely this expenditure on the Amherst drill hall might very well be postponed. Then there is a public building in Granby, which calls for an expenditure of $18,000.

An hon. MEMBER: Where is Granby?

Mr. McMASTER: I trust, Mr. Speaker, that for this offence I shall not be called to order too often. The Toronto Postal Station calls for an expenditure of $425,000. Portage la Prairie has not been forgotten, although the Laprairie motor road may have been neglected many years, and that calls for an expenditure of $25,000.

Then comes an expenditure to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. For years past in the Northwest Territories we had a magnificent police force—a police force of great prestige and the finest in the world. To-day we find it merged into the Royal Dominion Police Force; and that merging means $500,000. Surely the Royal Northwest Mounted Police might well have been left in the Northwest Territories, and the administration of order in this part of the Dominion left, as hitherto, to the provincial authorities. Was Eastern Canada such a desperately dangerous place to live in prior to the bringing east of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police? Is it necessary for us to see on the streets of this city the splendid figures of those strapping young men in their red coats and spurs? When I visited Europe I never liked to see the armed gendarmerie in the streets of Paris or elsewhere, and I do not like to see them in the streets of Ottawa or elsewhere in this country.

It is said of the late Sir Richard Cartwright, after he had examined the Estimates for wharves in Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, that he ejaculated: "Is there a cove forgot?" And when I look at the provisions made for wharves and breakwaters throughout Eastern Canada, I have this suggestion to make to any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who are responsible for the present administration of our affairs: That they should along with the Estimates print statistics of the number of vessels and the tonnage of those vessels which cleared from these various wharves during the last year of navigation. I cannot tell whether all these wharves are necessary; they may be; if they are, we will have to go on paying for them, but surely something could be saved along this line.

Now let us look at the next item to which I would draw the attention of the House: Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, $1,250,000. If there is one class of people who have been making money during the last two years, it is steamship owners. They have been making money to such an extent that even a single voyage would pay for the cost of the ship. Under those circumstances, surely there would be room for cutting out these annual subventions that have to be voted year by year. I find an item of $340,666.66 for a steamship service between Canada and the West Indies or South America. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) has just placed a large number of boats in commission, at a very heavy cost to the country. It is true that, according to his statement, interest has been earned upon that outlay; but nevertheless the capital expenditure has been very large. Now, he cannot expect to be allowed to build ships and operate them, and at the same time to pay other people for building ships and oper-

ating them; it is not reasonable. There certainly is room for economy there. Our steamship subsidies should, in the light of present conditions, be very carefully scritinized.

I see on the other side of the House the member for Lambton East (Mr. Armstrong). I trust that I will have his support, as his eloquent voice has been raised in this Chamber on many occasions to show us the extortionate profits that the steamship companies have been making, and to be consistent he ought to support my demand in regard to these maritime subventions.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will he?

Mr. McMASTER: I find there are also subsidies to wrecking plants to the amount of $35,000. Surely that industry might stand on its own legs, or rather sail on its own ship's bottom.

Then I come to Public Works, $20,000,000 for the Government shipbuilding programme. Well I have already said all I have to say in that connection on another occasion, and I do not wish to delay the House by repeating it.

But there are two other items in the Estimates to which I wish to draw attention, they are the subventions paid by the Government to two press associations, the first being to the Canadian Press Association to the amount of $50,000. I say that that is a very vicious subvention.—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: —I say it is a vicious practice for a government to subsidize a press. The other item is $20,000 for the Associated Press. I do not believe that the Government is now printing the Official Record. I think that that interesting periodical has disappeared—to the regret of none,—

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is too bad.

Mr. McMASTER: —from the periodical lists of this country.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Puffery.

Mr. McMASTER: You know, Mr. Speaker, years ago when a person wanted to clinch an argument, he would say, "I saw it in print." Now if one wants to discredit an argument in a friendly manner, one says, "Oh, that is just newspaper talk." That signalizes the depreciation which the press has suffered in public opinion. And the press for their own sake, as well as the Government for its own sake and for the sake of the pockets of the people should put a stop to these payments; there should be a free press.

I believe that the journalists of this country are high-minded men, I believe that they want to say the right thing—whether they are always at liberty to say the right thing is another matter.

Now, I have endeavoured to show and perhaps at greater length than I should have attempted—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. McMASTER: —the economies, which should be practised. As a matter of fact I would like to trace out the footsteps that the Government may follow in continuing their trend towards economy.

The new tax proposals I will now deal with. And just let me say here, how delightful it was last night to listen to the Minister of Trade and Commerce talk, not about Union party—he had forgotten all about the Union party—but about the Liberal-Conservative party, about which he talked with enthusiasm. I understand that a political club in Ottawa is now waiting to know what the Government is going to do so that it may be in a position to style itself either a Union or a Liberal-Conservative club. But, after all, it must be difficult to make these changes. One man in his time plays many parts, and my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) used last night one of the various titles of his party —the Unionist party, the Liberal-Conservative party, the Conservative party and the Tory party—mais, pour moi, toujours la même chose! But for me, Mr. Speaker, always the same thing.

Before attempting to consider the duties which the minister has brought down, may I make this preliminary observation: That these taxes should not have been brought down before the minister had informed us that he had exhausted other and more direct means of taxation. During the last five years, there has been in this country a great deal of money heaped up in a comparatively few hands. During the war there were those who called, with all sincerity, "for the last man and the last dollar." But some others there were who crying the most loudly meant the last dollar they could get out of the situation—and they got it.

Now, in Great Britain, to which I like to go for examples in sound finance, a Committee of the Treasury has reported that a levy on war wealth is perfectly feasible and would bring into the coffers of the State a very large sum of money.

Now, I will say this for the very wealthy people in the part of the country from which I come: That their sons and the young men among them left their luxurious homes and went to the front as gallantly and as gladly as those in humbler circumstances. I believe that there are many among the rich men of Canada who would have no objection to giving up a very large portion of the wealth which they made during the war, provided that the tax strikes everybody equally; that all are treated alike. I think that the Minister of Finance has been somewhat negligent, if I may dare to use the word, in not sounding to the bottom that proposal and either bringing it in or explaining to us why it cannot be brought in.

Mr. CURRIE: Will the hon. gentleman permit me to put a question to him, now that he is on that very interesting subject? I would like to know his own view; would he favour a direct levy on wealth in this country?

Mr. McMASTER: I would certainly advocate a direct levy on war wealth; that is to say, wealth which was accumulated because of the war. It seems to me that that is an absolutely proper subject of taxation. Whether a levy on all wealth would be required is another matter; I would like to exhaust the possibilities of the levy on war wealth before I went into the question of a levy on all wealth. But I may point out to the hon. member that we have to find money; we have to pay back a large part of the debt, while the level of prices is high. To-day with a bushel of wheat you can pay off, I suppose, three dollars of the national debt, but if we wait for ten years until foodstuffs resume their normal price level, we may find that it will require three bushels of wheat to pay off three dollars of the debt.

Let me make also this preliminary observation. Excise duties which have been brought down are open to the objection which pertains to all duties on consumption; that is to say, they are unequal in their incidence. Take a man who has "his quiver full"; let us say that he has six children. The man who lives next door, with an equal income, has perhaps only one child. Any tax founded on consumption is bound to strike much more heavily the man with the six children than the man who has only one child.

4 p.m. These excise taxes are open to this objection; a tariff, even a tariff for revenue, is open to the same objection.

I should also like to direct the attention of the House to the fact that the excise duties now proposed are superimposed on the tariff, and that they should rather be countervailing to the tariff. Let me illustrate. Suppose I have some money which I can invest in a motor car,—a somewhat unwarranted suggestion, but let us make it for the purpose of argument. If I go to Detroit, buy a car for $1,000, and bring it into Canada, I will pay, under the new duty of 35 per cent, the 7½ per cent having been taken off, $350 by way of customs duty, and then I will pay a 15 per cent excise tax or $225, a total payment to the Government of $575. But suppose instead of going as far as Detroit I stop at Toronto and buy a car there; I will find that I can purchase a car equivalent to the car that would cost me $1,000 in Detroit, for just about $1,500. But how much will the Government get out of my purchase? $225 instead of $575. What we have to do in this country is to deflect into the treasury a great deal of the money which is going into the pockets of the privileged classes, the manufacturers. The ex-Minister of Finance, the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), whose moderation in statement is known and appreciated by all members of this House, last year said that he believed that for every dollar that went into the treasury of the country through the operations of the tariff, at least two dollars went into the pockets of private interests. What we have to do is to take some portion of that two dollars and deflect it into the treasury, not leave it in the pockets of the protected manufacturers.

Now, let us see how this would work out. Suppose instead of superimposing a tax of 15 per cent on motor cars we impose an excise tax of 10 per cent on imported motor cars and of 20 per cent on home produced motor cars. What would the result be? The profits of manufacturers of motor cars would be somewhat reduced, and I do not think that would hurt the country. The trasury would benefit by a very large amount and the consumer would not pay any more than he is paying now. Surely that should appeal to the Government, if it wants to get on the road to economy.

In all other countries—perhaps I should not say in all other countries, but certainly in Great Britain—the principle of a countervailing excise tax has been admitted and has been operated. For instance, into India there is imported year by year a vast quantity of cotton. A tax of 10 per cent, I think, is collected by the Indian

authorities upon the cotton which comes into the country, but a countervailing duty of 10 per cent is placed upon the cotton manufactured in India in order that no private interest in that country may enjoy the benefit of special privilege and in order that the Government may reap the full benefit of the tax. I think that that point will appeal very strongly to the people of Canada.

There is another point which I wish to make in connection with the excise proposal. An excise tax should bear not on necessities but primarily on goods the consumption of which is to be discouraged rather than encouraged, such as an excise on beer and whisky. These are to be discouraged—

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. McMASTER: I say so frankly; they are to be discouraged; an excise tax on these commodities is perfectly proper. When required, an excise tax is quite proper on luxuries. But if the Minister of Finance were in his seat I would ask him if he thinks that boots at $9 a pair are a luxury? If he goes into any store in the city to-day and asks for a pair of boots that will last him any time, he will pay a great deal more than $9 for them. The same with men's suits and women's dresses, where $45 is the limit; you cannot buy for $45 a suit that will wear. If there is any class of the community which deserves the sympathy and the care of the Government to-day it is the black-coated proletariat, the people who have retired on small incomes; the rentier; the annuitant; the clergyman; the clerk; the salaried class; the civil servant,—they all deserve the protection, the care and the thought of the Government. They have to wear clothes such as their employees wear. Their womenkind, who move in the same circle as their employers' wives, have to be respectably and properly dressed; and by placing a luxury tax on boots over $9 and on a suit or dress over $45 you are taxing the people of this country who of all others should not be taxed, because of all others they have suffered the most from the high cost of living. I see one of my farmer friends smiling. It is true that the farmer too, has to pay a great deal more for what he buys, but I am very glad to say he also is getting very much more for what he has to sell.

Most of the economic ideas of this Tory or Conservative or Liberal-Conservative or Unionist Government come from the United States. They have a luxury tax in the United States, and no doubt the Minister of Finance got his idea of the luxury tax from there. But in the United States the tax is only applied on the excess over the price up to which the article is exempt. For instance, if in the United States they had a luxury tax of 10 per cent on a pair of shoes over $9 the man who bought a pair of shoes for $10 would only have to pay 10 per cent on the difference between $9 and $10, but here, if I understand the example given by the Commissioner of Taxation, Mr. Breadner, if you buy a pair of shoes over $9 you have to pay 10 per cent on the whole purchase price. I see my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) shaking his head. That is the explanation given in the Ottawa Citizen this morning.

Mr. CURRIE: I have been in the United States and I ought to know. The tax is payable on the whole purchase price there, just the same as it is here.

Mr. McMASTER: My information is to the contrary.

Mr. LALOR: Like the hon. member for Simcoe, I know something about this matter, and he is absolutely right in his statement.

Mr. McMASTER: Am I wrong in my statement?

Mr. LALOR: Yes, there is no question about it.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not buy as much in the United States as my Tory friends on the other side, but I understood that my explanation was correct, and I gave it to the House in good faith.

Mr. LALOR: I am sure the hon. member does not want to make a mis-statement. I can tell him that he is absolutely wrong.

Mr. McMASTER: I am quite willing to admit that my friends from Ontario know more about buying things from Buffalo and Detroit than I do, because I buy at home in Montreal, where I live. As the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) points out, with his usual logic, it is a very ridiculous tax if it is imposed in that way.

Mr. EULER: My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) is absolutely correct in his statement that in the United States the tax is paid only on the excess over a certain amount. I know that from personal experience.

Mr. McMASTER: My explanation of this difference of opinion is that when a Liberal

goes into an American store they size him up and know they cannot put anything over on him, but when my hon. friends opposite go in, they charge them 10 per cent on the whole amount. Perhaps another explanation is that they have more money to pay the tax with.

Mr. LALOR: If the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Euler) will come to Buffalo with me, and his statement is correct, I will buy him a new hat.

Mr. MURPHY: He is too young for that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must remind hon. members that the House is not in committee, and that the hon. member for Brome has the floor.

Mr. McMASTER: I only wish the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) would make his offer of a hat one of a complete outfit, pay the expenses both ways, and extend the invitation to me. I think we have had a pleasant little interlude, Mr. Speaker, but the point I want to make is that this is a very serious matter for the class of people I have spoken of, many of whom are doing some of the most valuable of the nation's work for very slender remuneration. I say that this luxury tax is only a pseudo-luxury tax; it is really a tax on necessities.

There is another matter I wish to bring before the House, and that is the tax on sporting goods. It strikes me as a pretty poor picayune sort of thing to tax the boys' skates and the girls' skis and the youngster's baseball. I do not believe that a great deal of revenue will be obtained from this tax. I think it is a poor return for the splendid services the youth have rendered this country in the last few years to tax the implements of their innocent pleasure. Why, I find in the Estimates, that mine of information, that this Government is giving $5,000 to the Boy Scouts and $3,000 to the Girl Guides to encourage them, no doubt, in outdoor sport, and then they take that help away with the other hand by taxing their staves and the bowie knives they wear and things of that sort.

I have no objection to the raising of the rate of taxation on large incomes. We have to find the money, and a man with an income of $50,000 or $60,000, even if the Government take $20,000 from him, can struggle along, no doubt, on what is left. But let me say this: The Government, having imposed a direct tax on the necessities of life, must give some relief under their income tax proposals to men with large families. The present relief amounts to nothing; it is a bagatelle. In my own case I think it amounted to $48 last year. That will buy about four pairs of shoes; it amounts to nothing. The exemption should be very substantially raised in view of these new excise taxes.

Now I come to what I trust will be an interesting part of my remarks; it was certainly an interesting part of the remarks made by the Minister of Finance. He referred us to a statement which he issued, I presume to the press, on the 15th of December last, in which he referred to a promise made by the hon. member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White) when occupying the position of Finance Minister, to the effect that during the coming year there would be an investigation into trade conditions which would determine the action of the Government in regard to the tariff. The legal training of the Minister of Finance came out when he asked the people to put their suggestions and complaints in writing. The Minister of Finance told us yesterday that after this had been done, he would go out and investigate matters. But what was even more interesting was the way in which he laid down the tariff platform of the Unionist party. He said:

> Our policy calls for a thorough revision of the tariff—

He does not say whether up or down.

> —with a view to the adoption of such reasonable measures as are necessary (a) to assist in providing adequate revenues.

There is no objection to be taken to that proposal;

> (b) to stabilize legitimate industries and to encourage the establishment of new industries essential to the proper economic development of the nation.

I have some questions to ask in this connection. What does my hon. friend mean by stabilizing industries? When the Government had bonds upon the market and they were going down below par the Government stabilized those bonds by expending the people's money and buying them in. Does stabilizing industries mean that when an industry in this country goes below par, when it is not effectively managed, when it needs support, the Government shall stabilize it by giving it more tariff protection? Is that the meaning of stabilizing industry? If it is I take very sharp issue with the minister on that ground. He speaks of legitimate industries. What are legitimate industries in this country? I will answer that. Legitim-

ate industries are those which can stand on their own feet, and pay their own way, and which do not require to be bonused by the taxpayers of this country.

Then the Minister of Finance added:

—to the end that a proper and ever-increasing field of useful and remunerative employment be available for the nation's workers.

Oh, how old that sort of language is! We heard it when the National Policy was preached in 1878. I am quite sure that the Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke words similar to those in 1878 when the Conservative party got in, and from 1878 to 1896 the trails from Canada to the United States were thick with people who were pulling up their stakes in this country and crossing the line. There was no real turn in the tide until 1896 when the Liberal Government did reduce the tariff. It is true that the Minister of Trade and Commerce may try to make fun of that statement, but it cannot be gainsaid that there was a reduction. It did not go as far as I should have liked, nor was it persisted in to the extent that I should have liked; but there was a reduction and it redounded to the advantage of the country. Further, the minister said:

—to develop to the fullest extent our natural resources.

Well, we all desire that; it is a question as to means.

—to specially promote and increase trade with the Mother Country, the sister dominions and colonies and Crown dependencies.

I have pointed out the manner in which this Government has developed trade with the United Kingdom by the way in which it handles exchange, which discourages imports from the United Kingdom and encourages imports from the United States. I see nothing in this statement as to trade with the great neighbour to the south of us, and I cannot understand the mentality of the man who looks for trade in the West Indies before he looks for it in the United States of America.

—to prevent the abuse of the tariff for the exploitation of the consumer, and to safeguard the interests of the Canadian people in the existing world struggle for commercial and industrial supremacy.

Why will these protectionists always talk about commerce as if it were war? Commerce is not war, but mutual service, and the interdependence of peoples, fostered and brought about by commerce, is one of the surest guarantees of world peace. I will not weary the House with reading any further from the speech.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. McMASTER: If hon. members desire that I should go on I shall comply with their request?

As a means of raising revenue the tariff should be so adjusted as to place the chief burden upon those best able to bear it. Articles of luxury should be heavily taxed through the imposition of customs and excise rates. Food commodities and other necessaries of life, not produced or manufactured in Canada, should, if taxed at all,—

Note the subjunctive, Mr. Speaker.

—if taxed at all, bear only such imposts as are necessary for revenue purposes. Those produced in Canada should be subjected to such customs duties only as may be necessary in the general national interest to be determined after strict investigation from time to time.

The minister continues in that strain. Now, I have some remarks to make upon this pronouncement of policy. First, it is indefinite; and, secondly, I say that in so far as it possesses anything of a definite character at all, it is a re-statement of the old National Policy, the old protectionist National Policy. And I for one should be glad if the Minister of Finance, as soon as the Franchise Bill is passed, would ask for a mandate from the people upon this old National Policy. We would meet him, and if fair argument appeals to the Canadian people, and if the Canadian people are, as I have no doubt whatever they are, intelligent folks, when the election was over we would be sitting on that side of the House and hon. gentlemen who are sitting there now would be on this side?

An hon. MEMBER: Which of them would be here?

Mr. McMASTER: I am speaking of those who might happen to come back. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me contrast these generalities that I have quoted with what is the policy of the Liberal party on the trade question,—a policy laid down by one of the most representative conventions of the progressive forces of Canada, one of the most intelligent and well-informed conventions that ever sat in this or any other country, a convention which was representative of the thought not only of Eastern Canada but of Western Canada as well. That convention arrived at this resolution with practical unanimity. Mark, Mr. Speaker, the following plain, straight and easily understood statement which requires no explanation at all:

That the best interests of Canada demand that substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest

importance: First, diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people: second, reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resourres of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country.

That, to these ends, wheat, wheat flour and all products of wheat, the principal articles of food, farm implements and machinery, farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery—

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance broached this question in some of his remarks. He said that for the purpose of encouraging the fullest development of our natural resources the tariff should be so adjusted as to permit machinery and implements of production to be purchased at prices which would compare equitably with those paid in other countries for similar articles. Now, I would almost think—

Mr. LALOR: May I interrupt the hon. member to ask if he has read the whole resolution?

Mr. McMASTER: I am going to read it. I shall read the whole of it; I am commenting on it as I go along. I would almost think that the Minister of Finance had been reading this resolution and had been struck by its wisdom, that he had been about to indite something similar to it when his hand was stayed by the more experienced hand of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who said, "What are you going to do? Are you putting into our platform a part of the Liberal party's platform? Don't forget that you belong to the Liberal-Conservative party. You must not do anything like that." The resolution continues:

—and repair parts thereof, rough and partly dressed lumber, gasolene, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils, nets, net twines and fishermen's equipments, cements and fertilizers, should be free from customs duties, as well as the raw material entering into the same.

That a revision downwards—

You know, Mr. Speaker, the promise of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance just calls for a thorough revision, but he does not tell us in what direction that revision is to go.

That a revision downwards of the tariff should be made whereby substantial reductions should be effected in the duties on wearing apparel and footwear, and on other articles of general consumption (other than luxuries), as well as on the raw material entering into the manufacture of the same.

That the British preference be increased to 50 per cent of the general tariff.

There is a specific proposal. Compare it for a moment with the vague generality of my learned and hon. friend the Minister of Finance:

—to specially promote and increase trade with the Mother Country, the sister dominions and colonies and Crown dependencies.

Is there any statement made there that there is going to be so much in their favour? No, that is left for the future to disclose. If I remember aright, the old Conservative party, in the days gone by, abused in unsparing measure my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's when he introduced the British preference. But now a change has come over the spirit of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and he proposes, but not in any definite language, to foster trade relations with the Old Land:

And the Liberal party hereby pledges itself to implement by legislation the provisions of this resolution when returned to power.

That is the tariff plank of the Liberal party. It closely approximates, although it is not in all respects precisely similar to the tariff policy of that other great progressive force in this country, the Farmers' party.

Let us see for a moment why we think this is the proper time to adopt this policy. I believe that protection is an evil thing, I believe it brings evil and not good to the people, the manufacturers and the Government of Canada, and that its influence throughout the world has been for harm. I believe with the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, that in the beneficent wisdom of Providence He intended each part of His footstool to supply out of its surplus the other parts and that all should form one whole. I believe that by an adherence to this policy we shall find peace for the world as well as increased wealth for ourselves.

There are two great causes which have made for international jealousy. Chauvinism, or Imperialism, is one, and Protection is the other. The great protectionist nations in Europe were anxious to increase the ambit of their power for what reason? That they might exploit the peoples and the resources of the uncivilized nations that might come under the power of their governments. I believe that few things have made so much for international discord as the principle of protection.

We have reached a time in the history of this country when every ounce of national energy and every dollar of national capital have to be put into those channels which will produce the greatest economic return, not only in this country but all the world over. In a book written by Mr. Keynes,

an authority who is admired all over the English-speaking world, he proposes a remedy for the ills of the war, and what is that remedy? That Europe shall become a free trade territory—a free trade entity. We have a tremendous amount of wastage to make good. The world has five years of wastage to make good and that we can only do with reasonable celerity by each nation devoting its energy and capital to those lines of activity in which it has the greatest advantage and then by a free interchange among them all. That is the policy which the Liberal party aim at in the future. That is the policy which I wish to see adopted in this country. I do not propose that it shall be adopted to-morrow. I am willing to give every reasonable opportunity for men who have developed their industries under a false economic system to adjust themselves to the new conditions, but we have to move forward and we have to move forward with sufficient speed not only to show in what direction we are going, but also to show that real progress has been made.

There has been in years gone by in the mouth of my protectionist friends an argument which has appealed to me as not being sound, but as being arguable. It is this: We would be prepared to do away with the tariff or at least accept freer trade provided we had a market to enable us to carry on production upon a large scale, because when you have production on a large scale you are as a rule able to reduce the cost of the unit. For many years the United States maintained a high tariff against the importation of Canadian goods. But the United States has turned from being a highly protected nation, from a nation which collected most of its revenue through a tariff, to a nation which collects 95 per cent of its revenues through direct taxation. Where as in the last fiscal year the United States, with a population fourteen times or thereabouts greater than ours, collected through its tariff about $189,000,000, we collected through our tariff $169,000,000, the United States collecting less than $20-000,000 more than we collected. The United States has a free list much more extensive than the free list we have. The United States has become much freer in regard to trade than it was before. We cannot expect to exist on the northern half of this continent as an independent political power unless we are able to have a fiscal policy as economically sound as that of our neighbours to the South. We cannot expect to attract and hold people in this country unless we are prepared to give them as good

[Mr. McMaster.]

living conditions as they will find on the plains of Dakota or of the Argentine Republic. It is not merely a question of economic theory; it is a condition as well as a theory which confronts us, and that condition is that we have spent vast sums of public money to develop our western lands which are largely empty, and until these western lands are filled up the great capital expenditures that this country has incurred will not carry themselves. We cannot fill up these great lands of the West unless we are prepared to give to the newcomers and to give to those who are already there conditions which will enable them to meet the competition which they have to meet when they export their products to the markets of the world.

In order that the fact of the United States has now a very large free list may be borne in on the minds of the people of this country I have arranged their free list in a series which I call "Reduction Rimes." This is very low grade poetry, and I would not have dared to place it on Hansard if I had not been encouraged by the action of the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who last night made an incursion into Shakespeare and referred us to the grapes of Escol. Even if this is an inferior brand of poetry it is original. We have no assurance that Shakespeare is original; some people say that it was Bacon who wrote the works that are attributed to Shakespeare. This is a list of the things which are on the American free list:

Reduction Rimes.

Setting out the many articles now upon the U.S. free list.

Agricultural implements, first on our list,
Next animals for breeding must not be missed.
Bread, biscuits and buckwheat are next in the line,
While flour of the latter makes pancakes so fine,
Cash registers, machines for setting up type,
Show that for trade progress the U.S. is ripe,
While sewing machines, the housewife's delight,
Keep company good with the typewriter bright.
Machinery for shoes and Portland cement
Join the procession of nothing per cent.
Coal, coffee and cocoa come next in a row,
Cotton and corn from where warm breezes blow;
Eggs, fish, fats and berries march next in the line,
With furs, skins and gloves to withstand a cold clime,
Grease, fats and oils which do similar work,
While lard and lard compounds their duty don't shirk;
To warm up the feet they use duty free boots,
While harness on horse helps get in the roots;

Free beef, veal and mutton they greatly enjoy,
While hams, lamb and bacon no duties annoy.
Nails, staples and horseshoes are on the free list,
Tacks, needles and oilcake must never be missed.
Oils for eating, for lighting, of all sorts, are found,
While rye, sago and salt are not to be bound.
Seeds to increase their production so great
Are found with the haddock, the cod and the skate.
Swine, cattle and sheep, the boundary cross,
Join wheat, tea and tallow without fiscal loss;
Barbed wire as in Canada now pays no tax,
Nor do logs, planks or clapboards to cover the cracks.
Wool of sheep, camels' hair are the last on my list;
I need not declare there are many I've missed.

Mr. Speaker, protection as a policy for this country is not only dead, but, after the next election, it will, as Disraeli said, be damned.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine): Mr. Speaker, in rising to reply to my poetical and free trade friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) I wish first of all to compliment him upon the very kindly manner in which he has treated the able Budget speech which was yesterday delivered by my colleague, the Minister of Finance. During the long speech to which we have just had the pleasure of listening, the hon. member (Mr. McMaster) has not uttered one word relating to a policy of a constructive character. He has reiterated once more his fealty to free trade principles; he has once more condemned the policy of protection for Canada; he has, in a general way, referred to the Budget, but he has not enlightened the House as to the ways and means of raising revenue that he would adopt if he were occupying a seat on the treasury benches. Later on I shall deal in greater detail with my hon. friend's remarks. Let me first take notice of his observations with respect to the Main Estimates. The gist of his argument amounted simply to this: he wants this fair, progressive and enterprising Canada of ours to fold her arms, to sit still, to put the shutters up, to let the grass grow on the steps. My hon. friend does not want any money spent on the deepening of the Welland canal, he does not want any money spent on building ships, he does not want any money spent on maintaining the militia force of Canada. In a word, he does not want any money whatever spent; he is satisfied—and I take it from the applause of the hon. gentlemen sitting around him, that they are satisfied also—to sit still and not endeavour to take advantage of, and develop, the wonderful possibilities of Canada notwithstanding the large war debt that we have to struggle with at the present time. My hon. friend made only one suggestion this afternoon, if I followed him correctly. He said that a committee of the Imperial House had considered the advisability of levying some special form—

Mr. McMASTER: May I correct my hon. friend? What I said was that a committee of the Treasury Department, not of the House—a committee of civil servants—were to examine into the matter.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am quite willing to accept the correction of my hon. friend, but it does not alter his argument. He informed this House that a proposal was under consideration in Great Britain at the present time to levy a special tax on what he is pleased to call, "war wealth." I wish to state that Great Britain has not adopted such a proposal. True, the proposal has been made, but it has not yet been adopted.

With reference to the Budget presented by the Minister of Finance yesterday, I am satisfied that it will be favourably received throughout the country, and that under the circumstances it is the very best that it was possible for any government to prepare. A close study of the Budget will reveal a few salient points worthy of notice. First of all, the luxury tax is placed on those best able to pay it; it does not apply to eatables, nor to articles of wear that are of moderate price. I am sure that the country will be perfectly satisfied that the luxury tax shall apply to those people who have money to buy boots and shoes costing over $9 a pair, or a suit of clothes that will cost over $45. It is not only fair, but it is most reasonable, that they that have the money should be those to come under this special luxury tax. It is clear to everybody except the hon. member for Brome, that this tax does not apply to persons of moderate means. I heard some reference in the House last night to the possibility that our brave and courageous women might make some objection to this luxury tax. I, for one, have no such fear. During the recent war the women of Canada showed where their hearts were; they stood loyally behind the government of the day, and our soldiers at the Front, from the very beginning of the war until its victorious conclusion. The heavy burden of taxation that now must necessarily fall upon the people is only an aftermath of that war, and I am satisfied

that the women of Canada are willing to bear their fair share of that burden. They will cheerfully do so because of the recollection of their beloved ones who will no longer return to them, for the sake of the wounded and those who will be blind forever; and for the sake of the national welfare as well.

A very important point in connection with the Budget is that it will give Canada sufficient revenue not only to take care of the ordinary expenditures, but also to pay off part of our national debt.

I wish to refer briefly to the business war profits tax. I know that there is a general feeling throughout Canada among the business men that this tax should have been dropped. I realize and appreciate the many objectionable features that pertain to it; but when we know that Great Britain is not only maintaining a similar tax, but has raised it from forty to sixty per cent, and that the United States is also retaining on her statute books a similar method of collecting money, in view of the very great necessity for Canada to obtain the necessary revenue, the Government could not see their way clear to entirely eliminate the business war profits tax.

I am sure it will be gratifying to the business men of Canada to know that there have been made certain reductions to which I need not refer in detail, as my colleague the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) dealt with them yesterday in his Budget Speech. Our Income Tax has been raised. It is not only as high as the Income Tax of our neighbour to the south, but it is still higher as a result of the five per cent added yesterday. The Government have also placed a tax on sales. It will, I think, be manifest to every one in this House and outside of it, that the burden of taxation now falls, as it properly should, on those best able to bear it.

My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) has stated that the Government have made no effort to reduce the high cost of living. I must take issue with him there, because as the Minister of Finance explained yesterday, the Government have eliminated the special war tax of 7½ per cent, thereby losing a revenue of $30,000,000. I am satisfied, and so will be every reasonable man, that that reduction of 7½ per cent must of necessity reduce the cost of living. The Government fully appreciate the urgent necessity of more revenue to take care of our war debt and our heavy expenditure, but in an honest endeavour to bring down the cost of living they made that reduction.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it might be of interest to know what our sister overseas dominion of Australia is doing in regar to tariff matters. I do not know whether she possesses as a member of her Parliament such an ardent free trader as my hon. friend from Brome, but judging from the article which I am about to refer to I should not think there are many free traders in the Parliament of the Australian Commonwealth. It will be seen from this article that the Government of Australia have revised their tariff, not downwards but upwards. I will read the article:

The Australian Tariff.

An important revision of the tariff of Australia recently made imbeds more firmly the principle of protection to native industry, increases rates of duty for revenue purposes, and provides contingently for reciprocal tariffs with British countries. A cablegram from the Canadian Trade Commissioner at Melbourne runs as follows:

"Tariff Bill introduced Parliament, March 24, and becoming operative March 25, has three schedules similar to Canadian. All embargoes and restrictions hitherto imposed upon importations such as confectionery, motor car bodies, etc., absolutely cease on May 19. Excluding existing limited African agreement, no preference has been granted any dominion, but minister stated that bill provides for reciprocal arrangements with any dominion on the basis of British preferential tariff or intermediate schedules whole or partly and to foreign countries under intermediate only but subject to approval of Parliament. Tariff strongly protective with increased British preference. Marked increase duties iron steel products, motor car chassis, and bodies."

The consequence of this legislation can scarcely be other than the contraction of the somewhat limited market Canada has hitherto found in Australia. There is a preference given Great Britain, according to one despatch, of from ten to twenty per cent, but other advices indicate a much greater preference. The tariff on manufactures of iron, for example, is said to be:

	From United Kingdom.	From Canada.
Pig iron	20s	40s
Billets	32s	65s
Wire rods	44s	80s
Black and galvanized sheets after June 1, 1922	65s	100s
At present	Free	10%
Plates and sheets heavier than 1-16, after June 1, 1922	48s	85s
At present	Free	10%
Barbed wire	68s	105s
Bolts and nuts	27½%	40%
Wood screws	Free	10%
Tacks and spikes	5½s	8s
Or, whichever is higher.	32½%	45%

If the foregoing schedule of duties is retained, there will be small chance of Canadian

manufacturers obtaining a footing in the Australian market in competition with Great Britain. Of the preferential feature of the tariff no complaint can be made, and it is the business of the Australian Parliament to legislate as seems to it in the best interest of that country, but when the avowed object of the tariff is to promote British trade, Canadians may with reason contend that as a member of the Imperial family they should not be excluded from opportunity to trade on equal grounds with the United Kingdom. There is not now, nor ever has been, a reciprocal tariff between Canada and Australia. New Zealand, South Africa, and some other British countries do enjoy the preferential tariff in respect of their exports to Canada, but Australia has hitherto declined an arrangement for reciprocal commerce. The Canadian Government should without delay open negotiations for the extension of the Australian preferential tariff to this country. The time is opportune, the need urgent. The Australian legislation opens the door, and with mutual goodwill existing, with a desire on the part of both dominions to promote Imperial trade, the hope may be entertained of more family and friendly treatment being extended to Canada than being placed on a parity with foreign nations. It has always seemed an anomaly that Canada's preferential tariff should extend to New Zealand, and not to Australia, though the fault is not that of this dominion. In any event if our trade with the Antipodes is to grow, the Government should hasten to conclude a reciprocal tariff arrangement.

That will serve to show what our sister dominion is doing. Australia evidently believes in the policy of moderate protection. Canada believes in the policy of moderate protection, I believe in that policy, and so does the Government and the party to which I have the honour to belong. I do not believe in free trade. And, Sir, there are many hon. members on the other side of the House who do not believe in free trade any more than I do.

I was rather amused to hear the hon. member for Brome this afternoon citing the tariff policy of the Liberal party as enunciated in the resolution adopted at its convention held in this city last August. I am sure the House will bear with me if I read that resolution once more, because it is well worth while to keep it very plainly before not only the members of this House but before the people of the country. It reads as follows:

> That the best interests of Canada demand that substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance: First, diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; second, reducing the cost of instruments of production—

That is a very vague expression, and I hope that when the hon. leader of the Opposition addresses the House he will explain what the Liberal party means when they refer to the "instruments of production." In my judgment, that would refer to everything that is made in this country.

> —in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country.
>
> That, to these ends,——

And here is the important part:

> —wheat, wheat flour and all products of wheat; the principal articles of food; farm implements and machinery; farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and repair parts thereof; rough and partly dressed lumber; gasoline, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils; nets, net-twines and fishermen's equipments; cements and fertilizers, should be free from customs duties, as well as the raw material entering into the same.
>
> That a revision downwards of the tariff should be made whereby substantial reductions should be effected in the duties on wearing apparel and footwear, and on other articles of general consumption (other than luxuries), as well as on the raw material entering into the manufacture of the same.
>
> That the British preference be increased to 50 per cent of the general tariff.
>
> And the Liberal party hereby pledges itself to implement by legislation the provision of this resolution when returned to power.

During the short time I have been in public life I have thought that when a great party, after having given serious consideration to the question of what their fiscal policy should be, published at a convention its deliberate policy in that regard, that policy would receive the unanimous approval of the members of the party and would be adhered to by them when speaking on the floor of this House and on public platforms. But, Mr. Speaker, the ink was hardly dry on this famous resolution before the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) delivered a speech at St. John, New Brunswick. The newspaper report which I have of the hon. gentleman's speech is headed in large type, "Mackenzie King for Free Trade." Then follows the hon. gentleman's speech, which I will now quote:

> The Liberal leader favoured the abolishment of all tariff duties,—

I cannot find that in the tariff resolution of the Liberal party. Let me quote the report in this newspaper:

> The Liberal leader favoured the abolishment of all tariff duties, all instruments of production in industries based upon the natural resources of the Dominion, such as mines, fishing, lumbering and agriculture, the development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of the country.

Well, the leader of the Opposition had scarcely delivered that speech when one of his followers, the member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) made a speech before the Liberal Reform Club in Montreal. He said nothing about the policy of free trade as enunciated by the leader of the Opposition in his St. John speech, and he carefully avoided any reference to the Liberal tariff policy as adopted at the Liberal Convention held in Ottawa during last August. But I must say that I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for West Lambton on that occasion. He said that he was a protectionist; aye, he even went so far as to say how he would fix the tariff. He said that in his opinion a tariff should not bear a lower ad valorem duty than 25 per cent. It seems strange to me that shortly after the adoption of this tariff policy at the convention in August the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) should make the strong protectionist speech that he did before the members of the Reform Club of my city. I will say this for the wisdom of my hon. friend: He knew the city that he was speaking in; he knew the proper policy to enunciate there.

Now, a by-election was held in St. James division in Montreal. If there is any constituency in Canada which does not want to listen to free trade talk or any suggestion about slaughtering the tariff so as to crush our industries, it is the constituency of St. James, Montreal. My genial and astute friend the member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) who was doing all he could to elect the hon. member who now represents that great division in this House (Mr. Rinfret), also made a very strong protectionist speech. But that is not all. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the expressions of very strong protectionist sentiment that have come from the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie). He and I do not always agree, but when it comes to tariff matters I think we do. The hon. member holds good, strong, protectionist views, and how he could have swallowed the policy that was adopted at the Liberal convention last August, how he could have stood for that platform, is more than I am able to comprehend.

But I understand also, Mr. Speaker, that all was not milk and honey at that convention. By the little birds who chirped on that occasion and who were not in the know—that is, in the inner circle—I have been informed that many good and true Liberal protectionists strongly objected to the proposed tariff resolution when it was being considered by a committee, and that they were absolutely opposed to it on the floor of the convention. Not only that; the Liberal Premier of British Columbia also made a speech during the course of the convention in which he expressed himself as being opposed to the Liberal policy as I have just given it. Moreover, Sir Lomer Gouin, the greatest French Canadian Liberal that we have in the province of Quebec, made a speech in the city of Quebec at a meeting which was attended also by my colleague, the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen). The Minister of the Interior and Sir Lomer Gouin both made protectionist speeches on that occasion, and notwithstanding the eloquence and convincing logic of the Minister of the Interior—and he never was in better form than he was at that banquet—the Premier of Quebec excelled him—and made a much stronger protectionist speech than did even my colleague. The papers did not publish the speech of the Premier of Quebec, but I have it here and I will read what Sir Lomer Gouin said on that occasion:

> I understand that you feel anxious on a certain question of public policy with regard to the future of your industry.

Referring to the boot and shoe industry.

> I mean the tariff. This was the theme of the speech I read this morning. I would not like to be excommunicated—

Listen to this:

> I would not like to be excommunicated for what I will say now, but I would like to speak my mind very candidly.
>
> I remember the day when many, too many, of our people, labourmen, farmers and merchants, had to leave the province of Quebec and emigrate to the United States. At that time I know there were very few manufacturers in the province of Quebec. I could not say why so many left Quebec, but they had to go for one reason or another.
>
> We now have manufacturers in Montreal, Quebec, Trois Rivières, Sherbrooke, and all our centres of a certain importance, and I cannot help but think that these manufacturers have contributed to bring back many of those who had gone and to keep with us many who would have had to go were it not for such industries.
>
> What we want in Quebec is a tariff that will keep our industries going—

A little different from the tariff policy of my friend, the leader of the Opposition.

> —our labourmen working for good wages, and the most deserving of all our citizens—our good farmers—content and prosperous.
>
> I am not asking for a tariff of 15 per cent, 25 per cent, 30 per cent, or 40 per cent; give us a fair tariff that will keep alive honest industry on our good soil of Canada.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the wise words of one of the ablest statesmen in Canada,

a man whose utterances and policies carry far more weight in the commercial metropolis of Canada, the city of Montreal, than do any words of my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster).

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to live in the province of Quebec since my boyhood days,—and it is indeed a great privilege to live in that province and to mingle with our French-Canadian friends. So far as I know their views on fiscal questions they are not free traders; they are protectionists. But I am afraid that the new Liberal party of to-day is in the hands of reactionaries and young bloods and that the old policy that was carried out for fifteen years by the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the then Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is no longer the policy of the Liberal party. Last night that veteran statesman the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) rose in his place and made statements like this: "I have been criticized by my party for believing in the policy of protection, but I still believe in it. I have been criticized by certain members of my party because I was willing when I was Minister of Finance to assist infant industries; I have no regrets or apologies to offer now. I thought that was the right policy then, and I think it the right policy now." Again, he said that during his term of office—and he certainly was a most excellent Minister of Finance—he gave certain bonuses to the steel industry in this country. He was criticized at the time, he said but he believed in bonuses then, and he believes in bonuses now. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask hon. members of this House and I ask the people of the country how they can judge; how they can form any opinion as to the policy of hon. members opposite? True they did draw up this policy, but the leader of the Opposition, as I have said, deviated from it, because he said in the city of St. John that he was in favour of free trade.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was not here when my hon. friend read the particular despatch from a paper, but two or three times he has mentioned in my presence that in the speech which I made at St. John I departed from what is laid down in the platform of the Liberal party. In the speech I made at St. John I was reading from the platform of the Liberal party as laid down at the convention. I said that I stood by that platform, and I repeat that statement now.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Of course, I must accept the explanation of my hon. friend, but as he was not in the House at that time I shall read what the press reported him to say on that occasion:

> The Liberal leader favoured the abolishment of all tariff duties.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That clearly is a statement by a reporter in a general way. While speaking on that occasion I had in my hand a copy of the platform of the Liberal party and I read what is contained there, as I shall read it to this House again when I have the privilege of speaking in this debate.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Do I understand that the leader of the Opposition is not in favour of the abolition of duties?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not in favour of the abolition of all duties; certainly not.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I must accept the hon. member's explanation that the press incorrectly reported his speech.

Inasmuch as my hon. friend has given us to understand that he is not a free trader and would be in favour I judge, of a certain form of protection, and as the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) has reiterated in this House this afternoon that he is an absolute free trader, if our friends opposite should come into power it is quite likely the hon. member for Brome, who has been the financial critic of the Opposition for the last two or three years, would take the portfolio of Minister of Finance. And in that event it is clear that the leader of the Opposition would have lots of trouble trying to reconcile his Finance Minister's free trade ideas with the protectionist ideas that have been given expression to by several hon. gentlemen sitting with him to the left of the Speaker.

The hon. member for Brome in his whole two hours' speech did not indicate in any way how he would raise the revenue. He dealt only in generalities, and therefore I am at a loss to know how my hon. friends opposite, if they came into power, would propose to raise the necessary revenues. I trust that the leader of the Opposition when he speaks in this debate will not only let us know whether he adheres to the tariff policy adopted at the Liberal convention in August last, but that he will also enlighten this House and the country as to how he would raise the revenue if he and his party came into power.

I notice that the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) some time ago made a

speech before the Montreal Reform Club in which he differed considerably from the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) and the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee), both of whom had made protectionist speeches before the members of that club. The hon. member for Lunenburg did not do so. In his speech on that occasion he made the rather remarkable statement that there was no difference between the underlying principles of the present Liberal policy and those of the United Farmers party. So there, again, we have a very marked difference of opinion among hon. gentlemen opposite as to what should be the tariff policy of the Liberal party.

The hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) referring some time ago to the speech delivered at Quebec by the Minister of the Interior, to which I alluded a moment ago, said: "What a calamity it would be if a record of that speech was played on a gramophone at Calgary, what a commotion it would create out there." I would ask my hon. friend what kind of a commotion and impression it would create if a record of the speech of Sir Lomer Gouin to which I have referred was played in the city of Calgary.

The hon. member for Brome, who I am sorry is not in his seat, felt very jubilant this afternoon. He challenged the Government to go to the country and was very confident that in such an event the Government would be defeated and that he and his friends would move over to the Treasury benches. I am afraid it was simply a case of the wish being father to the thought. He would indeed be a courageous man if he really wanted a general election now. Speaking for the Government—it has been said before, but I will state it again now—there is no reason why we should go to the country until the full term of this Parliament has expired. During my election campaign I never said anything about being elected only for the duration of the war, or that my service would end with the war. When the election comes, in due time, in the fall of 1922 or 1923—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Make it 1925.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: —the issue is going to be a clear-cut one. The issue by which parties are going to stand or fall will be: Moderate protection versus free trade. I, for one, while I have no political ambitions whatever, have no fear what the verdict of the people will be on that issue when a general election comes. In all former general elections that have been held in this country, any party that proposed to interfere seriously with the well-established fiscal policy of Canada met defeat at the polls, and if my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, thinks he can carry the country on the tariff resolution adopted at the Liberal convention, I can only say he misjudges the intelligence of the electorate of Canada. With the necessary publicity that will be given, I am satisfied when the people from one end of this country to the other come to decide between the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite and the policy which this Government stands for, namely, a policy of moderate protection, with favour to none and justice to all, framed for the diversified interests of Canada, a policy that is equally good for the farmer, the lumberman, the workingman, the fisherman and the manufacturer, I have no doubt, and this Government has no doubt, what the verdict of the people of Canada will be. The Minister of Finance yesterday clearly set forth the Government's policy, and I desire to have the privilege of placing it on Hansard. He said:

> Our policy calls for a thorough revision of the tariff with a view to the adoption of such reasonable measures as are necessary: (a) to assist in providing adequate revenues, (b) to stabilize legitimate industries and to encourage the establishment of new industries essential to the proper economic development of the nation—to the end that a proper and ever-increasing field of useful and remunerative employment be available for the nation's workers, (c) to develop to the fullest extent our natural resources, (d) to specially promote and increase trade with the Mother Country, the sister dominions and colonies and Crown dependencies, (e) to prevent the abuse of the tariff for the exploitation of the consumer—

That is the policy of the Government, and it has my full and unstinted support both in this House and outside of it.

Just a word with reference to our friends of the Agrarian group, sitting across the way. I am sorry my good friend the leader of that party, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), is not in his seat. There is one thing on which I can compliment the Agrarian group, the U. F. O., or whatever name the party is known by, and that is the very clear way in which they have given expression to their policy on many occasions during this session of the House.

The hon. member for Marquette and those who sit behind him are out and out free traders; they make no bones about that point and I think they deserve our thanks and appreciation for the very clear exposi-

tion which they have given us of their policy. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) when speaking in this House a few weeks ago was asked whether he believed in the policy of protection and he replied that he had never believed in protection, he did not believe in it then, and he never would believe in it. What could be clearer than that, Mr. Speaker? We know exactly where the members of the Farmers' party stand. I find no fault with them because this is a free country and we are assembled in a free parliament. Every one in this country has a right to think as he pleases and to vote as he pleases, and it is every man's prerogative to stand by whatever policy he considers is best conducive to the welfare of the country. But I rather differ from my hon. farmer friends when they say that this free trade policy of theirs, this new progressive policy, so-called, is a sound policy for Canada. If they said it was a policy for the three Prairie Provinces and one peculiarly framed for their own interests, then I could agree with them; but when they assert that the free trade policy which they advocate is a good one for all of Canada's diversified interests, I confess I cannot follow them in their logic. How could a free trade policy maintain our great manufacturing industries that exist from one end of Canada to the other? How could it afford employment for hundreds of thousands of workmen throughout the length and breadth of this country.

And what good would a free trade policy be even to the farmers? If any policy in this country is framed to suit any one particular interest and that interest alone, it is a wrong policy and can have only one result. If the farmers are to be prosperous in this country, then the manufacturers, the business men, the workingmen and all other classes must live under a policy that grants special favours to none, and which is framed in the national interests and for the benefit of the whole people. The moderate protection policy that has prevailed in this country since 1867 has proved just such a policy. Suppose for a moment that we had a free trade policy in this country. Suppose our friends of the prairies produced vastly more grain than ever they did, but other interests in Canada were not prosperous; the people did not have money; the railways did not have freight to carry eastbound and westbound; and our grain growers found a lack of demand for the enormous amount of wheat they were growing, and found prices low—for all that would follow a free trade policy—what would be the effect? The farmers would suffer with the rest. With all deference to my hon. friends, I am at a loss to know why, in a country like this, those gentlemen could purpose to put such a policy into effect if they had the opportunity to do so. The hon. member for Marquette, I will admit, modifies his policy very much according to the locality in which he happens to be speaking. He made a speech in this House a year ago and I have it here in Hansard. He said that the policy of protection was economically an unsound one, and he went on to say that he had recently travelled through the fair province of Ontario and had seen hundreds of farms, many of which were vacant, and this fact he attributed to the policy of protection. How he could come to such a conclusion is beyond my comprehension. Then later, when he was making a speech in the city of Toronto—a very strong protectionist city—he naturally modified his views. The leader of the Farmers' group on that occasion said, if I remember rightly: "I would not with one fell swoop demolish the fiscal policy and all the industries of this country. I would prefer to let them die a slow lingering death. I would therefore bring about this end slowly, gradually, but surely." Well, if such a policy as that is ever to be put into practice, I for one should prefer the former manner of fiscal decease, so as to let the industries of the country be put out of existence with quick despatch.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up the time of the House any longer. Once more I express my pleasure, as a member of the Government, at the Budget which has been presented, and if I may be permitted to do so, I extend my heartiest congratulations to the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) for the splendid, comprehensive, fair and logical statement which he submitted to the House yesterday, and which is meeting with the general approval of the people of Canada.

Mr. W. K. BALDWIN (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, in the Budget Speech which the Minister of Finance delivered yesterday afternoon I observed that it was his intention not to get all the national milk, so to speak, from the same old cow. He has taxed the unnecessary things of life, he has taxed the slaves of fashion and the molly-coddles of the country, and in that respect I have no complaint to offer. There is one particular, however, in which I would have been very much interested had the minister taken very drastic measures.

I should have liked to see an enormous tax on American automobiles or automobiles coming from any other country. The automobile, in my opinion, has been the means of more injury in this country than any other invention of civilization. It has destroyed homes, and the worries which expensive automobiles have created have sent many a man to his last resting place, because he was nagged and harassed to such an extent, and his business pride was such, that he preferred to die physically rather than face financial death. No one but an acrobat is safe in crossing the streets now. You go to any garage in the country and you will find automobiles galore; and in many of them in the small towns you will find anywhere from twenty-five to seventy-five secondhand automobiles for sale. There is a perfect craze on the part of people to-day to go riding through the streets in burnished, shining vehicles. It is an appalling fact, Sir, and I hope our Finance Minister will consider this phase of the subject and see to it that no more expensive cars are brought into the country. There is a craze among the people to go running around in these glaring, death-dealing instruments.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BALDWIN: I see there is unanimity on that point, and there is no question about the truth of it. It is but too well known that people, even wise people, have a mania to spend their money foolishly, and the automobile is one of the chief sources of their extravagance.

I noticed that last night the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce went so far as to say that my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) was inconsistent, comparing his present policy with his old time policy. Probably I am not quite as old as the two ex-Ministers of Finance but they isplayed a fellowship towards each other last evening which did my heart good. I believe that in a few years a new era will dawn on this country. But when the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce claims that my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's is inconsistent I might remind him that he himself went to Washington in the eighties and the nineties to try to effect a treaty of reciprocity with the United States. On several occasions he went down there and was unsuccessful. On the last occasion that he and his colleagues went to Washington the Canadian delegates found that the people who were to meet them had their bags packed and they offered them the excuse that they were going on a southern trip. I think that what I say is exactly correct. And so, the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues came home disheartened.

The question of reciprocity was not brought up again for a considerable time because the United States ignored all overtures until the time of President Taft. Then the United States had a vast population, they needed free natural products and free food. Naturally they had their eye on this half of the North American continent and they wanted free raw material. They made several overtures to Canada and my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's was very properly sent to Washington to have a conference with the Americans. An agreement was prepared and the Canadian delegates came home. Instead of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the great leader of the then Government of Canada putting that treaty into force at once he delayed in order to consult Parliament and in the meantime false representations, were put before the people by the press which declared that such a policy was disloyal and unpatriotic and that reciprocity with the United States would prove a dismal failure. But the present right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, as well as all the principal members of Sir John Macdonald's Government proclaimed throughout the wide country their feeling for reciprocity after that principle had been abrogated in the early sixties following the war of the rebellion in the United States. In the county that I represent, Sir John Macdonald spoke in favour of reciprocity in natural products and the Hon. C. C. Colby, who represented that county for about a quarter of a century always had as one of the planks of his platform reciprocity in natural products. Throughout the country they proclaimed that policy. I am sorry that the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not in his seat because if he were I would point out to him how inconsistent he was in fighting the very policy which he had tried to consummate for many long years. It was the policy of the party that he followed, and which he continued to follow, except for the short interval when he was out of the House.

The hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Ballantyne) says that we on this side of the House are willing to do nothing but sit around and that we have no policy. I have never known in all the years of the Liberal party that a free trade policy was advocated. Alexander Mackenzie, Edward

Blake and Sir Wilfrid Laurier never proclaimed themselves in favour of an absolutely free trade policy. These leaders advocated a tariff for revenue. The right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce last night stated plainly that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's had championed a free trade policy. That is something new in Canada. It seems to me that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's said that no member of this House is willing to acknowledge that Canada has yet reached the stage when she could have free trade.

We must remember that Canada has a vast heritage to develop. She has great wealth in water-powers which are better than the black coal of the United States. At present tens of millions of capital are coming into the province of Quebec, towns are rapidly growing up, manufacturers are coming in large numbers and they are building plants now that will cost millions for the bricks and motar alone without taking into consideration the working capital. We have a vast country here and as true Canadians we believe in its development. We know that under the present policy of the Government we cannot develop it without immigrants coming here to help us. This may be a suggestion to the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen). He talks about a hand picked people only being allowed to come in. I disagree with him decidedly. I know, as other hon. members know, that approximately a million emigrants annually went into the United States for many years. They went forth, engaged in different spheres of activity and helped to develop the country. I believe that immigrants should be allowed to come to this country regardless of colour and that we should make such laws as would give them to understand before they come that we have no place for any who are not law abiding and do not wish to work. I have said before and I say it again that all crooks, shysters and loafers should be kept out of Canada. People who come to this country should be made to understand that they cannot loaf around, commit crimes, and play crooked games on the people. If that is made plain to all who may contemplate coming to Canada people of that class will not come and we will get a better type of settlers. We have tremendous resources. There has been no boosting in Canada. We are not boosters. Why is it that we have not a larger population? The House was yesterday reminded that the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. White) said during his first Budget that about a thousand people a day were coming into Canada. If the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier had been continued this country would now have had eleven or twelve million people. We know that the tide had turned before the war and that tens of thousands of people were leaving Canada in 1912-13. Then there came this horrible war that has given such a staggering blow to this country. But it has brought Canada to its senses and enabled here to see herself Canada played a part in the war that at one time we never thought she was capable of; she demonstrates the ingenuity, the sagacity and the strength of other people. Canada to-day stands at the point where we should all get together and, regardless of party politics, work for the good of the country. The time has gone by when members on one side should picture those on the other as being either manikins or brass monkeys. We should get together and develop this wonderful country. Take for instance the Georgian Bay Canal. There is enough water power on that system of canals and waterways to pay for the completion of the enterprise within a period of fifty, or possibly seventy-five years. The cost of developing hydro-electric works now is enormous, but before this stage was reached there was ample time for the Government of Canada to let contracts for the development of the Georgian Bay Canal by granting for a term of years the use of the water-power that might be developed. Does any one imagine that these contracts could now be awarded at the present time for anything like a reasonable figure? The same may be said of the project for the deepening of the St. Lawrence canals. These works, in view of the present enormous debt, would be a tremendous undertaking to-day. The way to cope with our obligations, as well as to develop our great natural resources, is not by working eight hours a day; we must take off our coats and work for ten hours a day or more. I happen to be one of the unorganized labour party that takes pleasure in working fifteen hours a day. That does not kill people; it is far more healthful than indulging in nonsense and all sorts of extravagant pleasures. I repeat that our great need to-day is to develop this wonderful country. In so saying I only wish that the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Marine were in their seats.

Hon. Mr. REID: I am here.

Mr. BALDWIN: I am sorry, but as the minister is not occupying his own seat he escaped my notice. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that we have not a mile too many

railways in Canada, nor a steamboat too many for the development of the country, if the rates on those railways were only raised to make them self-sustaining, and thus prevent the present and coming generations from being burdened with an enormous debt to make up the deficits.

Hon. Mr. REID: If the hon. member would address the farmers at the other end of the Chamber and convert them to his idea it would make my task easier.

Mr. BALDWIN: I believe in the system of bonusing as to which we heard expressions of opinion last night from the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir George Foster) and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding); it would doubtless bring about better results than some other policies that have been advocated. It is ridiculous that a country of the tremendous extent and resources of Canada should only be mining five per cent of its deposits of iron ore. Can it be expected that we shall make a success of the development of this country if we do not use its great natural resources to the best advantage? Then there are vast areas of agricultural land which cannot be developed without labour, and how are we to get that labour unless we adopt a progressive immigration policy? True we are building up a great military machine to take care of those people in some of the provinces who are considered disloyal. In the province of Quebec we have no such elements in our population. The people there are willing to work ten hours a day. They are quite satisfied and have no use for travelling labour agitators; such men have no influence upon the people of that province or upon organized labour there. That is why immense capital for investment is flowing into the province of Quebec from Ontario, and from the United States and from other countries. Down there in the province of Quebec the people worship God and honour the King. Labour troubles are non-existent, and strikes are practically nil, but how different is the condition in other countries, for example in the United States, where strikes seem to be almost continuous.

With respect to the development of our railways we need money to link up the existing system, but the Minister of Railways seems afraid to make advances in the railway rates for fear the Canadian Pacific will enjoy the advantage of the increase. The Canadian Pacific got through its operations last year with the closest escape from a deficit, and surely it is a picayune idea that we should retard the development of our National railways, and expose the country to a loss of many millions of dollars, because of the fear that the Canadian Pacific would benefit from any advance in rates that might be ordered.

The admission of Newfoundland to this Confederation would be a decidedly forward step. There was a possibility of Newfoundland entering Confederation when Sir Mackenzie Bowell was Premier of Canada, but it seemed likely to involve an additional expenditure of $8,000,000—which in those days was regarded as a great sum of money—and the project fell through. What has the United States done in the last fifty years? They have doubled their territory by diplomacy, by dollars, and by war. Would the Republic to the south part with any portion of its territory even if it were offered a million times more than it cost to acquire it? Possibly it might in the case of the Phillipine Islands, but not with respect to another inch of its territory. In Canada unfortunately our people are not of a boasting type. We are losing our young men and our young women. We are not increasing in population at the rate we should in view of the fact that Canada is one of the greatest countries on the face of the earth and in area comprises half a continent. The people are becoming despondent, discouraged, and dissatisfied, and it is about time we became boosters for our country. One hon. gentleman raised the question of our doing business with the West Indian Islands. For my part, I think we should trade not only with the Mother Country, but with every other Dominion and Crown Colony in the British Empire in preference to any other part of the world. In order to avoid the rigours of the Canadian climate many of our people go to British Honduras, British Guiana, the Leeward Islands, Barbados, or the Bahamas. We could trade with the West Indies with advantage to ourselves, and I believe that trade would greatly develop with the progress of the years. I am of opinion that if we could win the admiration of the people of those islands we could win their trade, and if the West Indies were more closely united with Canada, both would benefit to a surprising degree. The Government should send to the West Indies to promote trade relations men endowed with boundless enthusiasm. I understand that delegates are coming here from the West Indies about the last of this month. Let us show these delegates that it would be a good thing for them to become more closely acquainted with this great country and its wonderful possibilities. I

hope the time will come when commercial union between Canada and the West Indies will be something more than a dream. I hope that we can win the admiration of the West Indies. I do not believe in war, but as one of the results of the war England has acquired a German colony of nearly as extensive an area as Canada, and, therefore, I think that this country deserves some consideration as well. I believe that a mutual agreement with the Imperial Government and the Crown colony of the great Caribbean sea might bring about a rounding out of this great Dominion. "Procrastination is the thief of time," and to-day when the United States are advocating that Great Britain sell those islands to the United States, it is about time for us to wake up. Even one of the prospective presidential candidates, Mr. McAdoo, has brought that subject before the people of the United States. If those islands were sold by England to liquidate her indebtedness to the United States, where would Canada be?

I am not a believer in sentiment, on the contrary, I am a believer in hard and fast business principles; but sometimes sentiment is a prevailing factor, and we should cultivate in our sons and daughters the sentiment that Canada is one of the best located countries on the face of the earth, with natural wealth beyond all comprehension, and so stimulate that patriotic pride which means so much in the development of any country. And with that sentiment properly cultivated, I believe that our future is assured.

If we succeed in bringing the West Indies into this great Confederation, the resultant advantages will be great indeed. Instead of depending on our neighbours to the South for the products of those islands our own mercantile marine will bring them direct to our Atlantic ports, and by means of our great inland waterways we shall be able to reach the markets not only of our own provinces but the markets to the South and be able to compete with the Americans in their home cities of Buffalo, Erie, Cincinnati, Toledo, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee and Duluth. But if we continue to procrastinate I am afraid that this Parliament instead of being praised by our people will be cursed.

I feel assured that the people of the West India Islands would be proud to belong to a nation of such vast resources as we possess. They need our products, and we need theirs, and there would be a constant interchange of traffic. They will never be manufacturing centres, but we are certain to become one of the greatest workshops of the world—although our development along that line has so far been slow. However, I think the dawn of a new day is awaiting us, and I sincerely hope that party politics will stop for a while until the people of Canada come to a realization of what vast possibilities are within their reach.

I claim that every product of a tropical character that we need here can be raised in the West Indies, and that emphasizes the importance of a mutually satisfactory arrangement being reached for their becoming part and parcel of this wonderful Confederation. From cotton down to the smallest tropical fruits would it not be a glorious thought for the householders of this country if they could send their children to get Canadian tropical products at the stores? Under our present trade relations with the United States that country holds Canada in one hand and the islands in the other; she discounts their money 41 per cent, she discounts ours from 10 to 15 per cent, and as a result she gains $30,000,000 in handling the products of the West Indies and selling them to Canada. Is it not ridiculous?

With this condition of affairs, is it not time that we ceased fighting over things that should not excite controversy? Because, as I said in my opening remarks, when two great finance ministers of experience get together in kindly fellowship there is a future for Canada that will make this one of the greatest countries upon this earth.

Our country is so vast that we have lost ourselves. There was a time when we used to hear about patriotism—people were proud of tne fact that they belonged to a country on which the sun never set. Love of country? We hear nothing more of it. We have gone far astray, and, like the lost tribes of Israel, we are wandering aimlessly. But it is time that we drew ourselves together. The people in the northern part of the United States are like ourselves, strong and vigorous, and their country is connected with the West Indies by a shipping service which gives her a predominant advantage. Already the United States owns Porto Rico; she has a protectorate over Cuba; she now has her customs officers in San Domingo.

What I am proposing would be a perfectly safe proceeding. It would not have the uncertainty of reaching out into the Orient;

it is a solid, straightforward business proposition. Our people should visit the West Indies and learn the requirements of their inhabitants instead of spending their money in the United States. Some years ago in the United States they started the slogan: "Look around your own country"; and since the war they have supplemented that with actually learning that they have a wonderful country. Do Canadians know their own country? I would advise the people of this city if they want a real holiday this summer to go right up into the woods, and they will discover that we have bench lands along the rivers—I am speakmore particularly of the province of Quebec —where millions of people could get their livelihood. I have seen thousands of acres red with wild berries—literally thousands of tons of them, which if they could be gathered would return sufficient to pay the interest on our national debt. We have a wonderful country. Too many think that in Canada there are vast ice-bound regions incapable of production, but those who entertain that view are vastly mistaken. Canada is a country which is capable of producing a strong and vigorous race. Yet we find that hundreds of people have left our country and gone to the United States. Just so soon as Canada does the things it should do; just so soon as this House takes steps towards the progressive development of our country, these persons who have left our shores will return to us. It is a crying shame that such a vast country as Canada should stand where it stands to-day for want of patriotism, for want of love of country, for want of boosting. I do urge the people of Canada; I do urge those who are in authority, to make a move toward the development of this wonderful country, with its possibilities—shall I say for I believe it—of maintaining hundreds of millions of people.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. ROBERT JAMES MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to deal at any length at all with the remarks of the previous speakers on the Opposition side who have taken part in this debate. One of the reasons is that it would take, I fear, a tariff acrobat to deal with them all, for the reason that in the first place the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) this afternoon took an absolute free trade stand, though I think he soft-pedalled slightly compared with previous orations. Then the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) took a moderate protectionist stand, and I understand my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Baldwin) to take a protectionist stand. I find myself wondering, after thinking that over, if the Agrarian members of the House decide to accept the invitation of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, which of those three constituencies they would come in through. I thought the criticisms of the Opposition speakers were tempered with mercy. In fact, I thought the criticisms of the hon. member for Stanstead were so tempered with mercy that they were almost a paeon of praise to the Minister of Finance. There is one statement the hon. member for Brome made—and I do not say this in any unkind way —with which I thoroughly agree, and that was his statement that the verses which he quoted were rather of an ordinary type. I do not use the word he used, because he might misconstrue it; I think he said of a low type. I think they were at least of an ordinary type.

So far as the three speakers thus far on the Opposition side are concerned, I found myself agreeing to a great extent with the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. I feel after having listened for a long time, during four sessions, in this House to debates on the tariff question that no subject in Canada to-day is of more importance than the tariff question. It is not only a question upon which political parties are dividing, but a question in which everybody in this country is taking an interest. It is a question the solution of which is very important to the best interests of Canada. I am not of the farmers, on the one side, or of the manufacturers on the other. I am of that large body of Canadian citizens who belong to neither class, and it might be interesting to place on Hansard the figures as to how many people there are in each of the different classes. According to the census of 1911 the total number of people employed in the different occupations in Canada was 2,723,000 in round figures, and I shall deal only in round figures for the reason that extended figures are rather dreary reading. Of this number the agricultural employees amounted to 933,000, or 34 per cent; manufacturing employees, 491,000, or 18 per cent. All the rest, 1,294,000, or 48 per cent, were of the working population of this country. That 48 per cent includes building trades,

domestic servants, civil servants, professional men, fisheries and forestry, trade and transportation. That 48 per cent, or nearly one-half of the working population of this country, are in danger of being ground between the upper and nether millstones of free trade and protection and that is my reason for speaking here to-day more or less on behalf of that 48 per cent of which I am a member. Belonging to that class, I feel I can look at the question dispassionately, as I have no direct interest in the matter, the only interest I possess being a desire to get the best policy for the betterment and advancement of Canada. I do not want to be misunderstood as trying to prove that free trade as a theory or as a principle is wrong. In that I believe I can fully agree with the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's when he said that in theory he was a free trader, but in practice, as I understood him—certainly he implied that—he did not believe in it. To the free traders of this country I presume that is a little bit like what doctors say occasionally "Though the operation was a success, the patient died." Sometimes, no doubt, the patient would prefer the operation to have been not quite so successful.

It would appear to me that Canada must take into consideration not theories, not principles, but actual conditions and facts as they are, and two of these important facts which must be taken into consideration are these: First, just to the South of us we have that immense American republic, the United States, which has a very high industrial development, and with the industries of which our industries must compete. Even if we had free trade in Canada, it would not necessarily mean that they would have free trade in the United States; in other words, our industries would have to compete in a free trade market with the industries of the United States in a protected market. Secondly, we are to the East of the teeming millions of Asia, with low wages and low living conditions, both wages and living conditions being on a very much lower scale than we believe in. So while we might desire the ideal of free trade, while we might desire to lay aside what some people might call the selfish national policy of tariffs, should we be so altruistic as to desire the progress and prosperity of other nations as much as we desire the progress and prosperity of our own? In addition to that, free traders both in this House and outside have been in the habit of making comparisons with conditions in free trade countries, particularly England. They have been making promises to Canada based, no doubt—in fact, it must be—upon the conditions in free trade England. I feel that a clear statement of the facts and a clear statement of comparisons, not with the object in view of disproving the theory of free trade, but of paving the way for a fair consideration of this subject on behalf of Canada, would be apropos here to-day, and that is what I intend to attempt; because after careful thought and consideration it appears to me that the moderate tariff course is the wise course for this country to follow. We should go neither to the extreme of free traders, knocking down all tariff walls, or to the protectionist extreme of placing a Chinese wall around this country which would bar out the goods of all other countries. It is not sufficient today to merely state one's conclusions. It is necessary to offer reasons for the faith that is in one. It has appeared to me that too often those who take the same stand as I do, and I think the vast majority of the members of this House have taken that stand, have taken it, some of us, at least, in an apologetic way. We have allowed free traders to try and prove their theories with theories and their facts with theories, and have not often enough insisted that they prove their theories with facts. I admit that the academic question of the tariff is more easily upheld on the free trade side, but facts are stubborn things, and it is facts I intend to deal with.

In the first place, if free trade is a panacea for all the ills that nations are heir to, how is it that England which adopted it in 1846 is the only great nation of the world that has adopted it? Italy, Spain, Germany, France, Austria-Hungary, the United States—none of these great nations have considered free trade worth while adopting. Even the overseas Dominions of the Empire, with one small exception, have not considered it worth while to copy the methods of the Mother Country. Cobden's prophesy that if England adopted free trade, in ten years free trade would be universal, is a long distance from being fulfilled. In England itself there is a large body of protection opinion. The other day I made it my business to look over three shelves of books in the Library dealing with tariff questions, and of forty distinct works by English writers twelve were in favour of protection. So I think I am correct in saying that there is a large body of opinion in England—and we know there is even amongst politicians in England—favourable

to protection, and who believe that free trade has caused England to deteriorate. If we look over the prominent figures in the political life of nations there are very good examples on both sides. On the free trade side we have such examples as Cobden, Bright, Peel late in life, and Lloyd George in England; in the United States, President Cleveland; and among former statesmen in this country Sir Richard Cartwright, and of the present day, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). On the protectionist side we have Peel early in life, Joseph Chamberlain, Balfour has made speeches more or less in favour of protection, Bismarck in Germany, President Lincoln and President McKinley in the United States, Premier Hughes of Australia, the late Sir John A. Macdonald and the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier among the late premiers of this country, and in this House of Commons the leader of the Government and all his lieutenants, and on the other side of this House I take it that we have the leader of the Opposition and most of his lieutenants, with the exception of the hon. member for Brome. So it seems to me that a man may take either side of this question and find himself in good company. Is it necessary, then, to apologize for taking the position that a moderate tariff policy is good for Canada? I am not disputing that a free trade policy may be, and perhaps is, the best policy for England. I am not dealing with her policy at all, except in a comparative way. In order to decide which is the best policy for this country we must make comparisons of that kind. Free traders make comparisons so I am going to make comparisons also.

In the first place, the United Kingdom consists of two islands in the North Sea with an area of 121,000 square miles, with powerful manufacturing plants, large accumulated wealth, practically no raw materials except coal and iron, and almost wholly dependent for her raw materials and for food on the outside world. Of wheat alone she imports 80 per cent of her needs. On the other hand, Canada is a country of 3,500,000 square miles, thirty times the size of Great Britain, and twice the size of Europe, leaving out Russia, and greater in area than the United States. We have little accumulated wealth, but almost unlimited natural resources, and practically all varieties of climatic conditions. We are a food-exporting country. Canada could practically live within herself if absolutely necessary, while the United Kingdom depends for her very lifeblood on her foreign commerce. She must import cheaply foodstuffs and raw materials, so that she can export manufactured articles in order to get food and raw materials for her people. So that principle which might apply with force to the United Kingdom might not apply at all to Canada.

A hundred and fifty years ago Edmund Burke made a statement to the effect that "on any moral or political subject nothing universal could be rationally affirmed," and I notice that Lloyd George expressed the same thought in speaking with reference to Ireland the other day. He said that there must be a limitation to the application of any principle. England demonstrates this in the principle which is dear to the heart of every Englishman, the principle of freedom, the principle of the absolute right of a people to govern themselves. Has England applied this principle to India, Egypt, or Ireland? She has not. And yet free traders claim that the lesser principle of free trade should be applied universally. After all, free trade is only a theory except in England, and history shows us many theories which were accepted by the whole world and which were afterwards exploded and proven to be inefficient when put to the test of facts. Galileo was confronted with the inquisition for exploding theories which were accepted by the whole world; and Harvey, who discovered the circulation of the blood, took years to convince the other members of his profession that his theory was correct. For nearly two thousand years previous to the time of Harvey a false theory of circulation was accepted. False theories are therefore nothing new, and though they may be strongly held and forcibly proclaimed they are often found quite inefficient when brought face to face with the test of facts. In Canada free trade and protection are sectional cries, the free traders being some of the farmers, not all of them by any means, and the high protectionists being some of the manufacturers. Both sides have a right to their opinions, and we may admit that both are sincere in desiring the best interests of the country. But is it not time, Sir, for Canada to act as one whole nation and not as a group of nations? Both the free trader and the protectionist argue that their respective interests are the most important. I admitted in the beginning of my remarks that in numbers the farmers had the advantage, but in production, according to the figures of the Minister of Finance the other day, it would seem to be the other way. In 1917, including field crops, animals, butter,

cheese, fruits, milk, etc., the agricultural production amounted to $1,600,000,0000, while the manufactured production in the same year amounted to $3,000,000,000, or nearly twice as much. Therefore, in production, the manufacturers I think have the advantage, but I mention this fact merely in order to clear the ground; because manufactured production cannot be divorced from agricultural production, nor can the reverse condition prevail. The prosperity of the country as a whole depends on both. This appears to be still another reason why a middle course is most desirable for the country.

Then there is the question of markets. Which market would appear to be most profitable for the farmers? Unquestionably, a reasonable farmer would say that the home market is more profitable than a market three thousand or six thousand miles away. Well, if that is correct—and I think it is hardly disputable—the building up of an industrial population obviously supplies the home market for the farmer, and therefore does indirectly benefit him. The United States wheat growers export only ten per cent of their wheat and sell ninety per cent in the home market, but the Canadian wheat grower must export seventy-five to eighty per cent of his product. Surely the building up of a home market is eminently desirable, especially when one considers the uncertainties and doubts and dangers that surround the foreign market. England buys her wheat in the open markets of the world. She plays no favourites. In 1896 she imported wheat to the extent of £31,000,000 sterling, and only 8 per cent of this came from the colonies. In 1913, one year before the war, she imported 105,000,000 hundred weight, of which quantity Canada exported 21,000,000 hundred weight or 20 per cent. The United States shipped 32 per cent of the total, and the balance of 48 per cent came from India, Argentine, Australia and Russia. So that Canada supplied one-fifth of England's wheat. In other words, Canada must compete with the whole world in the market so far as wheat is concerned. Undoubtedly the home market would be preferable, because it gives to the farmer the privilege of growing a greater variety of crops, which is a great advantage, and being independent of the foreign market he does not place all his eggs, or rather wheat, in one basket. Then there is another point. The extreme farmers claim that only the manufacturers are benefitted by State assistance. Now, Sir, is not the farmer also benefited by direct State assistance? In the Estimates which the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) had before the House the other day there was an item of over $5,000,000 for experimental farms, the Seed Act, health of animals, the livestock industry, and agricultural instruction. Surely that is direct assistance to the farmer of the country as well. Steel bounties between 1896 and 1915 amounted to only $17,000,000, and those bounties are much discussed and frequently are subject to grave condemnation by free traders. Yet I agree with the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) that those bounties, in the results which they attained, were a blessing to the country. Undoubtedly this $5,000,000 of which I have just spoken is direct assistance to the farming population of this country, and I do not think that any farmer will be disposed to dispute that point. And what about railways and harbours and roads? The farmer certainly benefits indirectly by the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been spent on railways and the hundreds of millions that have been spent on harbours; I think he benefits indirectly from them as much as the manufacturer does. Now, Sir, I do not wish to be understood as in any way condemning that vote of $5,000,000 when I describe it as a direct aid to the farmers of the country. By no means. In fact, I absolutely approve of it. But I believe that therein lies one of the reasons why in our statements we should be more moderate than the extreme farmers are inclined to be. Mind, Sir, I am speaking only of the extreme farmers and not of the ordinary moderate farmers. My constituency is not by any means entirely an urban constituency. I think that probably 25 per cent of it is rural, and I am just as anxious for the welfare of the farmers of my constituency as I am for the interests of the urban community. I believe, however, that moderation in national life is just as important as it is in private life.

Within the last few weeks we have heard a debate in which two hon. members proved that England does not live up entirely to her alleged free trade policy. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) read a letter from Sir Auckland Geddes in which it was admitted that England paid bounties on shipbuilding during the war; and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Burrell) gave facts to show that England imposed heavy duties on automobiles,—and many farmers in Canada to-day insist that these vehicles must be classed among the necessaries of life—on tea, sugar, coffee, clocks, cinema films, matches, gasoline, tobacco and various other articles, many of which

would be regarded here as necessaries of life. And the embargo against Canadian cattle entering the United Kingdom, is thinly disguised as a health measure, but it is as a matter of fact nothing more nor less than a protection for the cattle growers of the United Kingdom. The steamship subsidies which are paid by England for mail carrying are also claimed to be in the shape of a subsidy for the home trade, for the foreign steamship companies claim they have no chance of getting the subsidies even if they tender lowest. In other words, England insists on giving the contracts to her own people even if they are higher than the tenders offered by foreign companies. In 1917-18 the customs and excise in England brought in a revenue of $550,000,000; in 1918-19 the estimated revenue was $740,000,000; and this year, according to the speech of Mr. Austin Chamberlain reported in the London Times, the figure is $1,500,000,000. I admit that in that figure there are included in excise some duties which we do not impose here, but if you subtract even a great deal from that, you would have a greater income per capita for customs and excise in the United Kingdom than in Canada. So that England is not entirely free trade.

But in Canada, when any one takes the stand I am taking in favour of a moderate tariff policy, some free trader demands that the position should be carried to its "logical conclusion" and suggestions are made about barriers between one province and another and between one district and another, and between one city and another.

That is a favourite argument of free traders. You find it in all the books on the subject. Even that grand old man of British politics, Mr. Gladstone, used it in a debate with an American. It would be rather strange if we could not answer that question because the answer is very easy. The answer is that to carry protection to such a conclusion would be to carry it to an illogical conclusion. It would be like saying that if a slice of old English beef is good for your dinner, you should eat a whole ox; or if a thirtieth of a grain of strychnine or an ounce of brandy is good for a failing heart, why do you not give a pound of strychnine or a keg of brandy?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MANION: I assume from the applause that the keg of brandy might be popular. Let us turn that logical conclusion argument about and see how it works the other way. If free trade is the proper policy why not carry it to its logical conclusion? Why put restrictions on anything? Why should you restrict the slave trade, or the white slave trade, or the whisky traffic? They are all money makers. In fact, it is the southern party in the United States, which was the slave party, and is now the free trade party. I am not saying that with the idea of casting any reflection on free traders any more than it would be a reflection to remind the Conservatives that free trade was brought about in England by the Conservative party in 1846 when Sir Robert Peel, the Conservative leader, brought in his Bill. I am simply pointing out that it is not an argument on one side more than the other, to demand this so-called logical conclusion. It is just as unreasonable on one side as on the other. But we are always being reminded of the great foreign commerce of the United Kingdom. But it should be remembered that protectionists claim that the foundations of the foreign commerce of the United Kingdom were built up previous to 1846 while Great Britain was a protectionist country and when she insisted upon imposing very great restrictions on the colonies with respect to trade matters. John Morley has made the statement that the American Revolution was caused by restrictions imposed on the thirteen colonies in America in trade matters by England and that the final incident was the last straw that broke the camel's back. Protectionists claim that improvements in industry, invention and science, such as the steam engine and the steamship, played an immense part in building up the foreign commerce of the United Kingdom. That foreign commerce argument is so often used that one might think that foreign commerce was the only thing for which we were put on earth. I might point out that if we had a little less foreign commerce with the United States than we have had in the last two or three years our dollar would not have been discounted ten or fifteen per cent. Certainly if we had had free trade and a corresponding increase in imports from the United States our dollar would have been discounted still more.

Let us look into this question of foreign commerce. The United Kingdom has been a free trade country since 1846. The United States has been a protectionist country since 1861 and Germany a protectionist country since, I think, 1879, so that we can compare the foreign commerce of the United Kingdom a free trade country on the one

hand with that of the United States and Germany, protectionist countries on the other. The reason I do not take the United States alone is that if I did it would be said that with the large area, population and resources of the United States the comparison would not be fair. This claim cannot be made in the case of Germany. I saw in the Toronto Globe of April 12, I think, a statement made by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), when speaking in Toronto, that the United States was a comparatively free trade country at the present time. I noticed that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) this afternoon made practically the same statement. Let us consider that statement for a moment. The hon. member for Brome did not go into details, but the hon. member for Red Deer based his statement upon the fact that of all the imports into the United States only thirty per cent are dutiable. How can any one claim on a statement of that kind, that a country which puts a duty on thirty per cent of its imports, is a free trade country? But these figures are correct, and if you go back five years to 1912 you find that instead of 30 per cent the dutiable imports were 47 per cent and that in 1907 they were 55 per cent. That is only twelve years ago. Let us make a comparison with the dutiable imports into Canada. They were as follows:

	Per cent.
1919	42
1914	33
1907	33
1890	30

If the claim can be made on those figures that the United States is practically a free trade country you might as well, and with as much justice, claim that Canada is a free trade country. Of completely manufactured goods ready for home consumption the United States imported between 1909 and 1918, 26 per cent to 37 per cent. Canada's imports of manufactured goods ready for home consumption amounted to 57 per cent from 1899-1909 demonstrating that the United States manufactures are very much more highly developed than ours and that is one of the reasons why the hon. member for Brome could point out that the customs duties in the United States are down to such a low figure. The protective policy of the United States has so built up their manufactures, their industrial life and their agricultural life that they do not need to import very much from abroad. That is the reason for the condition which we find in the United States.

Let us look a little further into the claim that the United States is a free trade country. I made it my business, when I saw those statements, to write to the Department of Customs in the United States for some information. I find that the United States has duties on the necessaries of life as follows:

	Per cent.	
Cotton clothing	30	ad valorem.
Cotton underwear	20-30	"
Woollen goods	25-40	"
Carpets	20-50	"
Soaps	5-30	"
Cheese	20	"
Tobacco	35c. to $2.50 per pound.	

	Per cent.	
Automobiles below $2,000.	30	ad valorem.
Automobiles above $2,000.	45	"
Hats	45	"
Cutlery	25-55	"
Linen manufactures	10-35	"
Oilcloth	20-30	"
Matches	3c. per gross of boxes of 100	
Linoleum	30	per cent

These are some of the items that are on the dutiable list in the United States, necessaries of life or, if not actual necessaries of life, necessary to comfort. While there are many goods free in the United States you can hardly claim that it is a free trade country.

Mr. J. F. REID: Would the hon. gentleman give us a few of the items on the free list in the United States? It will be very interesting to the House.

Mr. MANION: Yes, I will be pleased to. I only asked for a certain list of goods and out of the list I received I can give a great many more dutiable items, but I do not wish to clutter up Hansard. Amongst the goods admitted free into the United States are eggs, poultry, boots and shoes, meats, cement, coal, tea, coffee, leather goods, agricultural implements, lumber and films. These are the goods I asked about. I am pointing out that in the United States there are many necessaries of life that are dutiable. I am not in any way trying to disagree with anybody and my only object in quoting these figures is to prove that the United States is not a free trade country.

Now, let us look a little further into the question of the foreign commerce of the United States, Germany and the United Kingdom. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that before the war the United States and Germany were rapidly gaining, under a protective tariff, on the foreign commerce of the United Kingdom. I am going to give figures to show that in that assumption I am correct. In the

twenty-three years from 1890 to 1913 the foreign commerce of the United Kingdom increased from £748,000,000 to £1,403,000,000, or 87 per cent. The foreign commerce of Germany increased from £419,000,000 to £1,070,000,000 or 155 per cent. The foreign commerce of the United States grew from 1,647 million dollars to 4,278 million dollars, or 160 per cent, twice as rapidly. Now I will take the period from 1875 to 1905, and during that period of thirty years the foreign commerce of the United Kingdom increased from 655 million pounds to 972 million pounds, or 48 per cent. The United States' foreign commerce increased from 1,046 million dollars to 2,636 million dollars, or 152 per cent, three times as rapidly as did the foreign commerce of the United Kingdom. I do not give the figures of German commerce because I could not get the German statistics back beyond 1890. To be absolutely fair—and I have no intention of being anything but fair because I have no personal interest in the matter except the desire of trying to have this question dealt with in a reasonable and fair manner with the best interests of Canada in view—before the war the United Kingdom surpassed either Germany or the United States in foreign commerce; but since the war the United States has completely overtaken the United Kingdom. The claim is advanced by free traders that the percentage argument is weak, and the hon. member for Brome when I gave figures of a similar character on another occasion made the statement that percentage arguments were no use anyhow, and he proved that as usual to his own satisfaction by taking a hypothetical case. He said: Suppose Nova Scotia has one hundred boats and New Brunswick two boats. A percentage increase of one hundred would mean that Nova Scotia would have two hundred boats and New Brunswick would have four boats. It was only a hypothetical case which the hon. gentleman cited, and certainly the figure of two boats in the case of the province of New Brunswick, which he mentioned, is hardly analagous to the billion dollar foreign commerce of the United States in 1875, or the billion and a half in 1890. As a further proof that the commerce of the United States and of Germany were gaining very rapidly upon that of the United Kingdom before the war I may quote from a writer whom the hon. member for Brome quoted this afternoon, Mr. J. M. Keynes. The hon. member quoted that gentleman in some of his remarks, and I shall also give him as my authority. Mr. Keynes wrote a book entitled, "Economic Aspects of the Peace Treaty" which to-day is very much in vogue in the United States. He said that before the war Germany was the chief seller to Russia, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Switzerland, Italy, Austria-Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria. Mr. Speaker, if free trade put England in such an advanced position, why did she permit Germany to undersell her in the markets of those countries which are neighbours of both nations? It simply shows that Germany was rapidly gaining upon the United Kingdom in international commerce before the war.

But, Sir, foreign commerce is not the only test of the prosperity, happiness and progress of a state; in fact, internal commerce might more reasonably be used as a test; and enjoyment of an average amount of the good things of life and the general well-being of the people may be regarded as a better criterion. Taking the national debt of each of these three countries just before the war, that of the United Kingdom was 678 million pounds, or $76 per capita; the national debt of Germany was one thousand million pounds, or $73 per capita. In addition to a lower per capita national debt than the United Kingdom, Germany has immense railway facilities and a canal system, which the country owns, and an English writer stated that Germany could sell both the railway system and the canal system and not only pay off her complete national debt before the war but have a good surplus on the side. To recapitulate: The per capita national debt of the United Kingdom before the war was $76; the per capita national debt of Germany $73. The total debt of the United States was 2,912 million dollars, or a per capita debt of $27. But if we add the State debts, and subtract the cash in the Treasury it gives the United States a per capita debt of $11, whilst the per capita debt of Canada is $40. So, according to these figures, and they are authentic, the per capita national debt of the United Kingdom —of free trade England—was greater than the per capita national debt of either the United States or Germany.

But, Sir, the rate of earnings and the general welfare of the people constitute a better way still of judging of the general progress and prosperity of a country and, it is unlikely that any one will deny that the general well-being of the people of the United States and Canada are superior to the general well-being of the people of the United Kingdom. I did hear one hon. gentleman make the statement not long ago

in this House that the conditions of the working classes in England were better, or as good, as the condition of the working class in the United States. I do not know on what data the hon. gentleman is question bases his statement, but I think it is absolutely disproven by the fact that the continual stream of immigration to the United States and Canada comes from England, and if the conditions there were better, or even equal, to those in Canada or United States, the migration would be in the other direction. It is stated, Sir, by free traders that in continental countries, which are protectionist, the conditions are not so good as in England. As to Germany I may quote from a work written by Mr. J. Ellis Barker entitled, "Modern Germany in 1912." According to his conclusion, after thorough investigation of unemployment statistics, savings bank deposits and emigration, the workers of Germany are considerably better off than the workers in England that is before the war. I might also quote the opinion of an American writer who wrote a book which doubtless a great many members of this House have read. I refer to Mr. Price Collier, who wrote a book entitled, "Germany and the Germans from the American Point of View." He says at page 231:

> Whatever figures say, the German working population are better clothed, better fed, and cared for, and have more enjoyment than either the English or American.

So that, according to these two writers --one English and the other American, and therefore not likely to be prejudiced in favour of Germany—the conditions in Germany were better for the working class than the conditions in England. Mr. J Ellis Barker takes up this question in particular, and proves to his own satisfaction that before the war conditions were better in Germany than they were in the United Kingdom.

Now, as to Ireland. In the period from 1841 to 1911 the population of Ireland declined from eight million to four million but I do not cite that as a proof that free trade is bad for Ireland or for any part of the United Kingdom. Other reasons existed. The other day Mr. Tom Moore, a Canada labour leader, made a statement in the press of this country, in which he said that recently conditions had improved in England to equal the conditions in this country, therefore implying,—as we in this country also thought—that the conditions in England before the war were not as good as those of the United States or Canada. Some people go so far as to say that the fact that conditions have improved in England may interfere with England's international commerce. I will go so far as to say that in my opinion from reading and observation, wealth, money and lands are divided better in protectionist France than in free trade England; and, it has been stated on good authority that the lands of England are in fewer hands than the lands in any other European country.

I will now leave that branch of my argument, and take up the railway question. There is no question of more importance to every man, woman and child in this country than the railway question, because transportation rates enter into the lives of all of us. To no class in the community is the railway transportation question of more importance than to the farmer. Well, Sir, we would expect that the railways in England having been built under free trade —and when I say free trade, I mean that the larger part of her railways were built under free trade—would be in a better condition than the railways of the United States, Germany, Austria and France built under protection. What are the facts?

The capitalization of those railways—I am quoting from a book written by James J. Hill in 1912, and I do not believe that any better authority on railway matters existed in the English-speaking world at the time—he said that the railway capitalization per mile in the United Kingdom was $272,000; in Germany, $107,000—a good deal less than one-half; France $126,000—a good deal less than one-half; in the United States $58,000 or less than one-quarter.

However, capitalization, per mile is not, perhaps, so important except as to its bearing upon transportation charges; the real point is the average rate per ton per mile. In England the average rate per ton per mile in 1907 was 2.31 cents; in Germany 1.41 cents—a little more than one-half; in France 1.46 cents—a little more than one-half; in Austria-Hungary 1.49 cents—a little more than one-half; in the United States 0.80 cents, or four-fifths of one cent—or one-third that of the rate in the United Kingdom. And, Mr. Speaker, let me remark that the rates in Canada are practically the same as the rates in the United States.

So according to that comparison free trade England shows up very badly so far as freight rates are concerned. The United States, according to those figures, had the lowest cost per mile, the lowest freight rates, and the highest wages of any coun-

try in the world; and Mr. Hill said that even the railway wages in Germany were higher than those in Great Britain.

Let us make another comparison, this time in regard to pauperism or abject poverty. In 1914, 761,000 paupers were relieved in England and Wales under the Poor Laws; in 1910—I could not get the same year, but I do not think it makes any material difference—84,000 paupers were relieved in the United States, or one-tenth the number with two and one-half times the population of England and Wales. In 1913 in the United Kingdom $89,000,000 was spent on poor relief; I have no records for Germany since 1885, but J. Ellis Barker, whom I have already quoted, in his "Modern Germany" says that there is much more pauperism in England than in Germany.

It has been suggested that comparison between the United Kingdom and the United States are unfair, because of the larger area, greater population, and immense natural resources of the United States. I admit that there is a good deal of truth in that criticism. But, Sir, if after a fair examination we find that the people of England following sixty years of free trade are not on an equal plane with the people of the United States under protection, then Canada being so much similar to the United States in area, in natural resources,—in minerals, fisheries, lumber and all those things, almost in climate except tropically, might it not be much wiser to copy the methods of the United States—probably that will be an unpopular expression—to consider the methods of the United States rather than those of some European country absolutely unlike Canada. At any rate, free trade exists only in England, therefore comparisons cannot be made with any other free trade country of importance.

Let us take other comparisons, for instance, agriculture. How has it stood the test of free trade in England? All hon. members know that the free traders of England are the manufacturers, and that the protectionists are the farmers; the reverse of what obtains in Canada. The reason is that the farmers have seen agriculture deteriorating so rapidly in England. And I am not going to let it go at that; I am going to give my proofs. England imports most of her foodstuffs. In 1913 she imported 215,000,000 bushels of wheat and grew only 57,000,000 bushels, or only one-fifth of her needs. It might be argued that the size of the United Kingom is the reason for the small amount of acreage there under wheat; but the fact is, Sir, that France, Italy, Germany, Austria, and even Spain greatly surpassed her in wheat production. Taking the wheat production of the world in 1913, I find these figures given—and I am leaving out any Asiatic countries, because it is not important to my argument to consider their production; Russia grew 814,000,000 bushels; the United States, 763,000,000 bushels; France, 319,000,000 bushels; Canada, 232,000,000 bushels; Austria-Hungary, 230,000,000 bushels; Italy, 214,000,000 bushels; Germany, 171,000,000 bushels; Spain, 112,000,000 bushels; United Kingdom, 57,000,000 bushels, or half that of Spain, exactly one third that of Germany, a quarter that of Italy, and about one-sixth that of France. I may say, Sir, that those figures are given from the Blue Books of our Department of Trade and Commerce so they are authoritative. So far as oats and barley are concerned, while the figures are not so strongly against England, they are nearly in the same ratio.

England imports 50 per cent of her foodstuffs, and is almost wholly dependent on the outside world in that respect; but before the war Germany raised 90 per cent of her foods, and France 100,000,000 bushels more wheat than we did in this immense country. Therefore England suffers by comparison in agriculture with practically all the European countries.

What a contrast, Mr. Speaker, in the United States, where under protection since 1861—I say under protection, not because of protection—the agricultural states of the west have grown rich, prosperous and populous, selling 90 per cent of their crops in their home market. The production of the wealth of the farms in the United States—and this statement is from the statistics published by the United States Government—including crops and livestock was in 1880, $2,000,000,000; in 1900, $5,000,000,000; in 1910, $9,000,000,000; in 1918, $21,000,000,000. The value of farm property in the United States, including land, buildings, stock and so on, increased 150 per cent in the twenty years from 1890 to 1910—from $16,000,000,000 to $41,000,000,000.

It seems to me, Sir, that the extreme farmer might well ponder over those figures before demanding a change in the fiscal policy of this country.

Rather strangely the argument has been advanced that protection is immoral, but anybody who has visited these various countries will not claim, I think, that free trade has had any particularly elevating effect on England; I do not imagine that any one will claim that England is more

moral than for example the countries on this side of the water.

Then, Sir, will a free trade policy develop our natural resources? Undoubtedly we need their development very much. What about our pulp wood, for instance? Under free trade there would be none of these provincial restrictions which exist to-day, and the raw pulp wood would go out to feed the pulp and paper mills of the United States, and our pulp wood resources would soon be exhausted.

Mr. VIEN: Will my learned friend allow me a question? A federal policy of free trade or of protection has, to my mind, nothing to do with the export duties imposed by the provincial authorities; and I would like to hear my hon. friend inform us how a change in policy from protection to free trade would affect those export duties.

Mr. MANION: I know what my hon. friend's point is as well as he does, that the restrictions imposed by the provinces are not restrictions imposed by the Dominion, and therefore can hardly be taken into account in discussing our tariff policy. But I ask my hon. friend can he prove that they are not restrictions just the same? The only point I am making is that under free trade you would not have restrictions. I admit my hon. friend's point; I think he will admit mine.

Mr. STEVENS: Export duties imposed by Liberal Provincial Governments.

Mr. MANION: Yes, my hon. friend from Vancouver reminds me that those export restrictions are imposed by Liberal Provincial Governments. I am going to say further that the Globe of Toronto, which can hardly be regarded as an intimate friend of the present Government, contained an editorial last Saturday very strongly condemning Senator Underwood who, before a Committee of Congress, threatened a heavy club over Canada's head if we did not take off those restrictions, his club being in the shape of refusing us coal, and iron ore. It has no effect on my argument, for the two questions are not at all analagous. But just to offer an opinion: Coal is a finished product; we do not do anything with it except to convert a portion of it into coke. So when we embargo coal we embargo practically the finished product; but when we export pulpwood to the United States we are not exporting a finished product. We are not putting any restrictions on the export of paper and pulp to the United States. What we are demanding is a demand the justice of which I think Senator Underwood must admit that before our pulpwood is exported it should be manufactured in this country.

Sir, a free trade policy, I submit, if carried out to a proper conclusion—I was nearly going to lay myself open to my own criticism by saying "logical conclusion"—would not put these restrictions upon the export of raw pulpwood to the United States, and surely, any free trader will admit that that condition of exhausting our pulpwood reserves would not be as good for Canada as the present condition, which has brought tens of millions of dollars of American money into this country to build pulp mills. To-day a gentleman waited upon me in my room in regard to dealing with this Government for pulpwood areas granted the Grand Trunk Pacific, and he is prepared to build an immense pulp mill in my city of Fort William. That is one of the results of these restrictions which to my mind are just and fair.

Then what of the iron, coal and oil which we import from the United States at the present time. Most Canadians admit that the development of these natural resources would improve our commercial position, give markets for our agricultural products, produce freight for our over-developed railway system, to say nothing of making us independent of Senator Underwood's threatened action of putting an embargo on the export of coal and iron ore to this country. In this connection the following figures are rather startling—they are to me at any rate. I am going to give figures showing the immense development of the natural resources in the United States under protection—not because of protection, although I think it might be truthfully stated in the latter form—for the period from 1880 to 1917, exactly the period of my lifetime, and I am not quite as old as Methusaleh. During those thirty-seven years the increase in production in the United States was for:

	Gallons.	Gallons.
Petroleum	1,000,000,000 to	14,000,000,000
	Tons.	Tons.
Iron ore	7,000,000 to	75,000,000
Pig iron..	3,000,000 to	38,000,000
Steel	1,000,000 to	45,000,000
Coal	63,000,000 to	640,000,000

The total mineral production in the United States increased in that period from $364,000,000 to $3,000,000,000. The exports of iron and steel and their manufactures increased from $14,000,000 to $1,133,000,000.

Are not those figures to conjure with, Mr. Speaker?

I can go a little further, and although I do not like to tire the House with figures, I cannot refrain from citing these statistics with regard to tin-plate imports into the United States in 1890 before restrictions were imposed. The importation of tin plates to the United States in 1890 amounted to 680,000,000 pounds, and twenty years later, in 1913, that was reduced to 28,000,000 pounds, due to protective policy. Tin-plate manufacturing in the United States amounted in 1890 to 2,000,000 pounds, and twenty-three years later, in 1913, had increased to 2,000,000,000 pounds. From 1880 to 1917 the production of natural gas in the United States increased from $215,000 to $140,000,000; of lead from 100,000 tons to 600,000 tons; of copper from 27,000 tons to 840,000 tons; of cement, from 2,000,000 barrels to 91,000,000 barrels. The production of corn increased from 1,700,000,000 bushels in 1880 to 3,000,000,000 bushels in 1917; of cotton, from 6,000,000 bales to 11,000,000 bales; cotton manufactures from $192,000,000 in 1880 to $701,000,000 in 1914; production of phosphate rock from 200,000 tons to 2,500,000 tons; of zinc, from 23,000 tons to 584,000 tons. The export of manufactured cotton increased from $10,000,000 in 1880 to $136,000,000 in 1917. The production of wheat nearly doubled in the same period, and the national wealth increased from $43,000,000,000 in 1880 to $187,000,000,000 in 1912. These figures may be of use on another occasion.

I might also point out—I am not going to put details of these figures on Hansard—that in the production of coal, iron ore, pig-iron and steel, the United States and Germany in some cases surpassed the United Kingdom, though they started away behind her. For example, in the production of coal the United Kingdom, starting with 186,000,000 tons in 1890, increased to 270,000,000 tons in 1911, while the United States starting with 148,000,000 tons, increased in the same period to 427,000,000 tons; that is, it started behind, but almost doubled the production in the United Kingdom in 1911. Germany, starting with a lower production than the United Kingdom in 1890, almost reached the same point as England in 1911. In the production of iron ore the United States and Germany surpassed the production of the United Kingdom in 1911, though they started equal in 1890, the United States producing in 1911 three times as much as the United Kingdom, and Germany nearly twice as much. France was about equal in iron ore production to the United Kingdom, although it started behind in 1890. In the production of pig-iron the United States and Germany surpassed the United Kingdom in 1911, though they started about equal (Germany behind) in 1890. France also gained more rapidly than England in the same period. In the production of steel the United States was producing over three times as much as the United Kingdom in 1911, and Germany twice as much, though they started equally in 1890. France also gained very rapidly. The reason I mention those four materials is that they are the basic elements of commercial progress. In the production of these four different materials the United States and Germany surpassed the United Kingdom in many instances, and in others were gaining very rapidly.

Then there is this argument: that a moderate tariff brings about a more diversified national life, because it produces greater opportunities to the youth of our land and prevents their exodus to the United States. There is no class of our people in the Dominion who profit more by that fact than the ambitious sons of the farmers of this country, and even if on occasions internal competition does not cut down the prices of materials quite so low as we might wish, is not a complete national development worth something? Do we wish to be simply producers of food and raw materials, simply hewers of wood and drawers of water to the other nations of the world?

We have immense taxes, due to the war, and it is doubtful if we can raise them by the direct method. History shows that every country after a great war has increased its customs to a certain extent.

I have not used the argument that we have to compete with cheap Japanese and Chinese labour, nor the quite logical argument as to the specialization in manufacturing in the United States. In other words, if Canadian manufacturers are forced to compete in an open market with American manufacturers in a protected market, and Canadians cannot specialize so greatly, they will be driven out of business in this country. They would no longer manufacture to a population of 8,000,000 or 9,000,000, but would go to the United States and manufacture to a population of 110,000,000. I think I have touched most of the important aspects of the life of a people. I have touched on home and foreign markets, agriculture, transportation rates, general taxes, pauperism, foreign commerce, development of our national resources, a diversified national life, and the general well-being of the people; and I have shown that the

people of England are not on an equal plane in most of them with the people of the United States, and in some of them are not on an equal plane with the people of Germany and France. I do not state that protection is the cause of all this. No one cause can be assigned for the progress, or the reverse, of any nation. Contributing circumstances must be taken into account. But if in sixty years free trade England has not succeeded in improving the condition of her people as much as has the United States in the same period, why should we adopt a free trade policy? Certainly the facts in the situation are against free trade. Then why should Canada embark on such a policy? Is it merely because it is claimed by some to be a panacea for all the ills that nations are heir to? Or is it merely to try out the theories of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster)? Suppose we admit that the conditions of the masses of the people did improve very much in England after 1846; that statement can be made truthfully of every other civilized country. Through invention and science alone much was accomplished. But despite its great population the United States leads the world. Protection in United States began in 1861, when that country had a population of 31,000,000. Now its population is 110,000,000, and in general prosperity, developed natural resources, real wages, social condition of her people, general comfort and opportunities in life, the United States is ahead of any other country. Can a parallel be found in the history of the world? I think that an answer may unhesitatingly and unqualifiedly be made in the negative. United States has two and a half times the population of the United Kingdom, twice the national income and two or three times the accumulated national wealth;—I believe that these figures are too conservative. The argument is sometimes put forward by free traders that the United States would be better off under free trade. But, Sir, that is only a speculation, and a very unlikely speculation. One would be just as fully justified in saying that the United States would have failed miserably under free trade. It is not necessary to say that now with her great amassed wealth and with her developed industries, it might be wise for the United States gradually to adopt free trade. In fact, one might easily conclude so. But her early commercial history may be looked upon, it seems to me, as a perfectly good model for Canada. Our progress has been slow in comparison; but should we experiment on account of that? Mr. Blaine during the course of a controversy with Mr. Gladstone, made a statement in 1896 which was published in the North American Review and which is in the library of Parliament in book form, in which he said that between 1812 and 1861 the United States tried free trade three times, and the result was recurring panics and depression; but that since 1861 the progress and prosperity of the country had been rapid and continuous. Therefore, Sir, we have the strongest arguments against experiments in the history and commercial conditions of United States which, I repeat, in area, resources and minerals is more like Canada than is any European country. Is it not desirable for us to profit by the example of the early commercial history of the United States?

Let us take all these things into account, and also the fact that forty-eight per cent of the people of this country are neither farmers nor manufacturers, and wish only the adoption of a policy which will be the best for Canada's development. I believe you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of the people of this country, of whatever political party, favour a moderate tariff policy, neither going to free trade extreme on the one hand nor the too high protectionist extreme on the other, by which too high protectionist extreme a group of men may exploit the people and subject them to overcharges. Of course, that is not to say that the present tariff policy must not be maintained as it is. The Minister of Finance has promised a scientific revision of the tariff, as was promised last year. It is not so difficult to understand that the revision that was promised last year was a little difficult to accomplish. Anyway, the Minister of Finance has promised this revision, and I think the House may certainly expect a revision by next year. I believe that tariff revision is very badly needed, but to say that is far from saying that free trade would be the proper policy for this country. The members of this House are fairly representative, I think, of the people of this country, and certainly the representatives on either side of the House are not leaning towards the free trade extreme. Neither of the old parties has shown any tendency toward that extreme. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's who is, I think, a pretty fair spokesman for the party opposite, does not show any inclination to take to it at the present

time. If divisions in parties are based alone upon the tariff, then I think the supposed difference between the present Liberal Opposition and the present Unionist party is a very artificial difference. Therefore, as a dispassionate observer I believe that the just and proper course would be co-operation between the moderate people of the three great groups, farmers, manufacturers and labourites, the latter including the forty-eight per cent outside of the farmers and manufacturers. I believe that if these groups work together along moderate tariff lines fixing as low duties as possible on the necessaries of life, on raw materials, and on the instruments of production, the result will be the bringing about of the greatest good to the greatest number and the building up in the Northern half of this continent of a great, prosperous, united, freedom-loving people.

Mr. THEODORE GERVAIS (Berthier): (Translation). Mr. Speaker, allow me, at the very outset of the few remarks I am about to make, to congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) upon the clear and precise manner in which he delivered yesterday, what it is agreed to call, in parliamentary language, the Budget Speech. Conscious of the responsibility devolving upon me as one of the mandatories of this country, I wish to express my opinion freely, according to the dictates of my own conscience, while remaining a loyal subject of the loyal opposition of His Majesty. In the course of a protracted debate which took place last year under similar circumstances, I had heard the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) state that, though he did not intend to prolong the debate, still he thought it was in the interest of the country that the discussion should be continued, as this was a means of finding out the opinions of each of the members representing the different parts of the Dominion. I do not wish to protract this debate either, but I do wish to explain my position, to express my opinion on the Government's policy, as well as on the Liberal platform laid down at the convention which took place in August last, and on the amendment now submitted to the House.

The country has passed through a terrible crisis; the war brought the Government face to face with many new problems, but this land never experienced social unrest in the same degree to which we are witnessing it to-day, in practically no part of the world was there ever seen such a social upheaval as that which has followed in the wake of the economic disturbance brought about by the war and which instead of lessening seems to gain in strength as time goes on.

What are the causes of this social unrest which finds expression in numerous and ever recurrent strikes, in popular movements which, at times, border on sedition, giving rise to popular clamour of every description and apprising us of the existence in the different classes of society of a ferment which threatens to destroy not alone the social equilibrium of this country but the economic equilibrium as well?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that these causes are both deep-rooted and remote; I hold that the economic system which has been established for years in this country is one of the main causes of this social unrest we are witnessing to-day and about which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) asked us yesterday to remain silent while knuckling down to the task of production. Furthermore I hold that these causes are remote. As I said a moment ago the war saw colossal fortunes piled up in this country; but even before the advent of war certain classes of our citizens enjoyed special privileges and that was, I believe, one of the conditions responsible for social unrest. The main cause of the trouble is found, it appears to me, in the fact that instead of recognizing agriculture as the basic industry of this country we have been too considerate of our manufacturing interests, afforded them too much protection.

The hon. member who has just taken his seat gave us a wonderful description of the situation that obtains in this country to-day. He gave us some very interesting statistics but he forgot, I fear, to acquaint the House —and I regret that he does not understand what I am saying—with one of the chief facts of the case. When the hon. member for Fort William was explaining his attitude and revealing himself in the colours of a moderate protectionist he forgot, in his comparisons between Germany, England and United States, to mention the respective populations of these countries.

Mr. Speaker, the United States are almost a world unto themselves, compared to England; Germany also has a much larger territory than England. The United States have a poulation of 110,000,000, Germany, 70,000,000 and the population of England, so far as I know, does not reach 50,000,000. I haven't the statistics here and I make no claim to infallibility, but before

the war I was a close student of the commercial activity of these countries and, as a British subject I was proud of the fact that England, the smallest in respect of population, the smallest in respect of territory, surpassed, in volume of trade, such countries as the United States and Germany; England's trade was greater than that of the United States despite the fact that the United States had two and a half times the population and four or five the territorial expanse of England.

In my youth whenever I used to hear public men speaking of free trade and protection, I was rather inclined to be an unreserved free trader since I was enamoured of big ideas; I considered that protection penalized trade. Having had occasion, later on, to become better acquainted with public affairs, I realize today that the economic system of this country should be grounded on free trade while at the same time granting to every industry the measure of protection necessary for the fostering of that industry.

I am astonished that the hon. member for Fort William should proclaim himself a moderate protectionist and should then express approval of the Budget brought down by the Finance Minister yesterday when that Budget puts a tax as high as 50 per cent on some articles. I wonder just how stiff a tax would be necessary to convince the hon. member that the tariff was rather high. In his opinion this Budget gives moderate protection. I might tell my hon. friend and colleague that since he changed parties, since he entered the Unionist fold, his views have perhaps undergone a change.

The question of protection and free trade is an old question. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I have practically grown up in the study of this question. This Canada of ours enjoyed prosperity from 1854 to 1866. At that time we had a reciprocity agreement with the United States, but the United States, dissatisfied with our attitude during the Civil War, withdrew from the agreement. In 1878 Sir John Macdonald inaugurated the National Policy. Our country had just entered upon its development; Confederation was in its early stages and the country's industries were just beginning to get a foothold. Elected to office the Liberal party in 1897, made a substantial reduction in the tariff the following year and relieved the people to that extent. With what regret Mr. Speaker, the people of this country recall the days of peace and plenty which blessed Canada under the Liberal Administration, which lasted from 1896 to 1911, fifteen years of peace, of social well-being and of material prosperity without precedent in the annals not only of this, but of any other country.

In 1911 things took a new turn in Canada; the Liberal party, consistent with the doctrine it had always held, sought to give a new impetus to agriculutre, realizing that the greatness and prosperity of this country can only be brought about by the development of agriculture. In a treaty negotiated at Washington by the Finance Minister, the Government of the day made certain concessions, took a step in the direction of free trade. But you are as well aware as I of the turn affairs took in Canada at that time. A powerful association sprung up wielding its influence throughout the country. The voters, it seemed, were not entitled to concern themselves with what the Manufacturers' Association considered its own particular affair. The association waged a war to the death against reciprocity with the result that the former Government went down to defeat and the affairs of the country passed into the hands of a party which, up to that time had espoused the doctrine of protection rather than free trade. What was the consequence of this change, Mr. Speaker? On reading to-day the speech delivered yesterday by the hon. Minister of Finance, I find the practical confirmation of what I said: the total agricultural production in 1910 (page 2555 of the unrevised debates for the 18th May, in the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance) amounted to $663,000,000 in round figures; in 1919 it reached $1,975,000,000, an increase in twelve years of $1,312,000,000, an average gain of $145,000,000 per year. So much for our farm produce. Now let us consult the figures for our manufactured products. In the statistics he gave the House yesterday the Finance Minister did not choose, for his comparison, the same years as in the case of agriculture.

In 1906 our manufactured products were valued at $718,000,000; eleven years later, in 1917, they had attained $3,015,000,000 in value, an increase of $2,297,000,000 in eleven years, a yearly average of $208,000,000. So we find that agricultural products increased, on an average, $145,000,000 in value each year while our manufactured products jumped in value $208,000,000 every twelve months.

I believe the present Government has failed to take sufficient interest in the mainspring of this country's development; that it has been too lavish in its favour to a certain class and too niggardly in this respect

towards agriculture. The building of tremendous fortunes both during the war and even prior to the war, thanks to our high tariff wall, is probably one of the causes of the social unrest I was referring to a moment ago.

I would ask each and every member in this House who enjoys the advantage of being conversant with the language in which I have chosen to express my opinions on this matter, even my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) whom the hon. member for Fort William classed as a free trader, to make the following comparison: take a farmer in your district whose holding is valued at $10,000 and who tills his soil with the assistance of his son; after ten years of hard work, when this man has raised his family, what will his investment of $10,000 be worth? The answer is easy; it will still represent $10,000. Take $10,000 to-day and invest it in a factory; in ten years your factory will be worth $100,000. Agriculture has not kept pace with the manufacturing industry of this country.

We hear the complaint, Mr. Speaker, that our country districts are becoming depopulated; but everything has been done to draw people to the cities. The farmers are asked to increase production—for, after all, the law of supply and demand is responsible for the high cost of living—the farmers are asked to increase production but in order to do that they must have more help; besides up to these last few years agriculture was far from being remunerative in this country.

In my opening remarks—and I was sincere—I had the pleasure of congratulating the hon. Minister of Finance; last year and up to the present time I had an opportunity of admiring his predecessor. When I first came into the House I listened with pleasure to the Budget Speech delivered by the Hon. Sir Thomas White and each year it was with renewed pleasure that I listened to him when he made his address to the House.

With our prosperity tumbling and millions being thrown away I used to admire the former minister, and I admire the present minister; however, I recall the ancient myth of the Danaïdes who by their father's order, were condemned to go on forever pouring water into a broken cistern. The present hon. Minister of Finance seems like his predecessor, condemned to constantly fill the public treasury vaults while his colleagues as constantly go on spending in the most thoughtless way. A deficit of $47,000,000 from our railroads; the building of a merchant marine, the profitable operation of which is open to question; millions spent right and left; an overburdened Budget. The member of former days will not recognize the Parliament of Canada for 1920; all the more reason for admiring the efforts of the hon. Minister of Finance while he strives to fill up the treasury, a reproduction of the broken cistern of the Danaïdes.

Mr. Speaker, it was in 1918 that I first came into this House; everything was new to me then. At that time I listened to rather inflamed speeches—we were so to speak on the top of a volcano—however I believe the intentions of my hon. friend's have changed for the better; they have realized I believe, that to promote peace and harmony in this country they should make their appeal to the spirit of good-will, to the spirit of tolerance. The war which was ranging then has come to an end. The post-war problems, however, did not dampen the enthusiasm of the association I alluded to a moment ago; here amongst my papers I discovered a gigantic advertisement that the Manufacturers' Association had published in the Montreal newspaper La Presse on the 17th of March, 1919. In this advertisement the Manufacturers' Association asks: Where are you going to get the revenue? Where are you going to find the $400,000,000 you need? In the pockets of the people of course, by burdening them with further taxes. I do not think the hon. Minister of Finance found his inspiration in this advertisement of last year; however, the same spirit is predominant in the Cabinet, the same spirit which was evident some years ago and is still evident to-day.

Not content with publishing advertisements broadcast in the newspapers this association appealed to manufacturers to enroll in its membership and showed them the advantages of such action. Fortunately the manufacturers of Berthier county recognize the merits of a free trade policy and I take pleasure in reading to the House the answer sent by one of our Berthier manufacturers to Mr. Howard Smith, chairman of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association:

BERTHIERVILLE, P.Q., April 22nd, 1919.

Mr. HOWARD SMITH,
Pres. Canadian Mfg. Assn.,
Montreal, Que.

Dear Sir:—

Referring to your communication regarding a petition to the Government at Ottawa to maintain the present high tariff on raw or finished products now manufactured in Canada, would say that our experience is that we would much prefer a reduction in tariff on our lines.

In fact, if you will remove the tariff on our raw material we are certain we would be in a position to compete with the United States very favorably and if the United States would remove their tariff on our finished product, we could and would go into the United States market to a very great advantage, since we would have 100 million more people to sell to.

We are therefore very much in favor of lower tariff on all of our lines finished or for the raw material at least.

In fact I am quite sure you are of my opinion in case we can so exchange with the United States.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) GEORGE A. SAVOY,
Managing Director.

(Translation.) Mr. Speaker, everybody is not in favour of a high tariff; I believe the great majority of our people desire a revision downwards. Since, as the statistics quoted by the hon. member for Fort William show, the middle classes comprise the major portion of our population, I feel sure that an increase in import duties will bear most heavily on this class of the community. I am almost through, Mr. Speaker. Let me say that I highly appreciate the nice regard shown us by our friends on the Government side in the course of the last, and of the present, session. I am happy to see that the sentiment which sprang up during the war is fast disappearing. I used to wonder if the members from the province of Quebec, who speak the French tongue, who represent the pioneers of this country, those ancestors of ours, who at one time preserved Canada to the British flag, I used to wonder, I say, whether those citizens had the same rights as are granted to other citizens. I believe that the effervescence stirred up by the war has subsided; I believe that all men of good-will are going to work for the cause of union and forbearance and that the energy of each and every one of our citizens will be pledged to the common task of leading our beloved Canada to the promised land of her glorious future.

Mr. S. E. ELKIN (St. John City and counties of St. John and Albert): Mr. Speaker, in opening my remarks this evening I desire in the first place to congratulate the Minister of Finance on the very able way in which he presented his Budget Speech yesterday. I think he is to be highly commended for the frankness with which he placed the country's present position, and particularly the financial situation, before the people. The people for some time have been waiting to know just what the conditions were following this terrible period of five years through which we have just passed. Naturally, with such large expenditures as the Government had to face during those years, it was to be expected that it would take some time to balance the accounts. I am sure that the situation, now that we know the truth, was not so serious as many of us had expected it would be. I think also that the country is to be congratulated on having a Minister of Finance with courage and boldness enough to bring into effect such a Budget as was introduced yesterday. It must have taken considerable courage to go from the beaten track of years into practically a new sphere of taxation, but the minister and his colleagues were convinced, no doubt, that the time had come when the people of Canada should bear the burden imposed by the war and that we should no longer borrow money for the immense revenue we have to raise. In this connection the minister, I think, has brought down a Budget which in every way will make for economy and production. Those who have studied the situation of this country during the last year have realized that if Canada is to take her place in the export markets of the world, if our people are to be prosperous, if posterity is not to be burdened with an enormous debt for years and years to come, then those of us who are directing or helping to direct the policy of the country should immediately get down to business as other countries are doing. Apropos of this, I may quote a little sketch I read the other day:

In popular parlance the "come-back" of John Bull & Sons proved something of a boomerang. It was as if John Bull was saying to the world, with the man who was called upon to deny his published obituary notice, "the report is grossly exaggerated."

American manufacturers have quickly realized that an insistance upon discounting our dollar to the limit was in truth the very killing of the goose that laid the golden egg. That is why many of them accepted Canadian funds, banking their balances within the Dominion until the situation clears.

I am sure that when our financial friends in the United States have had time to digest the Budget Speech of the Minister of Finance they will realize that so far as gold reserves and general trade are concerned, with the courage of the people of Canada there will be no need further to discount the Canadian dollar.

I am glad to hear the Minister of Finance say that if it is possible the business profits tax will be taken off next year. At the present time that tax seems to be about the only thing in the system of taxation that is vexatious to the people. It cannot

be denied that the business profits tax is unfair in many ways. We were the only country that put on a profits tax on business without making it retroactive. Every other country that adopted it permitted a company, when it had lost money in one year, to make up the deficit the next year. That scheme was not adopted here. A careful examination of results will show that a great many concerns did not make money during all the war period. Some concerns, particularly those engaged in staple lines, in the early part of 1914 and 1915 incurred losses and they were not permitted in 1916 and 1917 to make them up; they had to pay the full war profits tax on their business as it stood when the tax was levied. During the year 1917, and until the close of that year, prices of all commodities rose anywhere from 125 per cent to 250 per cent, and in some cases 300 per cent, and to a large extent the merchant or manufacturer paying this war profits tax was not able to keep up with the increasing cost of articles which he put into his store or his factory. The result is that to-day a large number of manufacturing houses, wholesale and retail, are borrowing from the banks far more money than they did before. The reason is obvious: a dozen eggs cost to-day two and three times what they did before, and the same thing applies to all commodities which are in stock. I am glad therefore that the Minister of Finance and his colleagues realize this situation and that we have their assurance that if possible the tax may be removed next year.

I have been very much interested in the discussion of the Budget, so far as the debate has gone. As I listened to the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), bearing in mind at the same time what I intended to say, I could not help thinking that we seemed to be in the position of two men who had had an enemy in their home town, and returning from a trip abroad expecting that they should have to do battle with this foe, found him dead. For I cannot see that at the present time there is any one in this House on either side, but particularly in the Opposition benches, who is prepared to voice his long-cherished love of free trade. I believed in free trade once myself, but conditions have changed, and I think we are approaching that stage where men should face things as they are. Even the Western free trader of the past does not exist to-day. We have an immense nation to the south of us, whose manufacturing industries, natural resources, and every phase of commercial life, have been developed to the highest point. This country to the south of us is immensely wealthy. It has been built up under a protectionist policy. How are we going to face competition with these people? The one thing that is bothering us at the present moment is the problem of correcting our balance of trade. There is an indication that the tariff between this country and the United States should be higher and not lower. If we are going to build up a nation within the Empire we must keep out these American goods.

Let me say right here, without attempting to be an alarmist, that I think the people of this country will do well to consider the situation existing between Canada and the United States. We had a sample the other day when Senator Underwood, before a committee of Congress in Washington, uttered what was almost tantamount to a threat when he said that unless certain commodities exported from this country to the United States were made more accessible to those people the United States would shut down on Canada's imports of coal and other things which we take to a large extent from that country. That situation is serious. It is more serious than would appear from casual observation. It is time that the people of Canada were self-sustaining; it is time that we developed our natural resources so that we can be a nation within ourselves and be not dependent on our neighbours to the south for anything but possibly the luxuries which, in time of stress, we could get along without.

I am interested in a comparison which shows the resources and the courage of this country. The revenue of Canada from 1899-1900 to 1918-1919 has increased in the following way:

	Revenue.
1899-100	$ 51,000,000
1909-1910	101,000,000
1918-1919	313,000,000

This year we expect to raise, through the resourcefulness of the Canadian people, $720,000,000. Surely this is an indication to the world of the courage and reserve powers of the Canadian people.

Passing now to the only advocates of free trade that exist in the House at the present moment—because, after listening to the words which have fallen from the Opposition or Liberal benches, there apparently is no one, other than the hon. member for Brome, who is willing to take the responsibility of absolute free trade—we

come to the Western Grain Growers, who want to make immediate and sweeping reductions in the tariff, are fond of picturing Canadian manufacturers as a small group of selfish men who support the tariff policy solely in their own interests. These grain growers ask, "why should this privileged class be permitted to levy toll on all other people in the country?" I would like to make reply that the following benefit by a protective tariff just as much as the manufacturers:

1. 600,000 men and women who work in Canadian factories.

2. The wholesalers, retailers, and their employees who distribute the products of Canadian factories.

3. The farmers, who find a market in Canada for 80 per cent of everything they produce.

4. The railways and steamship companies, and their employees who carry Canadian goods.

5. The bankers, brokers, and commission agents, and their employees who help to finance Canadian industries.

6. The innumerable investors who own stock in Canadian manufacturing concerns but who are in no sense manufacturers.

7. The professional classes (doctors, lawyers, dentists, teachers, clergymen), insurance agents, the publishers, and all others who make their living directly or indirectly from industrial concerns and the industrial population.

Canada does not have a protective tariff because a few manufacturers want it, Canada has a protective tariff because the nation wants it. The nation has so expressed itself at the polls time after time under both Conservative and Liberal Governments, during the last forty years. Is the policy of this country to be determined by the majority, or by the farmers and politicians who have little at stake but unwholesome notoriety.

Protection! Could there be any more flagrant abuse of the word than by the farmers themselves. They demanded the Canadian Wheat Board, practically pooled their interests to prevent competition and at a crisis in foodstuffs demanded a price from Canada and the world. What about $3 wheat? Granted it cost more to produce. So do manufactured goods. The farmer knows there is more than a tariff form of protection. Pooling in a world shortage is one other way, and he took it.

In passing I wish to make reference to the fact that we have a member, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould), who came to the House under what is known as the referendum and recall. I think that form of election to the House of Commons is based on a very dangerous and retrograde principle. Why should a man come to this House elected with the idea of doing what he thinks best for the country all the way down till he reaches his own constituents, to be at the beck and call of five, ten or sixteen men who may constitute the committee which asked him to agree to the referendum and recall? That form of election is a part of the policy of the Farmers' party and it will be put into force if they get into power. It is well that the people of this country should consider that fact very carefully before the next election, for the reason that we cannot expect to have independent thought and action on the part of our law makers if they are to be at the beck and call of a few party politicians at home.

At a time like this when there are already a number of people in Canada out of work, it is the obvious duty of every man who can hand out a job to do so. The man who can but won't is not playing the game. He is not half so bad, however, as the man who deliberately hires workmen in some other country to do a job that could be done just as well by Canadian workmen.

There is a company operating in the Canadian West which is an amalgamation of farmers. It boasts of 36,000 shareholders, all western farmers. It owns 300 interior elevators, and operates a 2,500,000-bushel terminal elevator at Fort William. It owns a timber limit, runs its own sawmill to supply its shareholders with lumber, and prints its own journal. It undertakes to purchase for its shareholders on the co-operative plan practically everything that is used on the farm. In all this it is to be commended for the enterprise it is displaying, but it certainly gave Canadian workpeople a raw deal when picking out the goods it decided to advertise in its mail order catalogue. The catalogue of the United Grain Growers, Limited, is a well printed book of over one hundred pages covering everything from binder twine to sewing machines. It is barely possible that some of the goods shown therein are made in Canada, but if so their origin is carefully concealed; every single article whose origin is made clear by the illustrations in the catalogue is shown to be made in the United States. The ploughs, harrows and cultivators, all come from La Crosse, Wisconsin;

the mowers, rakes, tedders, stackers, and wrenches, come from Peoria, Ill.; the portable elevators and washing machines come from Pontiac, Ill.; the wagons, from Nashua, Ind.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. ELKIN: Certainly.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): Does he know why the implements sold by the Canadian Grain Growers' Association come from the United States? I don't suppose the hon. member is aware, so I will tell him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must remind the hon. member that what he proposes to do would not be submitting a question.

Mr. ELKIN: I do not know the authority for the statement, but it has been rumoured that the Canadian Grain Growers' are interested in some of these factories in the United States. I cannot say whether that is the case or not.

Th practice of the western farmer, when buying an implement from a Canadian manufacturer, is to ask for credit which may vary from six months to three years according to the kind of implement bought. When he buys through the United Grain Growers Limited, he sends in cash with the order and the United Grain Growers Limited then sends the cash out of the country. This point should be borne carefully in mind when western farmers complain of the high prices they have to pay for Canadian implements as compared with imported implements.

If every shareholder in the United Grain Growers, Limited, is the head of a family and the family purchases its supplies as far as it can from the United Grain Growers, Limited, then that company must do a business comparable to what would be done by a departmental store that enjoyed a monopoly of the retail trade in a city of 125,000. These Grain Growers have it in their power, therefore, to help very materially in solving the unemployment problem by handling only Canadian-made goods. But when they deliberately handle nothing but imported goods it forces one to the conclusion, taking the most charitable view of it, that the troubles of their fellow-Canadians give them no concern. Every dollar they send out of Canada for goods that could just as well be made here represents at least fifty cents taken off our Canadian factory pay-roll to be added to the factory pay-roll of the United States. And these are the people who are insisting that in the redress of grievances they shall have priority.

The farmers are not the only people in Canada with a grievance. What of the artisan classes temporarily out of employment as the result of the cessation of all war industries? What of the wage-earners and salaried people in general who are struggling with the problem of increased cost of living? What of organized labour with its demand for a shorter working day? Are the grievances of the farmers so pressing that they must be remedied before we deal with the grievances of other classes? Are Canadian farmers, as a class, so badly up against it that returned soldiers and unemployed work people must stand aside until the tariff is adjusted? Have prices of agricultural products been held down to that point where farmers have barely been able to make a living? Have farmers been taxed more heavily than other people? Have they been called to contribute more generously to the Patriotic Fund, the Red Cross, than people living in our towns and cities? Are they struggling under the load of Victory Bonds they are carrying—or income taxes?

It should be the aim of Parliament to remedy every legitimate grievance, giving attention first to those that are most pressing. If the case of the farmers is to be given priority, then let the farmers show some cause more convincing than the loudness of the howl they are putting up. What taxes do they pay to swell the federal revenues other than those levied by means of the tariff? When other people are paying taxes under the tariff, and income and profit taxes besides, how do the farmers justify their demand that they be relieved of taxes altogether? If their grievance is a real one how do they account for the fact that there is such a brisk demand for western farm land, with advancing prices? If there were a movement away from the land there would be some colour to their argument, but the movement is all the other way. The Grain Growers' Guide, in soliciting advertising from manufacturers, represents western farmers as being more prosperous than ever they were before. In justification of that statement it instances the fact that in one year 17,000 new motor cars were sold to the farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Advocates of free trade or one-sided trade are prone to refer to manufacturers as a

"privileged class". They repudiate the idea that the tariff is of any benefit to the farmers; according to them, the "beneficiaries" of the tariff are all to be found among those who dwell in towns and cities. In tariff matters, they claim, the policy of the Government is dictated by our industrial centres, and they issue solemn warning that some day a long suffering public will arise in its might and sweep the pernicious principle of protection into the discard.

As a matter of fact, the long suffering public is made up of those city dwellers who have tolerated a system whereby the farmer has two votes to their one. The farmer always has dominated in Parliament and in our provincial legislatures, a fact which may explain why it is that, in all our plans of taxation, he escapes with an easier load than that which the townsman is called upon to carry. If the farmer persists in an attempt to get from under altogether, and leave the whole load to be carried by the townsman, it is not unlikely that the latter will arise in his might and sweep aside the pernicious principle whereby he has been deprived of his just representation and voting power.

The following comparative tables are illuminating. The figures are the official estimates of population given for each constituency after the last redistribution.

Manitoba.

Winnipeg Centre	58,903
Winnipeg North	45,682
Winnipeg South	35,525
	140,110
Dauphin	23,371
Lisgar	25,978
Macdonald	20,802
Neepawa	23,913
Portage	22,059
Provencher	23,996
	140,119

It will thus be seen that there are three members for 140,000 city people and six members for 140,000 country people. Now let me cite the figures for the Province of Ontario:

Ontario.

Parkdale	59,609
Toronto Centre	54,762
Toronto East	53,712
Toronto North	51,318
Toronto South	43,956
Toronto West	57,804
	321,161
Brant	19,259
Bruce North	23,783
Dufferin	17,740
Elgin East	17,597
Grenville	17,545
Haldimand	21,562
Halton	22,208
Lennox and Addington	20,386
Ontario North	17,144
Ontario South	23,865
Oxford South	22,294
Peel	22,102
Perth South	18,947
Peterborough East	15,499
Prince Edward	17,150
Wellington North	22,292
	319,373

According to the Ontario figures we find that six city members represent a population greater than the population represented by sixteen rural members.

Now let me take the Province of Quebec:

Quebec.

George Etienne Cartier	51,937
Hochelaga	44,884
Laurier-Outremont	45,176
Maisonneuve	33,796
St. Ann	41,541
St. Antoine	34,794
St. Denis	45,141
St. James	44,057
St. Lawrence-St. George	38,883
St. Mary	62,521
Westmount-St. Henri	56,088
	498,818
Argenteuil	16,766
Bagot	18,206
Beauharnois	20,802
Bellechasse	21,141
Berthier	19,872
Brome	13,216
Dorchester	25,096
Joliette	23,911
Kamouraska	20,888
Laprairie-Napierville	19,335
L'Islet	16,435
Lotbinière	22,158
Maskinonge	16,509
Missisquoi	17,466
Montmagny	17,356
Richelieu	19,810
Rimouski	23,951
St. Johns-Iberville	21,882
Shefford	23,976
Sherbrooke	23,211
Stanstead	20,765
Vaudreuil-Soulanges	20,439
Wright	23,862
Yamaska	20,387
	487,440

Here, there are 24 members for a population of 487,440, and only 11 members for a population of 490,818. Why should it be a case of one man two votes in the country and one man one vote in the city? Which is the privileged class?

The hon. member from Brome (Mr. McMaster) said this afternoon that protection was an iniquitous form of taxation; that it had not dóne any good to the country; that

we should abolish it as soon as possible, and that if his party came into power he would be prepared to act on that principle. I want to point out as a matter of record that by means of the tariff—I do not say under the tariff, but directly as a result of its having been so effective in this country—over 616 manufacturing concerns in United States have crossed the border and established branches in Canada. If there had been no tariff against the United States, it would not have been necessary for the manufacturers of that country to come to Canada; for they could have supplied the requirements of our market from the idle capacity of their parent plants. These 616 branch factories employ about 90,000 people in Canada, to whom they pay annually in wages about $90,000,000. If each employee, on an average, has three dependents, it means that over one-quarter of a million people are supported by factories that owe their existence entirely to the tariff. Some are demanding that the tariff wall be broken down, and that Canada commence to work towards the ultimate establishment of free trade with the United States. If these demands are granted, will any more branches of American factories be established in Canada? Will all those which are now here remain?

I would like to place on Hansard a few figures in connection with this migration of American factories to Canada and in doing so, I shall have regard to the statistics for the years 1905, 1915 and 1917:

American factories with branches in Canada for the years 1905, 1915, 1917.

1905—	
Establishments	15,796
Capital	$846,585,023
Employees on salaries	36,496
Salaries	$ 30,224,086
Employees on wages	356,034
Wages	$134,375,925
Value of products	$718,352,603
1915—	
Establishments	21,303
Capital	$1,994,103,272
Employees on salaries	52,683
Salaries	$ 60,308,293
Employees on wages	462,200
Wages	$ 229,456,210
Value of products	$1,407,137,140
1917—	
Establishments	34,380
Capital	$2,772,517,680
Employees on salaries	73,598
Salaries	$ 95,983,506
Employees on wages	619,473
Wages	$ 457,245,456
Value of products	$3,015,506,869

These figures must be conclusive evidence that a protective tariff, a protective policy, a policy which protects the infant industry, has been well worth while for Canada.

Having regard to the fact that this Government and possibly some other governments have not been unmindful of the consideration that a moderate protective tariff is an advisable tariff and that they have realized that conditions have so changed from time to time in this country as to warrant a reduction in tariff, I wish to place on Hansard a record of some of the tariff reductions which have been made since 1911. In doing so, I direct attention to the fact that there has been no reduction in the United States tariff since the introduction of the Underwood tariff in 1913. But at present there are pending in the United States a large number of Bills which will change the situation there. The figures are as follows:

REDUCTIONS IN THE CANADIAN CUSTOMS TARIFF SINCE THE YEAR 1911.
Since Underwood Tariff became effective 1913 no reductions U.S. tariff dues.

Tariff Item.	—	Old General Tariff.	New General Tariff.
20a	Butter produced from the cocoa bean.....lbs.	3 cents.	2 cents.
39c	Cassava flour, when imported by manufacturers of explosives.....	17½ p.c.	Free.
	War tax.....	.....	7½ p.c.
60	Wheat, n.o.p. Per bush.....	12 cents	Free.
61	Wheat flour, n.o.p., semolina, n.o.p. Per brl.....	60 cents.	Free.
79a	Rooted carnation cuttings in this first year of introduction.....	20 p.c.	Free.
	War tax.....	.....	7½ p.c.
157a	Amyl alcohol or refined fusel oil, when imported by the Department of Inland Revenue to be denatured for use in the manufacture of metal varnishes or lacquers, etc. Per gal.....	$2 40	Free.
	War tax.....	.....	7½ p.c.
83	Potatoes, n.o.p. Per bushel.....	20 cents.	Free.
83	Potatoes dried, desiccated or otherwise prepared, n.o.p.....	30 p.c.	Free.
90a	Wild edible berries, n.o.p.....	25 p.c.	Free.
110	Cocoanuts, n.o.p. Per 100.....	90 cents.	75 cents.
111	Cocoanuts when imported from the place of growth, by ship, direct. Per 100.....	50 cents.	50 cents.

[Mr. Elkin.]

REDUCTIONS IN THE CANADIAN CUSTOMS TARIFF SINCE THE YEAR 1911—*Con.*

Since Underwood Tariff became effective 1913 no reductions U.S. tariff dues.

Tariff Item.	——	Old General Tariff.	New General Tariff.
118a	Squid, per pound	1 cent.	Free.
180a	Photographs sent to the press for use only as news pictures	25 p.c.	Free.
188a	Decalcomania paper not printed when imported by manufacturers of decalcomania transfers to be used in their own factories in the manufacture of decalcomania transfers	25 p.c.	Free.
	War tax		
209b	Nicotine sulphate	17½ p.c.	Free.
264	Peppermint oil	20 p.c.	7½ p.c.
	War tax		7½ p.c.
264	Essential oils	10 p.c.	7½ p.c.
	War tax		7½ p.c.
278a	Peanut oil for manufacturing soap or for canning fish; soya bean oil for manufacturing soap	17½ p.c.	Free.
	War tax excepting peanut oil for canning fish		
290	Cement, Portland. Per 100 lbs	11 cents.	8 cents.
327a	Silvered lenses for automobile lamps	35 p.c.	15 p.c.
	War tax		
353a	Aluminum leaf or foil	27½ p.c.	Free.
	War tax		
375b	Ferromanganese and spiegeleisen containing more than fifteen per cent manganese. Per ton	$2.50	Free.
	War tax		
441	Typecasting and typesetting machines and parts thereof, adapted for use in printing offices	20 p.c.	Free.
445	Mowing machines, harvesters, self binding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers and complete parts thereof not including shafting or malleable iron castings; also finished parts for repairs	17½ p.c.	12½ p.c.
446	Cultivators, harrows, horse-rakes, seed drills, manure spreaders and weeders and complete parts thereof	20 p.c.	15 p.c.
446a	Traction ditching machines, not being ploughs, adapted for tile drainage on farms, valued at retail at not more than three thousand dollars each and complete parts thereof	20 p.c.	Free.
446b	Ploughs and complete parts thereof	20 p.c.	15 p.c.
446c	Windmills and complete parts thereof	20 p.c.	15 p.c.
447	Portable engines with boilers in combination, horse powers and traction engines for farm purposes; windstackers and threshing machine separators, including baggers, weighers and self feeders therefor and complete parts	20 p.c.	15 p.c.
448	Hayloaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm road or field rollers, post hole diggers, snaths and other agricultural implements, n.o.p.	25 p.c.	20 p.c.
466a	Glassware and other scientific apparatus for laboratory work in public hospitals also apparatus for sterilizing purposes, not including washing or laundry machines, all articles in this item when imported in good faith for the use and by order of any public hospital	17½ p.c. to 35 p.c.	
478a	Iron or steel bands, strips or sheets, number fourteen gauge or thinner, coated polished or not, and rolled iron or steel sections, not being ordinary square, flat or round bars, when imported by manufacturers of saddlery hardware and hames for use exlcusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	From 5 p.c. to 30 p.c. or $2.00 per ton.	
	War tax		Free.
533a	Garnetted wool waste in the white when imported by manufacturers of woollen goods	17½ p. c.	Free.
591	Farm wagons and complete parts thereof	25 p.c.	20 p.c.
664a	Nitrate compounds not elsewhere specified for use in the manufacture of explosives	17½ p.c.	Free.
	War tax		
671a	Metal tips, studs and eyes adapted for the manufacture of corset clasps and corset wires	35 p.c.	Free.
	War tax		
689a	Miners' rescue appliances, designed for emergency use in mines, where artificial breathing is necessary in the presence of poisonous gases, and automatic resuscitation apparatus for artificial breathing, to aid in the saving of human life	17½ p.c. to 35 p.c.	Free.

REDUCTIONS IN THE CANADIAN CUSTOMS TARIFF SINCE THE YEAR 1911—*Con.*

Since Underwood Tariff became effective 1913 no reductions U.S. tariff dues.

Tariff Item.		Old General Tariff.	New General Tariff.
692a	Articles presented from abroad in recognition of the saving of human life	From 17½ p.c. to 25 p.c.	Free.
705a	Machines, vehicles and various implements for agricultural purposes moved by mechanical power, if actually owned abroad by the settler for at least six months before his removal to Canada	From 20 p.c. to 35 p.c.	Free.
	Traction engines $1,400 and less; and traction parts thereof for farm purposes	20 p.c.	Free.
445a	Malleable iron castings when imported by manufacturers for use exclusively in their own factories in the manufacture of mowing machines, harvesters, binding attachments and reapers	27½ p.c.	17½ p.c.

Is Canada to be the only free trade country with free trade a misnomer as it is at the present time? Free trade, as we understand it to-day, or as it might be possible under our Farmer and Liberal friends, would be a one-sided trade.

In view of the demands which western farmers are making that our Government make an immediate and substantial all-round reduction in the customs tariff, it is only proper that we should consider what our Allies are doing!

The importation of manufactured goods into Great Britain is subject to restrictions which constitute very high protection.

France is not lowering her tariff; on the contrary she is shutting out the goods of other countries by a system of import licenses.

Italy, like Great Britain and France, is restricting imports.

The Premier of South Africa has announced that the tariff of that country, heretofore designed for revenue only, will be increased to protect home industries.

Nothing has been heard to warrant the belief that any lowering of the tariff is even under consideration by Australia, New Zealand, Newfoundland, Japan, Brazil or Portugal.

In the United States the Republican party has now a majority in both the Senate and Congress and it has always supported a high tariff. The National Industrial Conference Board of the United States reported —"That a more highly protective tariff will be advocated . . . . is practically certain," and twenty-six Bills now before Congress increasing the tariff.

The farmer, or one-sided trader might well be challenged to point to a single country in the world to-day which is proposing to lower its tariff at this critical time. And why is this? Because the above-mentioned countries are determined to reconstruct their industries on a peace basis, to manufacture for themselves what they need, and to provide employment for their soldiers and war workers.

Is Canada to be the only country in the world to throw down its safeguards? Is she going to ignore the great lesson taught by the war, that a nation must maintain within its own boundaries all the elements of self-protection and self-support? Are we to build a nation within the Empire—a Canadian nation, not a dependent; a nation self-sustaining in days of need as well as plenty. Our policy with our immense natural resources and people of initiative should be national, not class.

Referring for a moment to the latest Budget brought in by the Finance Minister of Australia, the new tariff, it is said for the first time follows the Canadian precedent in having three distinct schedules of duties —British Preferential, Intermediate and General Tariff columns. The British Preferential rates came immediately into operation in so far as goods and products manufactured in the United Kingdom are concerned.

The Finance Minister of Australia states:

> While it is admitted that no Parliament can bind the succeeding Parliament to any prospective customs duties, yet the new principle of a "deferred scale of duties" to become operative at fixed dates (mainly on January 1, 1921, and the same date in 1922) has been introduced into the Tariff Bill. The deferred duty proposals comprise twenty-two items, and their incidence bears chiefly upon iron and steel products, vessels trading in Australian waters, and certain lines of fuse and explosives. The minister explained that the deferred duty principle was to give definite encouragement to investors to establish industries within Australia, and quoted instances of the probable establishment of industrial plants when sufficient protection was to some extent assured.

I might point out a few features as to the Australian tariff. Pig iron was free until the new tariff came in; to-day the general tariff is forty shillings per ton. Pipes cast and wrought per ton, forty-eight shillings before this tariff came down; the Finance Minister of Australia has raised the duty to eighty shillings. Rails and other items in that category which were thirty-five shillings per ton have been raised to seventy-five shillings, eighty-five shillings and ninety-five shillings. And so on throughout this whole tariff. The Australian Government,—and a more or less Labour Government at that,—have at last realized that if Australia is to be a big industrial country these new industries must be protected, and they have gone at it in a wholesale way. Further than that, the value for duty is to be taken as the fair market value of the goods in the principal markets of the country whence the same were exported in the usual and ordinary commercial acceptation of the term and free on board at the port of export in such country, with a further addition of ten per cent on such market value.

Dealing with free trade as it concerns our transportation problem, transportation was a large issue in the Reciprocity campaign of 1911. It is a bigger issue to-day, because since then Canada has begun the operation of the Canadian National railways, a great transcontinental system. She has already spent hundreds of millions upon these enterprises, and may have to spend many millions more. Her only chance to prevent that investment becoming a dead loss is to keep a steady flow of traffic moving from east to west, and from west to east. If ever it becomes diverted to a north and south direction, her transportation plant might as well be scrapped.

Under reciprocity or free trade that is what would inevitably happen. In fact western farmers are quite frank in the expression of their desire to market their grain in Minneapolis and Chicago, and to buy their requirements in manufactured goods from the Middle and Western States. Their whole effort at present is to encourage the buying of United States goods in preference to Canadian. Inferentially, therefore, their whole effort is to make it difficult or impossible to operate our transcontinental railways at a profit. These railways were built with the money of the people of Canada, in order that there might be opened up for settlement a territory whose population are now enjoying marked prosperity. Without the railways there would have been no West. Without the taxes cheerfully paid year after year by Canadians in the East there would have been no railways. Is the partnership arrangement, that has proven so mutually profitable, now to be terminated simply because of the unwillingness of the West to pay its share of the operating expenses? And must the whole investment be wiped out in consequence?

It is essential that Canadian credit should be maintained at the high standard at which it now is. It may be necessary at some day in the future for public works or for other capital account to borrow money. When Canada goes to her banker, fortunately the Canadian people at the present time, and asks for a loan they will want to know two things: First, what is she going to do with the money she is asking for, and second, what sources of income has she that will justify the belief that she will be able to repay? Canada can hardly borrow money when she has to admit that she is going to give it away, or is going to use it in meeting interest charges on what she already owes. Her chances of success would be better if she could show that she was going to employ it in useful public works, but even then she would have to be in a position to prove that her revenue would be equal to the task of carrying all existing obligations, plus interest and sinking fund on the new loan she was trying to negotiate. Faced with the direct question "What is your estimated revenue for the year ending March, 1921, or 1922, and from what sources?" how would she answer were she at this juncture to enact any measure of free trade? She could show that under her present tariff, with the addition of the special war tariff and taxes, after meeting all claims for drawbacks, she was able to meet all her obligations for the year. But what guarantee would there be that she could do as well under free trade? At the very time when she absolutely must maintain her credit, is she deliberately to invite refusal, if need be, by adopting fiscal changes that will make it impossible for her to give any satisfactory assurances as to what her revenues will amount to? If she cannot borrow money for public works, and if, in consequence, there ensues a long period of widespread unemployment, what is the effect going to be on Victory Bonds? With business depressed and people out of work, the bonds will undoubtedly come onto the market in large volume, and that in turn will depreciate their value. Is Canada to be a party to an arrangement that will

double-cross her own people who have come so nobly to her assistance in financing the war? I think sometimes governments find it a difficult lesson to learn that future governmental revenues are based entirely on the present development of the nation's resources, and development can only be attained through the attraction of capital into enterprise by the inducement of satisfactory and reasonable returns on the capital invested.

I think it would be advisable for the Minister of Finance, if he can see his way clear, to impose a more moderate rate of income tax next year. It seems to me that the difficulty of collecting the small tax hardly makes it worth while, and the other tax is so heavy as to be almost exorbitant, and at times defeats its purpose.

I am sorry it has been necessary for me to take up so much time this evening, but I felt that, not having declared myself before, I should take a stand before this Parliament and before the country and my constituents. It seems to me that this is a time when all members of Parliament must shoulder the responsibility which rests upon them. After all the country looks to some extent to its law-makers sitting in this House to lead the way. We have a long journey before us in Canada, but it is a journey on which we can see our way. We have great resources. We have a courageous people. We are not so old but that the courage and the faith of our forefathers still remain in us. We are not so old but that we can remember many of the large developments that have taken place in this country. We have before us always the record of the past five years. Surely in Canada we have nothing to be ashamed of. We can look forward with a great deal of confidence to the mastering of the problems that face us financially, and in nation-building; and I do hope that this debate will be characterized by its high national tone.

After all, there is nothing so important at the present time in this country as that Canada shall stand higher than she has ever stood before. There is no real difference between the two sides of this House. The difference is purely imaginery, because while we have one side talking protection, the other side is talking partial free trade but means protection. This is a time in our history for us to forget to a large extent our party differences. The Government have many problems to face, and it behooves all of us who are in the fortunate position to represent constituencies in this Parliament at this critical time to maintain the general interest, not the interest of a class.

Mr. J. F. JOHNSTON: I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the farmers of Western Canada wish to market their wheat at Minneapolis and also to purchase their machinery there. If I heard him correctly, he is absolutely wrong in his statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members should not abuse the privilege which they have of asking a question by rising presumably for that purpose and taking advantage of the opportunity to interject a statement or expression of opinion. By a strict interpretation of the rules of debate these hon. members should be considered as having exhausted their right to speak.

Mr. D'ANJOU (Translation): Mr. Speaker, in addressing the House this evening I have no intention of setting forth a definition of protection or free trade. I merely wish to say that I, personally, am in favour of whatever tariff changes may benefit the country and that I abide by the resolution passed at the great Liberal convention of August, 1919. Therefore, since the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) contains a miniature likeness of that resolution I shall take pleasure in voting for the amendment. The hon. member from St. John, N.B. stated, amongst other things, that once upon a time he had been a free trader; he forgot to mention, however, that at one time he had been a Liberal also and that while he had altered his mind he had changed parties too, which explains how our former free trader has become converted to the doctrine of protection. A goodly portion of his speech was devoted to attacks against the farming community. Like many another hon. member on the Government side the hon. gentleman from St. John, N.B. seems to fear the farmers' movement; no doubt he despairs of ever being re-elected to a seat in this House, a lot which will assuredly befall the great majority of the hon. gentlemen on your right, Mr. Speaker.

I myself am not a farmer; I have no brief for the farmers; the important Farmer party in this House is well able to take care of its own interests. However, as the representative of a riding which is distinctly agricultural in character, I deem it my duty to challenge the statements of any hon. member who starts, hammer and tongs, after the farmers of this country.

The hon. gentleman from St. John, N.B. said that the farmers paid no taxes on their

profits, that their profits were exempt. The hon. member, no doubt, is interested in a few mighty corporations and he is not very keen on sharing his profits with the Government. Of course he is perfectly willing to share all honour with the Government, but he would rather keep his profits to himself. He resembles all those profiteers who, during the war, amassed fortunes with the help of this Government. During the war while our people were bowed down in pain and suffering, while so many of our boys were shedding their blood on the battlefields of old Europe, these gentlemen —we have several of them in this House— at the head of powerful corporations were taking in millions; at that time, I repeat, blood was flowing in torrents on the fields of Flanders and other battle grounds. So it seems to me the hon. member for St. John, N.B., has no right to complain of the farmers.

During the present session it has been insinuated that the farmers were the worst of war profiteers, that the war had enriched them tremendously. Like every other mere mortal the farmer has suffered from the rise in the cost of commodities; he has had to pay more for labour and for agricultural machinery; consequently he is entitled to dispose of his wares at a little higher price. It was brought out in a recent debate, particularly by my hon. friend, the member for L'Islet (Mr. Fafard) that profiteering is not to be found amongst the farmers, but amongst the middlemen; it is the middleman who goes from farm to farm buying up all the produce at ridiculously low prices and later sells this same produce in the public markets at a fabulous figure. As the hon. member for l'Islet explained, potatoes bought last fall for between 90 cents and $1.10 a bag were later sold at $5 and $6 a bag. Did that money go into the farmer's pocket? No, it went into the pockets of the middlemen who hoarded this produce in cold storage plants; the middlemen that this Government wants to shield—there you have your profiteers. They are the men who deserve the Government's wrath; not only should they be thrown into prison, they should be hanged. That is the treatment meted out to profiteers in certain countries of Europe.

According to the statement of the Minister of Finance himself the country is confronted with a pyramid of debt. The people of Canada will be astounded to hear this statement from the lips of the minister. However, there is nothing surprising about it after all the guilty extravagance indulged in by this Government during the last five years. Truly the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) must feel satisfied; at last his dream has come true; the country is bankrupt; we are down to our last farthing.

On March 31st, 1920, our national debt was $3,014,483,774.12. I repeat, there is no room here for surprise. For my part, during the last and preceding sessions I stated that, although not absolutely opposed to our participation in the war, I decidedly was opposed to this country taking an unreasonable and irrational part in the hostilities; that is my position still. We see to-day the result of this irrational participation in the war. Whatever may be said, this war was not fought for the defence of civilization and liberty; even now that the League of Nations has become a reality, we can very well see that the last war, like most others, was fought for commercial supremacy and world domination.

The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) declared that the paternal Government of which he is such an ardent supporter had striven with every means at its disposal to promote agriculture in this country; indeed, he said, the Estimates for the present year give $5,000,000 to agriculture—however the Estimates include $12,000,000 for military purposes. Apparently the member for Fort William is satisfied with this vote of $12,000,000 for military purposes since he finds $5,000,000 sufficient for agriculture. Well, I would like to see those $12,000,000 added to the $5,000,000 already voted; thus agriculture would have $17,000,000 and the army nothing. The war we have just been through cost us enough in blood and treasure. While the war was perhaps not fought for the defence of freedom and civilization it was fought for the destruction of Prussian militarism, and I maintain that when, at the cost of untold sacrifices we have succeeded in crushing militarism in Germany, is no time to introduce militarism into this country. I do not know what opinions the hon. member for Fort William may hold. I say that instead of voting $12,000,000 for military purposes the Government should have given the money to agriculture, should have used it, as I have often asked, for the establishment of new experimental farms, for schools of agriculture and not for military schools, for an army of tillers of the soil and not for an army of soldiers. I have not changed my attitude and even if some

hon. member on the Government side should accuse me of disloyalty I would not care one whit; I have the courage of my convictions and no one will deter me from taking my stand openly.

When I asked the hon. minister for an experimental farm in Rimouski county he told me that he could not grant my request because the Government lacked the necessary funds. Under cover of the policy of economy the Government is doing things which are neither to the advantage of the country nor in the country's interests. Among other things I was promised nearly $30,000 for the completion of the port at Rimouski. This undertaking was in the interest not only of Rimouski county alone, but of a very important district of the province of Quebec; it would have been equally advantageous to the neighbouring county represented by my hon. friend from Matane (Mr. Pelletier). Well, on the plea of economy, I was refused $16,800, and now the Government is going to spend $12,000,000, perhaps $20,000,000, to establish military encampments all through the country. I do not countenance this policy; I am in favour of economy, but economy well understood. I have said before in the course of the present session and I repeat here to-day, that the Government can never spend too much money for the promotion of agriculture; since agriculture is the principal industry of this country and will help us, more than any other thing, to overcome the difficulties which beset our country to-day.

The spirit of unrest is stalking through this country, unrest caused in great part by the high cost of living; still the Budget reveals no attempt on the part of the Government to bring relief to the people.

If I am in favour of the amendment presented by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, it is because I am convinced that the adoption of this amendment and the carrying out of the policy therein enunciated would bring about an improvement in the present situation and the lowering of the cost of living.

Over production is certainly one of the best ways of doing this, for with us as in many other countries, consumption has increased enormously and production has decreased. There should at least be equilibrium between the two, and in order to bring that about, production and over-production should be encouraged by all possible means. You hear much said in blame of the farmers, but during the war we were very well pleased to see them bend all their energies towards intensified production, so as to feed not only the Canadian soldier at the front but our people at home. The most rational and most efficient way of encouraging agriculture and over-production is to put the farmer in the way of obtaining more cheaply farming implements among other things, by removing the customs duty from them, and also, as asked for in the amendments, from certain necessaries of life.

But the present Government are not in power for the benefit of the agricultural class any more than of other classes in the country save one. The present Government are in power for their own advantage and that of their supporters. This Government have the support of the profiteers, of those who were enriched by the war, of the namby-pamby young fellows who paraded the streets of Ottawa, Montreal and elsewhere during the war on a $10, $12 or $15 a day pay, while the workmen's sons were having their backs broken in the trenches of Flanders.

I would like to say a word as to the railway policy. Like all the hon. members who sit on this side of the House, I have always been, and am still, opposed to the operating of the railways by the Government, and the events have proved that we were right. Before the Government came to the conclusion of finally adopting this policy, we had the examples of England and the United States, which in trying to apply this policy had met with monumental failure. Consequently, when the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) came to tell this House that, after a period of nine months, his administration of the Government railways showed a deficit of $45,000,000, the hon. members on this side of the House were not surprised. For my part, I still hold that such a policy is not calculated to benefit the country, but rather to benefit certain railway magnates, close friends of the Government, and who share their advantages, perhaps, with certain members of this House who advocated this policy and supported it in Parliament.

I do not intend to occupy much of the time of the House. I would like though to say a few words as to the general course followed by the Government. There is no doubt but that we are governed somewhat according to the Russian or Prussian system. Autocracy reigns supreme in this country, and as was so truly observed by the hon. leader of the Opposition in the

magnificent speech which he delivered the other evening, we have come to the point of using secret diplomacy. Such is the new ill-use of power which this Government has added to their guilt. They decided, without consulting Parliament, that is, without consulting the Canadian people through their representatives, to send an emissary to Washington; and when everything was done, they came and said to Parliament, "Without your authorization, without consulting you as representatives of the people, we have decided this, and to-day, whether you are willing or not, the thing is done, and has to be abided by." A fine way forsooth of governing a democratic country; a fine way of respecting the rights of the people! I for one have already had occasion to protest against such ill-use of power on the part of the Government. I find the Canadian nation a long-suffering people. It seems to me that had such abuse of power taken place in some other country, its government would long have ceased to exist. The Canadian people are good, they are patient, but their hour shall come before long, and whatever be the government then sitting on your right, Mr. Speaker, be they a Liberal Government—as I am convinced they will be—or be they a Farmers' Government, they will be a vast improvement upon what we have to-day.

We already knew that the Government was no longer trusted by the people, but we had further evidence of the fact the other evening when the vote was taken upon the motion of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's protesting against the appointment of a Canadian representative at Washington.

Then how could this Government have the confidence of the people, seeing the iniquitous way in which they won the election and the fraudulent methods they used to get into power? No wonder that, from the start, the people had no confidence in them and the Government did not act in such a way as to win their confidence. There remains only one thing for them to do, i.e., to pack up their trunks and to appear before the electorate. The people are anxious to look upon the congenial faces of these hon. gentlemen opposite when they seek re-election; anxious to stare at these renegades who sit at your right, Mr. Speaker, and who betrayed them. I am sure that the answer of the people will be a condemnation of this Government who usurped the executive power and who committed all the abuses of which an autocratic Government might be guilty. It does not matter what Government will be formed at that time: either a good Liberal administration having at its head the eminent and able leader of the Liberal Opposition or a Government composed of our friends the Farmers who have a very distinguished leader in the person of the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar). What we, of the Opposition want is that the Government come and ask the people for a new mandate. We are sure that the verdict will be one of reprobation and condemnation, because the people who were deceived and shocked in their most intimate feelings, want to take their revenge and the revenge will be unsparing. I am sure, there might not remain ten of the present members sitting now at your right, Mr. Speaker. The people will elect representatives not like some hon. members of the present parliament who owe their election to the extorting of soldier votes, but who shall have been chosen freely and sincerely through a better franchise Act than that which the Government wishes to impose upon the House now. I am positive that the people will grant their confidence to hon. members of this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, for they have always worked hard in the interest of the country and this they will continue to do until the Government decide to appeal to the people.

On motion of Mr. F. R. Lalor (Haldimand) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Thursday, May 20, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS TABLED.

Annual Report of the Department of Railways and Canals.—Hon. J. D. Reid.

Reports of the Proceedings of the Canadian War Records Office, covering the period from 1916 to 1919, and including the Report of the Executive Committee of the Canadian War Memorial Fund.—Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Borden.

CRIMINAL CODE (FRENCH VERSION) AMENDMENT.

Rt. Hon. C. J. DOHERTY moved that Bill No. 131 (Letter C of the Senate) to amend the Criminal Code (French Version) be read the first time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will the minister please explain the purpose of this Bill?

Mr. DOHERTY: The Bill is intended to correct a number of errors in translation that have been discovered in the Criminal Code; errors dating back practically to the time of the passing of the Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

EX-SENATOR P. A. CHOQUETTE.

Mr. FRIPP:

1. At what date was the resignation of ex-Senator P. A. Choquette placed in the hands of the Government?
2. What were the reasons given by ex-Senator Choquette for sending in his resignation?

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In reply to No. 1: in the month of December last; in reply to No. 2: no reasons were assigned.

SIR WILLIAM MACKENZIE.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

How many times has the private car of Sir William Mackenzie travelled on the Canadian National Railway system within the last two years?

Hon. Mr. REID: The Government have no information as to the details of operation of each individual car on Canadian National railways.

FREIGHT BOATS ON INLAND WATERS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton):

1. Does the Government intend to place freight boats built and owned by them on our inland waters during the present season?
2. If so, how many of said vessels will be so placed?
3. If the National Merchant Marine Organization has the handling of the Government-owned boats, what reason, if any, do they give for not using some of the vessels under their control in the carrying trade on our Great Lakes?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Boats owned by the Government through its Government Merchant Marine are being operated by that organization in connection with the Canadian National railways as will appear in the public interest. Cannot say at present time what steamers may operate on the Inland Waters during present season.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

BIOLOGICAL BOARD.

Mr. TURGEON:

1. Who are the members of the Biological Board of Canada?
2. How are they appointed and by whom?
3. What salaries are they paid for their services?
4. Who is chairman and who is secretary of the board?
5. Has the Commissioner of Fisheries any connection with the board?
6. Where are biological investigations carried on under the board?
7. What scientific staff did they employ last year, and where?
8. Does the Fisheries Branch of the Naval Service give the board any fishery or other problems to investigate?
9. If so, what are some of these fishery problems?
10. Are the services of the Biological Branch of any value to the Fisheries Branch, and to the fishing industry?
11. What reports are issued on the work of the Biological Board and its staff?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Professor E. E. Prince, Commissioner of Fisheries, Chairman; Dr. A. P. Knight, Representative of the Department of Naval Service; Professor L. W. Bailey, Representative of the University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, N.B.; Professor A. H. R. Buller, Representative of the University of Manitoba, Winnipeg; Reverend Canon V. A. Huard, Representative of the Laval University, Museum of Public Instruction, Quebec, P.Q.; Professor J. P. McMurrich, Representative of the University of Toronto, Toronto; Dr. A. H. MacKay, Representative of the Dalhousie University, Halifax, N.S.; Professor R. F. Ruttan, President of the Royal Society and representative of McGill University, Montreal.

2. Two members are nominated and appointed by the minister and represent the Department of the Naval Service on the board. The remaining six members are nominated by the several universities in the different provinces, and represent such provincial universities on the board.

3. None of the members of the Biological Board are paid any salary or honorarium for their services.

4. Professor Edward E. Prince is chairman and acts are secretary.

5. Answered by No. 1.

6. The Biological investigations are mainly carried on on the Atlantic coast at the Marine Biological Station, St. Andrews, N. B., and on the Pacific coast at the Marine Biological Station, Departure Bay near Nanaimo, B.C., but investigatons are also carried on at various points on both coasts and the Great Lakes by members of the scientific staff told off for special work. Oyster investigations are being carried on in Richmond Bay and other P.E.I. oyster grounds. Lobster investigations have been carried on at points extending from Gaspé

to the Bay of Fundy. Shad investigations have been carried on in various Nova Scotia rivers and special researches have been conducted in Miramichi Bay and off Cape Breton shores, while on the Great Lakes investigations have been carried on upon the supply of pearl mussels for the button industry, also on the whitefish fisheries and other cognate subjects.

7. The Scientific Staff consists of seventeen (17) trained scientific workers at St. Andrews and 15 scientific workers at the Pacific Station at Nanaimo. Their names are: Dr. A. P. Knight, Kingston, Ont.; Dr. A. G. Huntsman, Toronto, Ont.; Prof. L. W. Bailey, Fredericton, N.B.; Prof. Phil Cox, Fredericton, N.B.; Prof. C. J. Connolly, Antigonish, N.S.; Prof. J. W. Mavor, Toronto (now of Union College, N.Y); Prof. Alexander Vachon, Laval University, Quebec, P.Q.; Dr. F. S. Jackson, Montreal, P. Q.; Miss E. Shanley, Montreal, P.Q.; Miss B. K. Mossop, London, Ont.; Dr. Louis Cross, Montreal, P.Q.; Miss J. McFarlane, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. A. H. Leim, Toronto, Ont.; Miss M. Anderson, Fredericton, N.B.; Dr. W. G. Savage, England; Mr. D. A. MacKay, Ottawa, Ontario;Professor Perry, Wolfville, N.S.

The Scientific Staff at Nanaimo, B.C., include fifteen (15) trained scientists:—Professor McLean Fraser, Nanaimo, B.C.; Mrs. Fraser, Nanaimo, B.C.; Mr. Cyril Berkley, Nanaimo, B.C.; Mrs. Berkley, Nanaimo, B.C.; Prof. C. H. O'Donoghue, Winnipeg, Man; Mrs. O'Donoghue, Winnipeg, Man.; Dr. A. H. Hutchinson, Vancouver, B.C.; Miss I. Mounce, Vancouver, B.C.; Prof. J. J. R. McLeod, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. T. S. Oldroyd, Stanford, Cal.; Mrs. Oldroyd, Stanfard, Cal.; Prof. F. J. Lewis, Edmonton, Alta.;Miss G. Tuttle, Edmonton, Alta.; Mr. George Henderson, Duncans, B.C.; Mrs. Henderson, Duncans, B.C.

Of these scientific workers Dr. Huntman and Dr. Fraser receive an annual salary from the board and certain other members are paid a small honorarium.

8. Yes.

9. During the past year, amongst questions referred to the Biological Board for investigation and report, by the Fisheries Branch, are epidemics of disease at some of the whitefish and salmon hatcheries of the department; also causes of death of spawning salmon in reserve ponds. The problem of the deterioration of oyster beds; protection of cod in British Columbia waters; the life-history of the sardine in B.C.; sea-water densities at certain Atlantic ports for use in the navigation of vessels; the bacteriology of canned lobsters, clams and various cured fishes especially finnan haddie, also the age and growth of food fishes, and the utilization of new kinds of fishes; also the growth and migrations of important commercial fish.

10. Yes.

11. Numerous reports have been issued by the Biological Board and its staff chiefly as follows:—

(a) Volumes of "Biological Contributions" covering a large series of subjects and issued at intervals.

(b) Biological Bulletins especially on the marketing of new food fishes; these being in popular form and widely distributed.

(c) Biological Leaflets dealing with bait—supplied for fishermen, introduction of new food fishes and other important matters.

(c) Special studies on life in the sea and in the inland waters, chiefly dealing with important fishes and forms of life.

SHIPBUILDING CONTRACTS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Referring to an item of expenditure described as steel for shipbuilding to be refunded by contractors, $3,283,965.05, found on page ZZ42 of the 4th volume of the Auditor General's report, has all this money been refunded?

2. If so, when?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Not all, because the department has not finally settled with the builders for the ships for which the steel was purchased. The balance outstanding is $289,252.10.

2. By deductions from progress payments during 1918-19, $861,430.80; 1919-20, $2,133,282.15.

CONSERVATION COMMISSION.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. Who is the deputy assistant to the Chairman of the Conservation Commission?

2. How old is he?

3. At what salary rate was he paid for the fiscal year 1919-20?

4. What are the limits of the salary it is proposed to give him under the re-classification?

5. What office, business, engineering or other experience did he have between leaving college and taking his present position?

6. Has the Government satisfied itself that the increase in salary proposed for him is in the interests of economy and justified by the nature of his duties?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. James White.

2. 57.

3. $6,000.

4. Mr. White's classification is the same as other deputy heads, namely "$4,200

and up," the "Rate to be determined by the Governor in Council."

5. Mr. White has had a very wide experience in professional work extending over some 36 years.

When writing the Premier, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, under date October 27, 1909, the Chairman of the Commission of Conservation requested the appointment of Mr. White as chief officer of the commission and added "I really do not know where we could look for another man who would be satisfactory."

1884 to 1894, Mr. White was engaged upon topographical and geological work on the staff of the Geological Survey of Canada;

1896-99, Geographer and Chief Draughtsman to the Geological Survey;

1899, appointed Chief Geographer of the Department of the Interior;

1901, compiled report on " Altitudes in Canada" which has saved many thousands of dollars during the railway construction;

1903, on Alaska Boundary Convention;

1906, completed Economic Atlas of Canada—the first comprehensive compilation of the resources of Canada ever undertaken;

1906, elected full Member of the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers;

1907, assisted in investigations respecting fast trans-Atlantic passenger steamships ("All-Red" Steamship Line);

From 1899 to 1909, Chief Geographer of the Department of the Interior and engaged in study of the resources of Canada and economic methods of the development of same;

1909, Mr. White was appointed Chief Officer of the Commission of Conservation;

1913, was given the rank of Deputy Minister.

6. So far as known, no such increase has been proposed.

SASKATCHEWAN PENITENTIARY.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria):

1. What was the total number of prisoners serving time in the Saskatchewan penitentiary on January 1, 1920?

2. How many officials are employed, and what was the cost of maintenance for the last fiscal year?

Rt. Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Prisoners January 1, 1920, 112.

2. Permanent officers employed, March 31, 1920, 31.

Expenditure for maintenance of convicts, 1918-19 (last completed year), $10,807.77.

[Mr. Tolmie.]

MANITOBA PENITENTIARY.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria):

1. What was the total number of prisoners serving time in the Manitoba penitentiary on January 1, 1920?

2. How many officials are employed, and what was the cost of maintenance for the last fiscal year?

Rt. Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Prisoners January 1, 1920, 108.

2. Permanent officers employed, March 31, 1920, 33.

Expenditure for maintenance of convicts, 1918-19 (last completed year), $10,534.62.

REPARATION BY GERMANY—ALLIES CONFERENCE AT OSTEND.

On the Orders of the Day:

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on the 18th instant the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont (Mr. du Tremblay) asked me a question with regard to a special conference of the Allies to be held shortly at Ostend to consider the financial question affecting the Allies. The hon. gentleman desired to know if the Government had been invited to attend that conference and if Canada would have a representative at it, to which question I gave an answer in the affirmative. I find on looking at the official records, however, that we have no official notification of any conference at Ostend. The conference which I had in mind at the time of the hon. gentleman's question is one which is to be held at Spa of which we have been notified, and to which we have been asked to appoint a representative. In response to that request we have appointed Sir George Perley.

EMPIRE DAY ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. C. W. PECK (Skeena): Before the Orders of the Day are called may I inquire of the Government whether we are to have a holiday on Monday next, Empire Day,

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): It is proposed that we shall sit on May 24. We think that we could not better honour the day than to engage in our usual duties.

Mr. PECK: I should like to say that we who come from the West have travelled a considerable distance and are kept constantly at Ottawa, but we are asked to adjourn on many occasions to celebrate Holy days. Now I think we should at least adjourn over Monday to honour the festival that is dedicated to our Empire.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The reason I had reached the conclusion which I have just stated to the House was that a great many hon. members, particularly those from the West, had expressed to me their intense desire that the work of the House should be proceeded with as rapidly as possible. Some hon. gentlemen have been urging me recently even to sit in the forenoons and on Saturdays, and I thought that in line with that strongly expressed desire we perhaps would be sufficiently honouring this highly important anniversary if we proceeded with our usual work on that day. If, however, it is the desire of the majority of hon. members that we should not sit on Monday, I can only say that I am just as ready as any one else to take a holiday and will offer no personal objection.

Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: At all events, I am prepared to leave the matter to the judgment of the House.

Mr. BELAND: Question.

Hon. W. F. FIELDING: I think that the 24th of May is an almost ancient holiday with us. Those of us who are no longer young will remember the 24th of May as a great holiday of the year, and I certainly trust that we are still going to have duly observed the Queen's birthday, as the day is known to us.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Since my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) appeals on the ground of age I am afraid I will have to back him up.

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear, and we stand by you.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In view of the opinion expressed by these hon. gentlemen, who have had a much longer experience than I in public life, I will move:

That when this House adjourns on Friday, the 21st, it stands adjourned until the Tuesday following at Three o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would point out that in the absence of the customary notice, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hear a "No." That being the case, notice of motion will have to be given. Do I understand that any hon. gentleman objects to the motion?

Mr. GAUVREAU: Yes, I object to it.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): I desire to protest against any protracted holiday. On Friday afternoon every week the House is left empty by members from Quebec and Ontario who go to their homes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): The session has been taken up largely with the useless discussion of unimportant matters. There are a number of us who are anxious to get back to our homes and who desire to proceed with the business as fast as possible.

Mr. HOCKEN: I would suggest that we meet on Saturday and take a holiday on Monday. I entirely agree with the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) that as this is a traditional holiday in the Dominion of Canada it ought to be observed by Parliament as an example to the rest of the country. It seems to me that we have wasted too many days upon which we might have worked, and it would be better, if we cannot afford to take Monday, to sit on Saturday and make up for it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must again point out that unless objection is withdrawn the motion cannot be put to the House. In the absence of notice unanimous consent is required.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): I do not care to be the solitary voice in protest against this proposed holiday. If this holiday is going to be taken I will withdraw my protest, but I would like to see the House sit on Saturday and let us get ahead with the business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. GAUVREAU: No.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It can stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands as a notice of motion.

THE BUDGET.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON THE ANNUAL STATEMENT PRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

On the order for resuming, from Wednesday, May 19, the debate on the motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would point out to the House that Rule 17C states that on Thursdays and Fridays when the Order of the Day is called for the House to resolve itself into Committee of Supply or of Ways and Means the Speaker shall leave the Chair without the question being put. I know that notwithstanding this rule, it is the desire of hon. members that the debate on the Budget should proceed. In order to facilitate public business it is desirable that the debate should be carried on over Thursday and Friday, and I simply point out that our continuing to-day without the Speaker leaving the Chair is not to be construed as a precedent.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. H. M. MOWAT (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, if a lawyer and, worse than that, a lawyer without a brief, or not much of a brief, may venture upon a domain which really should be reserved to those members who make or who sells things, if that be the case, I should like to offer a very few remarks in this very interesting debate. I naturally at the beginning would like to add a respectful word of praise to those which have been uttered with respect to the manner in which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) delivered his speech on the financial affairs of the country. The Budget Speech was characterized particularly by two features. The first was courage and the second completeness. There were some who had doubt as to the capacity of the hon. gentleman to be the Minister of Finance, he not having had financial experience, to carry out the duties of his office but we who know him for many years in our home town—as His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales might call it—knew that there would be no mistake made in his choice for that position because we knew his natural ability, his capacity for hard work and his never failing capacity for taking pains. It does not surprise us, and the country as a whole will approve the method and material of his speech.

In discussing tariff matters it seems to me that the country, and those who take an interest in public business are much in the same position as that ascribed by Julius Caesar to France, "Gallia est omnis divisa in partes tres"—our country may be said to have three divisions in respect to its people; first, sensible business people, who want to see good business and as little dislocation as possible; second, free traders in theory and, third, political propagandists and partisans who do not care much one way or the other about the business of the country provided things can be steered in the direction of their own political preferences.

I believe that in the last two or three years we have not been able to understand tariff requirements for the reason that our country is so diversified and the business of one part differs so much from that in the other. There is no man probably in the country who is versed in all the requirements of the tariff. I was forcibly impressed with this when, last year or perhaps the year before, the battle raged a bit in the corridors and smoking rooms in regard to tariff changes. I was impressed with this fact very much and on behalf of those who honestly felt that they did not understand all the features of the question or the contentions which were made by the respective parties and contestants, I suggested that we should choose two or three from each side who were well versed in the matter, one from the standpoint of the manufacturer and business man, another from that class of business men who are farmers and another from those who are consumers. The suggestion that this little debate should take place, not in Parliament but elsewhere was received very agreeably, but I found that the interest flagged in what might have been a very interesting debate and which would have given us a much better understanding of the question at issue. I had come to the conclusion that a number of men on each side had not themselves made up their minds very clearly as to just what was needed by the country. It was forced upon my mind in regard to this debate and the stating of the case that one party was afraid and the other daren't.

Then again I learned at that time of some facts which made me still more doubtful as to the general knowledge of the people, and of members of Parliament on the subject. There is in my constituency a class who form the vast majority of the employees of the great works of the Massey-Harris Company, manufacturers of agricultural and other implements. Last year I was told by one of these employees that the Massey-Harris binder could be, and was sold in the Northwest Provinces at lower prices than the American machines were sold for. Well, this I confess was news to me because it had been continually dinned into my ears, as well as the ears of others, that we were permitting the exploitation of

the Agrarian class by keeping up the price of these machines. However, I found there was no dispute as to this fact. The gentleman that I spoke to said, "Yes, that is true to some extent"; and the extent he meant was that the Massey-Harris machines were sold cheaper than American machines—considerably cheaper in some cases—in the Northwest as far west as Medicine Hat. At that time, and at that place, on account of the longer railway haul, the prices naturally became greater; but the prices mentioned were the prices to distributing points in the case of the American machines, but the price of the Canadian machines was the price of the machine actually delivered at a man's own station nearby. This, of course, was an important fact which, if true, would change the opinion of many upon this question because the ordinary man in Canada does not want to see an injustice done to any class simply because another class happens to have the predominant voice in public affairs. If it is a fact it should be stated, and should be known by the people. Then, on the other hand I was told in the city of Toronto of a manufacturer—the man himself did not speak to me but a friend of his to whom he had just spoken did—who turns out a very large output of a certain kind of machinery and this manufacturer said that day—it was but a very few months ago—that if he had five per cent protection on his business it would be sufficient for him to carry on and prevent dumping from other countries at certain times. But the duty on the goods he manufactured was not five, but thirty-two and a half per cent. Now I was convinced from what I learned that this manufacturer did not increase the price of his goods by the extra twenty-seven and a half per cent, because he was an honest, respectable individual, and he shrank from charging the people a price which would more than repay him for his investment and industry. But there you are: We do not know how many of that well disposed class of manufacturers there are, or how many take advantage of an unnecessarily excessive tariff to exploit the business for themselves. I am quite sure that when the 32½ per cent duty was imposed it was necessary for that particular manufacturer, but now just as in the case of the Massey-Harris Company, it is not necessary. Therefore it is essential that the tariff should be revised by competent persons, possessing a knowledge of the wants of the whole country and not merely the wants of the people in a particular section. Accordingly, I hail with gladness the statement by the Minister of Finance, which seems to me of the most definite kind, that in August the board chosen to revise the tariff would commence its sittings. I believe that policy will be carried out, and I am strongly in favour of it being done before we undertake to tinker with the tariff, or cut down or raise duties, when we have not sufficient knowledge as to what the effect of such action will be.

The Massey-Harris people—at least the gentleman who spoke to me,—said that the reason the company now required the tariff was because at certain times of the year—according to the harvest period in different sections of the United States—the concerns in the adjoining republic would throw over their machines into this country and, at a sacrifice, undersell the Canadian manufacturers, because it would not pay the former to take those machines back to the places from which they were originally shipped, owing to the cost of the long haul that would be involved. Now, of course, that is something that our manufacturers certainly need to be protected against. If that is just a whimsical, selfish action on the part of our rivals in another country to undersell our manufacturers even at a loss, it is obvious to everybody possessing ordinary business sense, it seems to me, that we should protect our own people by some tariff restrictions. As the harvest moves eastward, or northward—on account of climatic changes—from Tennessee and the southern states, I was told there was a vast difference in the price of machines; and it would be very unfair to allow the exigencies of trade and manufacture in one country to interfere with the legitimate profits of manufacturers in another.

Again, I am glad that there is no present reduction, or dislocation, of the tariff by reason of the fact that I have a local interest in the matter, namely, that in the last dozen or score of years there have been established in the constituency that I represent hundreds of manufacturing concerns from the United States who have come here necessarily in order to carry on their business. They have brought thousands of employees of the very best kind; they have invested in these manufactures in Canada millions of dollars; and a sudden dislocation of the tariff, such as might he supposed to result from the adoption of the amendment of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) would certainly disarrange business to a very large extent. In addition to that if tariff reductions were made suddenly it is not at all likely that the employees who

are engaged in these hundreds of manufactures although they have become friendly to the country, and have their homes here at the present time, would prefer to stay in Canada. The strong cords of home affection would doubtless lead them back to the land from which they came if there was no reason for the further maintenance of the business with which they are at present associated here. For that reason I do not want to see a sudden closing up of this vast number of industrial concerns, and the sudden departure of so many employees. Therefore it will be understood by the members of the House, and it is perfectly natural, that I, at least, should object to an unthought-out lowering of the tariff or a cutting off of duties just to suit a theory.

The political aspect of this question is interesting because it is so dramatic. The other night the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) stated his political creed on this matter, and I must say that to me it was surprising. For many years I was accustomed to follow that hon. gentleman, and to agree that what he did in the public interest was right; and during that time any changes in the tariff from the old national policy of our Conservative opponents did not seem to us to be very shocking. I was rather surprised at the confession that was made by my hon. friend. Perhaps because I was brougnt up in such a strict political school I thought it was very bad politics to admit anything which might be taken advantage of by one's opponents; but the confession having been made that the Liberal party of those days was really not a free trade party but a protectionist party, frees me from the secrecy that I would otherwise maintain, and permits me to say that I concur with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) who made this confession that the Liberals of those days did not, among themselves anyway, claim that they had materially reduced the protective policy of the country.

I suppose the reason was that they saw everything was going well and they did not want to make a change. But I am told, although I have not analysed the figures myself, that the net reduction in tariff from the time the Liberal party came into power in 1896 until their defeat in 1911 was only about two and one-half per cent. So it cannot be charged against me that I am very much of a "change-about" if in sitting on this side of the House on account of other reasons I feel very little sense of guilt when I hear my leaders of those days now confess that their views on fiscal matters are very similar to those held by my colleagues on this side of the House.

But another interesting feature in the debate last night will be taken notice of by the country at large—the speech made by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), who I wish was in his seat now. That was a distressing incident. The hon. member on account of his abilities had been chosen to lead the attack from the financial standpoint, and in many respects he did it very ably. But he has been dispossessed —I will not use such a word as discarded which **I hear some hon. members** suggest to me— he has been changed, no doubt as the result of consultation, because it was felt that something else had to be done than support the very strong views expressed by the hon. gentleman in former years in favour of free trade. So his speech last night was really in the nature of a swan song. He seemed to think that the times were out of joint—anyway his nose was out of joint—and the lack of that enthusiasm which formerly characterized his speeches on tariff matters was most noticeable. He did not repeat the methods of former years, which he then thought would be popular in certain sections of the country, by moving for the reduction of duties on certain specific articles. Consequently we must conclude that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have discarded his arguments of last year, which they then supported very reluctantly, and have decided to take their cue from those whom they have set up as their champions in the present debate.

Last year we all remember my hon. friend took a supposed "consumer" into an upper chamber and proceeded to undress him. First he took off the consumer's boots and told us the duty on them; then his sox, his braces, his shirt—really it got to be such a delicate subject that had not the hon, gentleman noticed there were ladies in the gallery I am afraid he would have gone to the extremity of completely disrobing this poor consumer in order to tell us what duties he had had to pay upon his habiliments. But there is no disrobing scene this year, no attention is called to any particular article of wearing apparel, and although my hon. friend made an able speech he did not talk with the vim that characterized him last year.

So we are left in this position: That the Government promises scientific revision of the tariff based upon information gathered from all over the country; while the amend-

ment asks for an immediate cutting down of certain duties. In other words, there is a difference of only two months between the two propositions before the House, and for my part I prefer a scientific revision rather than an arbitrary and immediate reduction, which, it seems to me, is proposed simply as a foundation for political speeches and appeals to the avarice of certain classes of the community.

Before I close, I think it is proper that I should say something in reply to the remarks made by the hon. member for Brome in relation to the Militia Estimates. He suggested that they should be cut down to the extent of $4,000,000. He did not know what those Estimates were for, what sort of training the money was to provide, or in what other way the money was to be utilized, but he desired to have that wholesale reduction made so that he could emphasize his view that pacificism is the proper belief for the people of this country.

I am quite sure that my hon. friend is not without a certain amount of political ambition, and in spite of the fact that his views are highly unpopular in many quarters, he does apparently hope to attract a class of people who will put the crown of leadership upon his brow. Well, there does not seem to be any one to dispute with him that leadership. If my hon. friend desires by making those strong statements, which are based purely on the theory about the sinfulness and wickedness of preparing to defend one's country he will undoubtedly attract to his banner—if there is such a thing as a banner among people of that sort—all those who were deterrents to our war efforts, all those who funked in that time of national crisis, all those who were of no use to the country when she most needed their services. Well, if he desires to become the leader of that class and of all the "sissies" in the country, he is welcome to the honour and I think no one will be anxious to become his rival.

My hon. friend referred to the splendid war record of our soldiers. Undoubtedly they did well, and there were times when they were the spearhead of the Allied forces. But how much less mourning there would be in Canada to-day if the men who "carried on" at the front had had sufficient military training to give them the skill and caution which is so essential in warfare to save the lives of our fighters and to make their gallantry completely effective. They would have been entitled to just as much in the way of credit, just as much in the way of thanks from our people, but they would have been trained to protect themselves, as unfortunately they actually were not, and as a result there would have been fewer mourning homes in Canada than there are at this day. I hope that the mothers of Canada will not be led away by any such arguments as those put forward by my hon. friends who seem to think that simply because they desire to maintain a pacific attitude we shall be exempt from the attacks of others who are stronger and more aggressive. History shows that that is not a sound way of looking at it. My friends on the other side who come from French Canada applaud such sentiments to some extent, but they must remember that their forebears were not of that kind.

Mr. BUREAU: Where is French Canada?

Mr. MOWAT: I leave the geographical question to my hon. friend. History will tell them that in the early days Canada was preserved to their ancestors by the fact that they were always ready for defence; when the conflict came the French-Canadians were always better prepared than their English-speaking fellow colonists to ward off the attack and to attain victory. Even though hon. members may applaud these sentiments to which I refer, I know that that feeling does not exist in Lower Canada, in the province of Quebec. I know perfectly well that if hostile ships should sail up the St. Lawrence and the people of that province realized that they must protect themselves in order to avoid slavery for perhaps one hundred years, they would be just as keen upon the adoption of compulsory service as would the people of any other province.

My hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) spoke also with a certain kind of sneer about Imperialism, which he linked with Chauvinism. He evidently feels that when a man thinks that it is wise to stay within the Empire; wise to keep on good terms with the Mother Country and with the sister dominions, that that involves a certain vice, a wrong state of mind which ill effects the condition of Canada. Well, many of us do not agree with that. We think that our future and our happiness consist in the continued growth of the British Empire; and if it is called Imperialism to try to keep on friendly terms with the Mother Country and the sister dominions, then we are not at all ashamed of being Imperialists. But I do not know why the word "Imperialism" should have been used in the same sentence with the word

"Chauvinism," which means exaggerated nationalism. But we find that feeling existing; we see it in my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) who is supposed to lead in that respect. I regret to have to allude to this, but I feel that it ought to be protested against; if it were allowed to go uncontradicted it would be a sort of admission that an improper kind of Imperialism really existed. The greatest Imperialist we ever had in Canada was the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He was a sane Imperialist; he did not believe in subjecting Canada to the control of any other country, but he always endeavoured to maintain good relations between the component parts of the Empire Sir Wilfrid Laurier more than any other person gave a start to the good feeling between the Mother Country and Canada, which resulted not only in friendship but in material prosperity, by the granting of the Imperial preference, despite the protests of strong protectionists, and despite a strong national feeling in some quarters. In doing that he did the greatest thing for Canada, in my opinion, that was ever done. Sir Wilfrid Laurier remained in power a long time, as undisputed head of the country, but it must be remembered that at times he was not able to appreciate or to understand the sentiment of the country. When he was in favour of maintaining good relations between Canada and the Mother Country and the sister dominions; when he was in favour of those ideas which we Imperialists say we have, he was successful; but when on two occasions he failed to appreciate what was felt by Canada as a whole on these subjects, he was disastrously defeated. If this misrepresentation is to go on, why, we cannot help it; for my part, I desire to state unequivocally where I stand, and if that will help anybody else in the protest against the sneering at Imperialism, then I believe I have at least done something in favour of my country.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to follow at any great length the remarks of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat). He seems to me to be of the Bourbon type, one who never forgets anything and never learns anything. Some forty-five years ago the same sentiments to which my hon. friend has given utterance to-day were expressed in the Parliament of Canada by a distinguished predecessor of his, the Right Hon. Sir Charles Tupper. That hon. gentleman thought that if there was any revision of the tariff in those days, the doors of commerce would be closed and general ruin would prevail throughout the land. My hon. friend has evidently been reading that ancient doctrine lately, for he seems to fear that that is going to happen to Parkdale. Let me assure him that I have greater confidence in the people who borrowed him than he has. He was inclined to be sarcastic with regard to the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). He set up a class of sissies, whatever kind of people they are; he evidently saw an aggregation of them lined up before him and they were going to choose a leader. Now, if these sissies had to choose a leader and their choice was between the hon. member for Brome and the hon. member for Parkdale, I think they would at once see a striking suitability in the choice of the member for Parkdale. I do not like sneering references and sneering remarks of that kind. I do not think it is necessary for the hon. member to be everlastingly talking about his loyalty and his Imperialism. I do not know anybody in this House who is not an Imperialist so far as proper connection between ourselves and the Mother Country is concerned and as respects our loyalty and allegiance to Great Britain and the King. It is absolutely preposterous for sane men who are of age to be keeping up that kind of talk in the House from day to day and from year to year. I hope that we have heard even from Parkdale for the last time this hackneyed, worn-out assertion of glorified Imperialism, which exists largely, if not altogether, in the city of Toronto.

I notice that with all his adherence to old things, he crowns his faith by stating that he still looks forward to the time when there shall be a reduction of the tariff. He feels satisfied that there is nothing that he can now expect in that direction; he must wait for a scientific revision. Might I remind my hon. friend that on the 29th day of November, 1911, which is quite a little while ago, an hon. member asked this question in the House:

> Will the Government appoint a permanent tariff commission? If so, will the labour and the farming interests be allowed to nominate a majority of the representatives on such commission?

The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) answered:

> Authority from Parliament will be necessary, and a measure to that effect will be introduced.

That is eight years, five months and twenty-one days ago to the day. Every year since then the Government has been going to appoint this commission, to take

this legislative authority and scientifically to revise the tariff. My good friend, who is a close student of history and of parliamentary procedure, must have known that for the last eight years this bait has been held out to hon. gentlemen supporting the Government, and yet up to this very day no steps have been taken to obtain that authority to appoint a commission, and the revision of the tariff is just as far away as it ever was. Still, the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) is happy, contented and full of hope and faith that this scientific revision is some day going to take place. So far nothing is in sight or has been done, and I do not think, in view of the fact that eight years, five months and twenty-one days have passed by without anything being done in this regard. I am too bold when I say that the Government have no intention of doing anything along that line, and particularly as regards revising the tariff downwards, because their masters and bosses will not permit them to do it. The hon. member for Parkdale brings them notice from his part of the country that such a revision downwards is not to be made, as so many important factories would be closed down if that were done. Let me assure my hon. friend that he need have no fear of a revision downward or of anything progressive, as long as he himself and the Government that is now in power will keep together and stay behind the ramparts of the inability of the people to get at them. That is about as far as I purpose following the speech of my hon. friend.

Let me now take up the question of the Budget. It is a good rule of responsible government that once in the year the Government of the day must bring down to Parliament a statement, showing the financial condition of the country. As regards the present Budget, that should have been done long ago, and I have only to say, not only to the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), if he were here, but to the right hon. gentleman (Sir George Foster), who has been leading the Government from the commencement of this session and who is practically leading the Government now, that the latter has told us on several occasions that we should hurry on and bring the session to a close; that the business of the country should be facilitated as much as possible so that hon. members may be able to go home and attend to their private affairs. We were all agreed as to that; but days, weeks, months passed by, and this most important part of this year's session was not brought down. What were my hon. friends waiting for? When the Budget did come down, what was it but an array of old figures that the most ordinary clerk in any department of the Government could put together in less than a day? When that could be done, and there was nothing new about the Budget, surely the Government will admit that anybody could have stood up in the House and read it, as was done. What were they waiting for? A school boy in half an hour could produce and tabulate all that was new in connection with this Budget. Nevertheless, we have been held here from day to day and from month to month until the 18th day of May without this important part of the business of the session being brought down to Parliament. When hon. members ought to be home about their private business, they are kept here, the session is prolonged and the country involved in greater expense because the Government did not do what they should in bringing the business of the House expeditiously before us. There was on this side of the House no evidence of any kind of any idea, knowledge or desire, other than to facilitate the business of the House and to get along as rapidly as possible. The responsibility for the delay, the increasing of the expense and the keeping here of hon. members when they ought to be elsewhere, is entirely upon the heads of the Government, and they must bear the responsibility for that.

4 p.m.

What is the object of the Budget? It should be and is to give the people of this country to understand how the country stands financially, how their ledger account stands. I am sorry to say that, although we had a Budget Speech lasting about two hours, the financial condition of the country was not made very plain; it was not submitted in that concise manner that would enable the ordinary man to get a quick grasp of it. The minister says that if we took only ordinary revenue and ordinary expenditure, there was a surplus. He arrived at that conclusion by taking the extraordinary course of confining his ordinary expenditure to what is really ordinary expenditure and taking the extraordinary revenue and placing it with the ordinary revenue. He forgets to tell this country that there are ordinary and extraordinary expenditures, and ordinary and extraordinary revenues. The ordinary revenues of this country are revenues similar to those which we used to receive

before the war. Every new tax that has been collected since the 4th day of August, 1914, is a war tax, and from those war taxes the minister collected last year something like $118,000,000. If he will subtract $118,000,000 from what he calls ordinary revenue, which was $388,000,000, he will find that last year we had an ordinary revenue of only $270,000,000. The ordinary expenditure, so he told us—and we have reason to believe that is correct—was $349,000,000. Therefore, if you subtract the ordinary revenue of $270,000,000 from the ordinary expenditure of $349,000,000, you have the extraordinary sum of $79,000,000 of a deficit even on the ordinary expenditure and ordinary revenue. That is an absolute fact and it is made up in this way. It is admitted by the Government themselves that they collected $30,000,000 from the 7½ per cent extra war tax. As a letter which used to be carried for two cents is now carried for three cents, we are correct in saying that one-third of the revenue of the post office, or $7,000,000, comes from war tax. The business profits tax, amounting to $44,000,000 is entirely a war tax; the income tax, amounting to $20,000,000 is also entirely a war tax, and other war taxes, as set forth in the minister's speech, amounted to $17,000,000. Thus, you get the sum of $118,000,000 which is extraordinary revenue, but which the minister takes as proper and natural income and charges against it only the general expenditure of the country which is largely statutory, and then he says that he has a surplus. That is absolutely incorrect, and if the minister intended to present a statement which was nearly what it ought to be, that should not be done, because the purpose of the Budget Speech is to give the people an absolutely straightforward and honest statement of the financial condition of the country. The result is that, with a total expenditure in 1919-20 of $886,741,110 and a total revenue of $388,000,000, we have a deficit of about $498,000,000 confronting us. That is the statement which would have made the matter clear to the people of this country, instead of a statement mixing up the figures and the minister saying: If such and such were the case and something else the other way, we would have had a surplus. The fact is that the people have to face a deficit of $498,000,000 on the operations of last year.

I think it is only fair to compare that condition of things with the condition in which the country was when hon. gentlemen opposite took office. Undoubtedly, every allowance must be made for war conditions and all that has transpired during the years of the war. But apart from all that there is a vast field for criticism and there is abundant reason for the Canadian people to look carefully into the operations of this Government. In the year in which hon. gentlemen opposite took office, in 1911, I think I am safe in saying that the revenue of this country was about $100,000,000; it might have been a little one way or the other, but I think I have given approximately the correct figure. After meeting all the necessities and claims of the country for that year we had a surplus of $30,000,000. What is the condition of affairs now? Let me repeat, in 1911 we taxed the people of the country $100,000,000 and after having paid all necessary expenditures we had $30,000,000 to the good. Last year this Government taxed the people $388,000,000 and yet they are now behind $498,000,000. That is just the difference between the two. To put it succinctly: We collected $100,000,000 and had $30,000,000 over; they collected $388,000,000 and have a deficit of $498,000,000. And even on ordinary expenditure they have a deficit as large as was the whole expenditure of the country in the last year of Liberal administration. On their own showing, they have a deficit of $79,000,000 on ordinary expenditure, and that was the total expenditure of the Liberal Government in 1910. That, Sir, is the condition of this country at the present time. We have been borrowing money from time to time, and the hon. gentleman who resigned the office of Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) the able predecessor of the present minister, last year gave evidence before the Pensions Committee, when he stated that we had to borrow $300,000,000 then and would have to borrow $300,000,000 more this year; and unless we borrow, Mr. Speaker, not only $300,000,000 but this $498,000,000 that we are behind, it is nothing short of a mystery to an ordinary man like myself where the money is going to come from. The situation is serious, but there it is. We are taxing every green spot in the country; we are gathering all the money we can; and yet, withal, we have this enormous deficit staring us in the face. We have borrowed until the interest to-day is something like $120,000,000 as compared to $13,000,000 formerly.

Now, the only touch that was given to the tariff—and it is put forward as a sort of remedy for the ills of the poor man—was

this extra tax that was put on things luxurious. The poor people of the country are given to understand that the idea underlying this tax is to lighten the burden which lies on their shoulders and to transfer the great weight of it to the more sturdy shoulders of the wealthy who are better able to bear financial strain. I take this opportunity to tell the House and the country generally that as a matter of fact all this tax means—if it means anything—is an attempt to get more money. There is not one particle of relief to any one by reason of this tax. The poor man pays just the same money as he did before for his groceries and his clothing and everything he requires. The real idea behind the tax has nothing to do with any benevolent purpose of relief; the tax is simply for the purpose of drawing the line of demarkation more strongly between the millionaires and the profiteers of the country, and the poorer classes, who now get fairly decent clothes. The idea is that they shall not be permitted to get purple and fine linen such as is worn by the millionaires. The millionaire says: "What is the good of my millions if this poor Mordecai can come up to my gate every day and tantalize me by wearing the same sort of hat and the same sort of coat as I wear, and if his wife can appear in the same elegant attire as my wife wears? What is the good of my millions under those circumstances? Something must be done to stop this iniquitous transgression." And that is what this thing is for, Mr. Speaker. It is not for the purpose of relieving the poor people of the country. When the Estimates were being prepared, I can imagine the following colloquy having taken place between the Minister of Finance and his colleagues. The Minister of Finance was approached by a group of these millionaires and was told that something had to be done to prevent this contamination of their temple by these poor lower class and second class people who were daring to profane the high places of the mighty. The minister was told by these millionaires: "Why should those G ntiles of the lower and middle classes be permitted to be clothed in purple and fine linen, a distinction which by divine right belongs to us and to our wives and successors alone? Why should these Mordecais continue to defile our temple? Right you are, says the gallant knight of the treasury. More than right you are, say the Minister of Labour and the Minister of the Interior in chorus; Winnipeg is burned on our hearts in large letters and we will never forget the fact. Hear, hear, says the Minister of Trade and Commerce; I have an old speech on peace, order and good government that will put Napoleonic grape shot into the Crerar bunch should they dare to squeak. Go on; we stand with you, Sir Henry; put up your breastworks, strengthen your outposts and keep those fellows out so that not one of this gang shall even touch the hem of the garment of any of us." "What do you think of it, Sir Robert?" They turn around to the Prime Minister. "Well, gentlemen, your conduct strikes me as partaking strongly of that headlong course of the famous and historic Gadarenes, which ended so disastrously to pigs and devils. For myself, I have not yet fully made up my mind in that regard. You are of age, your sins will be on your own heads. Like Pilate of old these hands are clean."

"That is somewhat beyond my manuscript," said the Minister of Finance, "but the duties come in, and the Gentiles go out, and they, poor fellows, will think we are out to help them."'

That is the way in which the poor people of this country are made to believe that this Budget is for their help and assistance. That is the way the change came about in the formation of this new tariff. The idea of this Government doing anything to relieve the poor people or to reduce prices is absolutely absurd in view of their history. When you ask this Government to do something with regard to a commercial port of commerce, or something else, to cut down the high prices, you are told: "Let trade, in its proper course, regulate itself; let supply and demand govern the condition of things, and if trade is left to work out its own destiny the poor people of this country will get the benefit." There is a great deal in that argument, but is that what they do?

When the war was over we had a right to suppose that we would come back gradually to pre-war prices, and that competition between traders would have the effect of giving the people lower prices. Instead of allowing the ordinary law of trade and commerce to do its work, what was done by this Tory Government? The manufacturers and the millionaires, their masters, came to them and said: "We have been doing splendidly with these prices for the last five years; it would be sad indeed if we had to go back to the hum-drum, ordinary prices of pre-war days. We must do something to keep up prices. If nobody else

will buy our goods you must buy them yourself. You must buy our cheese, our wheat, our butter, our manufactured goods and everything else in order to keep up prices." What did they do? They passed through this Parliament a vote of $276,000,000 against the persistent opposition of this side of the House and they used that money in buying goods in this country and sending them out of the country to destroy competition and to keep up prices against the poor people whom they were professing to help. What happened? Proof of what I am saying appears in the evidence of the hon. member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White) given before a commission and reported in the blue-book. That blue-book was passed around and I received a copy of it. The evidence of the hon. gentleman begins at page 84 and continues to page 106. In the evidence the hon. gentleman states that this money was furnished by this House and the country and was expended in buying goods for the following countries:

Great Britain	$170,000,000
Belgium	25,000,000
France	25,000,000
Roumania	25,000,000
Greece	25,000,000
Italy	6,000,000

In all $276,000,000 was extracted from the pockets of the poor people of this country in order to keep up prices against themselves. I know of nothing that is more iniquitous or less consistent with the idea that we are being given from day to day that this Government is sweating blood in order to help these poor men. Nothing of the kind is being done to-day.

Is it to be expected that the working classes, the ordinary rank and file, will have confidence in any Government which, will because they have the power, come down to the Houses of Parliament and take from the pockets of these poor people, who are depending on us to protect them, this enormous sum of money?

If the Government had kept control of it themselves it would not have been so bad, but what has happened? They appointed a commission of their Tory friends and those who are manufacturers and producers in this country. They called them together and said: "Go to it; divide this $276,000,000 between yourselves; there will be no competition." Nothing could be more in contravention of the principles of responsible government than to step in and spend this money for no other purpose than to keep up high prices and to make it impossible for poor people to get the benefit of that competition in trade which would otherwise have been given to them.

In the further observations that I wish to make, it comes to me now to say something about the subject of Government ownership and Government management. In the line of Government management or expenditure we have this $276,000,000 for which we have no substantial return. I do not think it was even mentioned as an asset by the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech. It may have been; I have not been able to read it all but I followed the hon. gentleman very closely while he was speaking the other day and I do not recall that anything was said about this $276,000,000 which we have so lavishly expended on these foreign countries—foreign to us, all except Great Britain—and for which we have nothing of a substantial character to show in return. I was going on to say, Sir, that we should cease from this idea of monopolizing everything in the hands of the Government. As we do put that monopoly in the hands of the Government we decrease and break down the ambition of ordinary people, having the right, the ambition and the power, to do things for themselves and who should not be interfered with by the monopolistic operations of Government. I do not know but that I had occasion before to quote in this House a philosophic statement made by Lord Macaulay a long time ago. I think this statement was made by him in 1830:

> "Our rulers will best promote the improvement of the nation by strictly confining themselves to their own legitimate duties, by leaving capital to find its most lucrative course, commodities their fair price, industry and intelligence their natural reward, idleness and folly their natural punishment, by maintaining peace, by defending property, by diminishing the price of law, and by observing strict economy in every department of the State. Let the Government do this; the people will assuredly do the rest."

That, Sir, was the advice given to the British people so long ago as the year 1830. I find, Sir, that that idea is not dead; I believe that it is a British idea. I find that recently Sir Archibald Williamson, P.C., was addressing a gathering of business men in London, and I have here his views as reported in one of the newspapers. It was put up to him that the Government should cease from interfering with business in England, that they should give a free hand to the people to look after their own affairs, and his answer to that statement was as follows:

> At the earliest possible moment that that emergency legislation could be brought to an end, it must be brought to an end, and at the

earliest possible moment they could finish with Government control they must do so. He would only remind them that when the Government brought about certain restrictions it was not through folly or lack of consideration. They did not do that without going into the deepest consideration and argument of the matter. Those who condemned them were not aware of all the details of the case before the Government. He made bold to say that there was not one member of the Government who did not desire to get rid of the control which had been necessary owing to the war at the first opportunity. They could not spend five years in such a war with a complete interruption of all commercial life and economic processes and then find themselves able to resume at once pre-war life. If they looked through the Government restrictions in the recent Parliamentary Bill carefully they would see there was not one which any of the members of that association would not think necessary and useful. He observed with pleasure that the chief articles of their association stood for the value of individual enterprise.

The whole history of their country, which had been the greatest country commercially in the history of the world, but whose commercial successes had not weakened its idealism for high effort, had built up its achievements on the knowledge that exceptional individual enterprise and ability deserved exceptional individual reward. They must sweep away the crazy doctrines and muddy philosophers which told them that the best way to achieve the best results was to work on the aggregate of all the citizens, where the reward of the thrifty man and the idle man would be the same. Ever since civilization raised its head there had never been a community in the world which had prospered on that system, but greatness had always been achieved by following the exactly opposite system. Speaking for the Government, he could say they had definitely set their faces against these doctrines.

It was the view of the Government that the great businesses and commercial enterprises of this country could better be carried on by private individuals for the good of the whole in the manner which had been customary in the past. When the Government was met by threats from any body of men, that they would adopt the course of action which could only recommend itself to them because they were in a minority, the Government would never give way to them —never. That was the touchstone of their ability to apply democratic doctrines as they understood them. The nation was going to govern itself through a Parliament chosen by itself; and it was for the nation alone to decide those great business questions and array themselves against all those who threatened to impose the coercion of a privileged class.

That, Sir, is the idea given by this distinguished member of the British Government, Sir Archibald Williamson He carries out, although not perhaps familiar with the doctrine established and enunciated by Lord Macaulay, the idea that runs through the minds of the British people; and to-day in England they are getting clear, as rapidly as possible, of the notion that there should be any governmental interference with the enterprise of the British people. If it is good enough for the people in that country it should be good enough in Canada, and this Government should give way at the earliest possible moment and carry out what is suggested here by Sir Archibald Williamson—that the people of Great Britain shall select their own men for their own purposes, and that a Parliament shall be established in Great Britain at the earliest possible moment that shall properly represent the interests of the country as expressed by the freewill of the people. Let me remind this Government that they are not on very stable ground. Let me remind them that the position they occupy is not a very proud one. From the Atlantic to the Pacific they have received notice to quit, and still they are not quitting. They are over-holding tenants, and they are determined to sit until the sheriff or the bailiff turns them out. Let me remind my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) of the many notices to quit that he has received. He received one from Prince county, in Prince Edward Island. He read it and put it away, no doubt marking the date on the back of it. He received notice from Carleton and Victoria, in the province of New Brunswick. In that case also the same process was gone through and the notice was pigeon-holed. From Kamouraska in the province of Quebec he received a very emphatic notice to quit. From the division of St. James in the great city of Montreal he received notice to quit; and, no doubt, instructed his clerk to put it in the same pigeon-hole. Then, Quebec East has most emphatically sent notice, in the person of my hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe) that this Government—as far as the people of that constituency were concerned—had reached far past the end of their tether, and the sooner they left the better. Then we come to Timiskaming, and we have the distinguished stalwart from that county here as a notice to quit which has been already served upon the Government. I had the distinction of being up in that constituency myself. I was not trying to help my hon. friend (Mr. McDonald) who is now a member, I was trying to help in the election of another man, but one thing I did tell the people was this: The Government—not by any will or wish of their own but sadly enough owing to death—had given them the opportunity to speak their mind, and to state whether they approved of the Government or not. If they were not satisfied with the administration of the present Government it was their duty to elect a member who would pronounce definitely along the lines of that dissatisfac-

tion, and although they did not send my man to Parliament——

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend got notice to quit.

Mr. McKENZIE: —I was simply preaching this doctrine: I was talking to a free people in a free country, and I said, "Whatever you do, do not send any one down to Ottawa who will support this Government." They took my advice on this score, and served notice to quit upon the Government. Then we go farther West and find in the county of Assiniboia——

An hon. MEMBER: You forget North Ontario.

Mr. McKENZIE: I will come back to North Ontario. I am taking the by-elections in the order in which they occured, and I think the election in Assiniboia occurred before the election in North Ontario. Then from that beautiful province of the West notice to quit was served upon my right hon. friend, which he now has in his possession. Then the good old Scotch county of Glengarry and Stormont rose in their might. That good, strong philosophy which is found in Scottish countries was here mixed with a strong French sentiment, and the two nationalities made up their minds and said to the Government: "You go. You are no longer fit for our confidence, and as far as we are concerned we will give you the most emphatically emblazoned notice to quit," and the right hon. gentleman has that notice also in his possession. But, saddest of all, in the good old province of Ontario the Government has perhaps had the most emphatic notes served upon them that the people desire a change. Prince (P.E.I.) Victoria and Carleton, N.B., Kamouraska, Que., the St. James Division (Montreal), Quebec East, North Ontario, Timiskaming, Assiniboia, and Glengarry and Stormont—altogether nine constituencies have served notice upon the Government; and I wish to remind my right hon. friend who has been so ably and patiently leading the Government for the last few months (Sir George Foster) that he should realize that his Government has lost the confidence of the people. Every constituency that has had an opportunity has spoken with one voice: "Whatever else may happen, whether we choose a Labour man, a Farmer man, or a Liberal, one thing is certain, we will not choose a Tory or a man who will support this Government."

The other night the Minister of Trade and Commerce got a good deal of satisfaction out of the fact that there were, as he said, two parties on this side of the House, and that as the opponents of the Government were somewhat divided no greater disaster would befall him and his friends. I am afraid that the right hon. gentleman, and the Government itself, is something like the little boy who asked his school mate, "Jack, if you were lost in the woods which would you rather be eaten by, a bear or a tiger?" The selection was not a very delightful one. And the Government must decide whether they prefer to be eaten by the Liberal party or by the Farmer party, for eaten they will be, and they may as well understand that at once.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Does my hon. friend's history teach him whether or not the boy was actually eaten in the end? I think he escaped.

Mr. McKENZIE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss the tariff, a subject which my hon. friends on the other side of the House say we are not dealing with in that careful and logical manner which its importance demands. All I have to say to those hon. gentlemen is that as far back as 1893 the Liberal party established a tariff policy, they have been following it ever since, and during the fifteen years that they had the opportunity to put it in actual operation they brought such an era of prosperity to our people as was never enjoyed before and has never been enjoyed since. We were placed in power in 1896 on our tariff policy; we have not changed that policy since.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: I hear some hon. gentleman say "hear, hear." But that is the fact. We came into power in 1896 with the avowed purpose of giving the best possible fiscal conditions to this country, making goods free wherever we could do so, and giving help to industries where help was required. In that way, and without erecting a high Chinese tariff wall, we succeeded under the leadership of our great chief, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, supported by the Hon. Mr. Fielding and others, in giving the country an entirely satisfactory government. What we are saying to the people to-day is "You had a trial of us for fifteen years and you know what we are. We have a good many of the same men yet in our party, including the hon. gentleman who was our financial leader during those fifteen years. If you are satisfied with the way in which we handled the affairs of this country for the fifteen years we were in

power, we ask you to give us another trial, and we assure you that the good faith, the ability and the integrity that characterized our former administration will be continued in our efforts to bring back this country to the same prosperous condition which it enjoyed during our fifteen years in office."

I submit, Sir, that no person who cares for the development of this country will ever lay down any hard and fast rule to continue any policy, however good, without change no matter what the conditions may be. We have no intention of erecting a high tariff wall. We are prepared to carry on as we did before, to deal with circumstances as they arise, and, we hope, with the same successful results which attended our administration in days gone by.

Can it be said for the edification of those who think that we still adhere to the old National Policy that we stole the clothes off the Tory party in 1896, and that we were only adjusting those clothes to suit ourselves year by year? I imagine, Sir, that in 1896 no man in the House of Commons of that day understood the National Policy better than the late Right Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, who was then the leader of the Opposition. Undoubtedly he would recognize the National Policy just as well as any of his contemporaries, and if the Fielding policy which Mr. Fielding introduced in his Budget Speech in 1897 was the same old National Policy, no person would have been more ready to take advantage of the situation than the right hon. leader of the Opposition of that day, and point out that while Mr. Laurier--as he then was—and his friends were promising tariff changes, yet their Budget proposals failed to give effect to that promise and merely constituted an adoption of the tariff policy of the Tory party. But what did he say? I invite hon. gentlemen to look at page 1258 of Hansard for the year 1897, where they will find that the Right Hon. Sir Charles Tupper speaking on the Budget that was then introduced by Mr. Fielding, said:

> I confess, sir, that I listened with the most profound astonishment to the speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Finance, Mr. Fielding. I did not suppose it possible, whether in one section of the Empire or another, for a great Parliament such as that which the Dominion of Canada possesses to have presented for its consideration a Bill of such entirely illegal and unconstitutional character. I have no hesitation in saying that you will search the history of Parliamentary Government throughout the British Empire in vain to find any parallel for the position in which we find ourselves in relation to the Budget speech of the hon. Minister of Finance.

Again, at page 1262, in the same volume of Hansard, on the same date, the same right hon. gentleman is reported as follows:

> Now I listened to this most remarkable address with the most profound astonishment because it violates the most plain, clearly-understood, and well-known laws governing the Parliament of Canada. It was in antagonism with the constitution of the country, and in violation of everything that hon. gentlemen on either side of the House had a right to expect from a Minister of Finance.

At page 1291 of the same volume he is reported as saying:

> The result is that this tariff goes into operation, and the hon. gentleman knows that the industries of this country are already paralyzed in consequence, while hon. members gloat, vindictively gloat, over the destruction of Canadian industries. I was reading the wail, the sorrowful wail, of those industries in the Montreal Gazette, where one manufacturer after another declared that their industries were ruined, that their mills must close, and that they saw staring them in the face a return to the deplorable state of things that existed when the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House was in charge of the fiscal policy of this country. I say that a deeper wrong was never inflicted upon Canada.

That, Sir, is the pronouncement of the gentleman who was leading the Tory Opposition, who was at one time Minister of Finance and at another time Prime Minister of this country. He understood the National Policy; if he was not its father, he was certainly posing as its godfather. I must ask hon. gentlemen, therefore, to believe that the National Policy to which he referred was not the National Policy which was introduced by my good friend (Mr. Fielding) on that occasion.

Now, Sir, what has happened? We had the application of that policy for fifteen years. I wish to repeat and to bring to the touchstone of Toryism at its best the judgment which they passed upon the application of that Bill which Hon. Mr. Fielding introduced at that time, and also the results which that Bill, when enacted into law brought to this country. The new Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) in the Tory administration which came into power in 1911 looked over the scene, looked over the results, anxious to find fault, if he could; anxious to show that the financing of the Liberals had been bad; anxious to show that they had not kept faith with the people. He was brought here to curse the Grits; he was forced to bless them. This is what he said:

> Our Dominion continues to be the land of hope and promise to the homeseeker. During the last year, as before shown, our immigra-

tion from Europe and the United States reached an average of nearly a thousand a day, bringing their capital, their intelligence, and their energy to assist in the great task of developing the resources of Canada, and building up her nationality.

Much has been said in the past with which I am in accord as to the selection of immigration as far as possible with an eye to the quality and character of our future citizenship. Notwithstanding the large stream of immigration, labour conditions are good, and extreme poverty from any reason other than incapacity or direct misfortune is hardly known.

Under the favourable conditions which I have described, and with every prospect for their continuance, the future of Canada looks bright indeed. In the enjoyment of peace, plenty, and prosperity, her energetic, loyal and patriotic people look forward with hope and expectation to an ever great and greater future.

That, Sir, is the testimony of the leading finance authority of the Tory party when they came to pass judgment upon our handling of the Fielding tariff for fifteen years under Liberal administration. That is their testimony, and we are prepared to place that before the people of this country and say to them: that is absolutely true; perhaps it is not the whole truth, because the Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White) could have gone much further in showing the grandeur, the immensity of the growth of Canada during those fifteen years. But he said enough to justify the administration of the country's affairs during that period. We say to the people: To-day we hold the same policy; we have the same ideas; we act in the same good faith; put us back in power and the same good conditions will come to you that were brought to you before. That, Sir, is the position which we occupy, that is what we say to the Canadian people.

As to our policy generally, we have standard ideas for the good of the people as set forth at the convention held in Ottawa last year. We stand by the resolutions adopted at that convention. That is our policy; that is our standard. We are willing that our opponents shall criticise us in respect to our living up to these high standards that we have set for ourselves; that they shall measure us by what we have done on former occasions.

I do not think, Sir, that it is necessary for me to put on record any of the resolutions that were adopted at that convention. The resolution respecting the tariff was put on record yesterday; it has been read in the press of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and I shall not detain the House by putting it on Hansard now. But I wish to read the tariff portion of the Farmers' platform to show the striking similarity between our own policy as enunciated at the convention and the policy as put forward in this booklet which I received a few days ago. I quote:

Whereas Canada is now confronted with a huge national war debt and other greatly increased financial obligations, which can be most readily and effectively reduced by the development of our natural resources, chief of which is agricultural lands;

And whereas it is desirable that an agricultural career should be made attractive to our returned soldiers and the large anticipated immigration, and owing to the fact that this can best be accomplished by the development of a national policy which will reduce to a minimum the cost of living and the cost of production;

And whereas the war has revealed the amazing financial strength of Great Britain, which has enabled her to finance, not only her own part in the struggle, but also to assist in financing her Allies to the extent of hundreds of millions of pounds, this enviable position being due to the free trade policy which has enabled her to draw her supplies freely from every quarter of the globe and consequently to undersell her competitors on the world's market, and because this policy has not only been profitable to Great Britain, but has greatly strengthened the bonds of Empire by facilitating trade between the Motherland and her Overseas Dominions—we believe that the best interests of the Empire and of Canada would be served by reciprocal action on the part of Canada through gradual reductions of the tariff on British imports, having for its objects closer union and a better understanding between Canada and the Motherland and at the same time bring about a great reduction in the cost of living to our Canadian people.

That is practically word for word the policy of the Liberal party; and I was pleased to find that the Farmers' party, the Labour party and the Liberal party are almost, if not altogether, unanimous on the idea of making Canada a good country to live in, a free country, letting nobody have any special privileges, but keeping all on an equal footing, and saying that while we are anxious to assist the manufacturers just the same as every other Canadian who is a good honest man trying to make an honest living, it is our intention to let nobody take shelter behind an unduly high stone wall, behind which he can defy competition from the outside and sell shoddy goods at high prices to the people of Canada. Our intention is to give every honest man in this country a square deal and an opportunity of making a success, but at the same time, he must produce the goods and sell them to the people at reasonable prices and to the best advantage of those who live in the country. That is the idea which we entertain and which we intend to carry out, and the people of this country will, I am sure, hear with delight that before long this Government will make up their minds to be manly and

strong and will come to the conclusion at long last that their tenure of office has been too long and that the proper thing for them to do is to give the people of this country an opportunity either to confirm them in their seats, if the people so desire, or on the other hand, to send here men who will have the absolute confidence of the nation from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Budget debate is one of those valued institutions which all countries under the British form of Government prize very highly as giving opportunity to the representatives of the people to discuss fairly and frankly the various problems in which the country at large is interested and which affects the welfare of the country as a whole. The particular matter before the House is the discussion of the Finance Minister's proposals of ways and means to carry on the affairs of the country, and it is the privilege and duty of hon. members to discuss these proposals from every standpoint. It is my intention to do so within a limited time and without, I trust, boring the House too long with matters that are not directly germane to the subject.

Before, however, continuing my observations with regard to the Budget, I should like to refer to the speech just delivered by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie). Hon. members who have been acquainted with him for many years always look forward to his speeches. Usually, he has a very happy vein of humour and is entertaining and vigorous; but I think we are all struck today with the fact that my hon. friend lacked his usual manner and that he laboured somewhat to justify the course which apparently he intends to follow, namely, that of voting for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). At the very outset of his remarks he made a most extraordinary reference to the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton)—and may I pause to say that from the comments I have heard outside of the House, with which comments I concur, the Minister of Finance has given to the House a Budget of which he may justly be proud, and which the country at large will, I think, receive with favour. Referring to that Budget, my hon. friend said that the Minister of Finance brought down to the House an array of figures which could have been put together in a day and which any schoolboy could have compiled in an hour. That was rather an extraordinary statement, and the hon. member, by the way, dismissed the Budget with that statement and then proceeded with his particular pet line of argument. I would, however, call his attention to the words of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, whose opinion is, I think, highly regarded in the House, certainly by hon. gentlemen opposite. That hon. member said:

> At all times the preparation of the Budget is a matter calling for painstaking labour. It is a matter of large responsibility which any Minister of Finance must necessarily take very seriously, and that responsibility has fallen on my hon. friend at this time under circumstances of more than usual difficulty.

Later on he congratulated, in a gentlemanly, courteous, and I think, very proper manner, the work accomplished by the Minister of Finance. Yesterday, another illustrious gentleman on the other side, the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) confessed—I use that word advisedly—that he was at a loss to understand the import of the very large mass of statistics brought down by the minister, which statistics, my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) says, could have been compiled in an hour by any school boy. If we are to measure the sincerity and logic of my hon. friend's subsequent arguments by this, it would be a simple matter to dispose of them.

The hon. member made another very extraordinary statement which, although I do not think he did it intentionally, was—I use the word kindly—grossly misleading. He said that the Minister of Finance had produced a Budget showing a deficit of about $70,000,000 on ordinary expenditure. What are the facts? The facts are these. Last year the revenue was $388,000,000, and the expenditure under the Consolidated Fund amounted to $349,000,000, leaving a surplus of $39,000,000. But the unfairness and the utter abandon of my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) will be realized when I say to the House that, included in this ordinary expenditure which the Minister of Finance brought down in his speech the other day, is $108,000,000 for interest on war debt, $26,000,000 for pensions and $49,000,000 for loans to soldiers under the Land Settlement Act. Thus, you have included in ordinary expenditure an item of $175,000,000 which, in normal times, would not have been called for at all. In spite of that enormous sum included in ordinary expenditure, the Minister of Finance was able to apply $39,000,000 or $40,000,000 to the reduction of the debt of the country. It is true that last year we had to borrow a large sum of money, but the House, in one direct vote, appropriated the sum of $350,000,000 for war ex-

penditure. My hon. friend dismissed that; he tried to impress the House and the country with the idea that there was a deficit of about $400,000,000, and that is a most unfair, unreasonable and inaccurate application of the figures.

Then, he made some criticisms of another expenditure. He said that the Minister of Finance and this Government had given to foreign countries credits amounting to $226,000,000; or, to use his own words, that the Government said to the manufacturers: "Here is $226,000,000; divide it amongst you," and that the Government

5 p.m.

was dipping down into the pockets of the people of Canada to keep up the high prices. Can the House imagine a more unjust, unfair statement than that? What are the facts? The facts are these. The Government, realizing the necessity of maintaining exchange abroad and the importance of supporting the starving population of Europe, found it necessary to supply some credits in this country in order to ship out the foodstuffs required in Europe for the starving populations, and, in addition to that, to stimulate our foreign trade by sending manufactured articles abroad. My hon. friend stated that this item was not shown in the figures brought down by the Minister of Finance the other day; that there was evidently no record of this amount of $226,000,000. He said: It does not show as an asset. In the figures brought down by the Minister of Finance and placed on Hansard the day before yesterday, not ancient history—if he had read the Budget they could not have escaped his attention—are the following:

Imperial Government..	$171,710,168.19
Other governments..	34,336,117.75

Then there is a miscellaneous item after said: It does not show as an asset. In the record, included in the statement of the assets of the country, this enormous sum he speaks of. Now, I turn briefly for a moment to the wisdom or otherwise of these advances. Here we are in Canada with a large quantity of goods that we are able to sell to the world. What is the condition of affairs throughout the world to-day? Mr. Speaker, the subject has been gone over so often that one hesitates even to refer to it for fear of wearying one's hearers, but in the face of the extravagant statements of the hon. gentleman, who was himself a leader for a year of a large party, it is necessary sometimes to harp back to facts that are known, to use his own words, to every school boy in the country. There is Europe, devastated and largely incapable of producing, while its credits are generally destroyed. We in Canada have goods to sell and desire to open up new markets and get a share of foreign trade. What is more wise than that, so far as we are able to do so, we should supply credits to such countries as may be reasonably safe in the matter of repayment? To whom did we extend credits?—to Great Britain, Belgium, Greece and a few other countries, and in every case it was a wise and judicious provision on the part of the Minister of Finance. There is only one matter for regret in connection with this question, and that is that it is difficult for Canada to extend further credits to these countries. I think it is unfortunate that we are unable to do so. My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) also, apparently with much pleasure to himself, read what he called the death warrant of the Government, calling upon them to resign and go to the country, and serving upon them a series of notices. If the hon. gentleman will remember, he referred to one trip he made to the constituency of Timiskaming. He said: "I made a speech up there and I told the people there that whatever they did they should vote against the Government candidate. They might vote for a Farmer or for a Liberal, but whatever they did they should not vote for this pernicious Government." I presume that is the only speech he made there, but he took a great deal of credit to himself in the matter. Now, what was the result on polling day? In the town in which he delivered that address we find that the Government candidate received a vote of practically two to one against his opponent; and I think that if we desired to be at all selfish, we might express the regret that we did not invite the hon. gentleman to speak at other places in that constituency. If my hon. friend can take any solace out of the results let him.

Last year the hon. member was in the position of leader of the Opposition, and how well we remember, in the Victoria Museum, his standing in his place and holding out the light in the window to the Liberal-Unionists on this side. The latch string was hanging out through the door, and the hon. gentleman drew a homely picture inviting the Liberal-Unionists to come back. He has no word this year for those gentlemen; he turns to my hon. friends the farmers from the prairies and holds out a winsome invitation to them to come in and join his ranks. Why, he says, "there is no difference between our policies; our policy is just the same as yours;

we are all out for a reduction in the tariff;" but he says, "we must stand pat where we were in 1896." How my hon. friend will justify himself before the country in standing pat as he was in 1896 I do not know. I notice when he said that, that his chest expanded and his voice increased in volume, but when he was talking to my hon. friends opposite his brow clouded and his voice was tremulous and I could scarcely catch what he said. He was not so sure of himself on that occasion, but he followed the lead given by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and decided that he must hand out some sort of invitation, and therefore he gave the invitation to his farmer friends to come in and join in his policy.

Now, I should like to proceed to review briefly the attitude of my hon. friends opposite as given to the House and the country in speeches delivered by the leading critics of the Opposition, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). I think it is proper and desirable that we should know how hon. gentlemen opposite stand on this subject, because after all the way we judge as to the value of our hon. friends' criticisms is to measure them up and see whether or not the opinions expressed by their side all agree. If they do not agree then these hon. gentlemen can hardly expect us to accept them. My hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's, who for fifteen years was Minister of Finance of this country and who speaks with a great deal of experience and authority, yesterday I think spoke with intense sincerity; and out of his years of wisdom, out of that fifteen years of ripe experience in the position of Minister of Finance, and from his life long experience as a Liberal, he gave his verdict on free trade. We cannot doubt for a moment that he had studied the question. He is an intelligent man; he is a learned man, the editor of a large financial journal which speaks for the financial interests of the country to a large extent; and his words are worthy of consideration. Speaking of free trade, he said, after stating what it was:

> That is free trade, but it is quite possible that the best of principles may be carried too far; it is quite possible that men who believe in the general principle of free trade must recognize that there are conditions under which it cannot be applied.

My hon. friend from Brome has something else to say in the same debate, and on the same issue. Speaking from the same benches as the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, he cites a book written by Mr. Keynese on why Europe may become free trade territory, and says:

> That is the policy which the Liberal party aim at in the future. That is the policy which I wish to see adopted in this country.

On the one hand you have a learned and experienced leader on the other side declaring that it is impracticable and unwise to apply the principles of an abstract theory in practice; and on the other hand you have a pseudo-leader declaring that it is his intention to stand four square on the great principles of free trade, of which by the way I shall have something to say later on.

Then we have my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's enunciating some other doctrines which certainly are in absolute contradiction of the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite as expressed in this and in every preceding similar debate in recent years. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) took the full credit and responsibility of the dumping clause, an arbitrary, definite, protective measure and a measure that I do not for one moment criticise. We ought to bear in mind that hon. gentlemen who pretend to a certain element in the country that they are the friends and the advocates of the policy of free trade have no right to stand upon this doctrine which has been enunciated by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's.

But that is not all. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) takes a step forward and he makes another rather extraordinary statement, a statement that I, with all my Toryism, such as it is, would hesitate to make in this House. He says that not only is he in favour of a measure of protection but that the peculiar brand of protection he is in favour of is the bonus rather than the customs tariff. Bonuses and bounties are classified by all economists as constituting the most extreme measure of protection. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's to quote his words, says:

> I would willingly help an infant industry, and as between protection and bounties—

Mark his words!

> I think I would prefer the bounties.

That is from the lips of the leading financial critic of the Opposition, the hon. gentleman who himself moved the amendment to the resolution which I shall deal with later. Again I invite the attention of the House to a strange contradiction in

the attitude of his colleague who followed him a few hours afterwards and who referred to the statement of the Minister of Finance dealing with infant industries and the necessity of not killing or annihilating them by careless or reckless legislation. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) goes on to say:

> He speaks of legitimate industries. What are legitimate industries in this country?

Bearing in mind the attitude of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, this is what he says:

> I will answer that. Legitimate industries are those which can stand on their own feet, and pay their own way, and which do not require to be bonused by the taxpayers of this country.

On the one hand you have one leader (Mr. Fielding) stating that he prefers bounties and bonuses in protecting infant industries and on the other hand you have his colleague, (Mr. McMaster) ousted temporarily I believe, from the position of chief financial critic, saying that he is absolutely opposed to bonuses and bounties.

The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's not only was in favour of bonuses and bounties but he was in favour of mergers as well. Again I am not differing from him. I would pause to say that in my estimation, and this has been my opinion for a great many years, so called mergers, combines or whatever terms you like, or large combinations of capital as applied to industry, constitute a wise and economical method of handling industry provided there is reasonable governmental restrictions on their operations so that they cannot impose their power upon the country in an oppressive manner. In so far as the operation is concerned I believe it is a sound and economical method of industrial control. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's comes out flat-footed for the merger. Can we not hear the former member for Edmonton, the Hon. Frank Oliver, from his place in this House, year after year, as I and many hon. members have heard him, hounding the Government because he said that it was, supporting trusts, mergers and combines? To-day, here is his colleague (Hon. Mr. Fielding) who sat with him for fifteen years in the same Cabinet chamber standing foursquare for trusts, mergers and combines. That is the condition that we see amongst hon. gentlemen opposite. In the light of that attitude of mind, in the light of these statements made by these hon. gentlemen, what construction are we to put upon the amendment which is before the House?

The hon. member for Brome made the statement that he delighted to take Great Britain as an example and lead in his financial policy. In view of the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite in moving this amendment, I am going to invite the attention of the House for a moment to the last British Budget delivered only a few weeks ago by the Right Hon. Austen Chamberlain whom my hon. friend delights to follow. What was done in that Budget in the way of taxes? Compare Mr. Austen Chamberlain's action with that of our Minister of Finance. The British Government brought down their Budget and increased the taxes in connection with the postal service—we have a Bill on the table of this House to increase the charges in connection with the postal service. The British Government increased the taxes in connection with telegraphs and telephones. That is a Government institution over there and we as a government are not so deeply interested here in telegraphs and telephones. They increased the charge for motor licenses, which service is controlled by the Imperial Government—we are imposing a new and enlarged tax upon motors in this country. I am sorry that my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) is not in his seat but I invite the attention of his colleagues, because this is included in their platform, to the fact that the British Government repealed the land values tax. They increased the taxes on spirits, beer, wine and cigars. One would think that they had been reading the proposals of the Minister of Finance of Canada. They enlarged the stamp taxes increasing the tax on cheques, notes, share transfers, receipts, etc. They made no increase in the income tax. We have made an increase in the income tax. They also have a business profits tax, as we have. They have imposed a new tax on corporations in Great Britain. We last year put a tax on corporations, which has been in operation for a year and is being continued. These are new methods of taxation in Great Britain practically every one of which is included in the Budget before us to-day. Will my hon. friends opposite, in the few days to come, stand up in their places and advocate the complete wiping out of these proposals?

The hon. member for Brome made a proposal also that I think should be reviewed very briefly because it should not pass without being taken notice of. He

stated yesterday that there certainly should be a direct levy on war wealth. He means a direct levy against capital. Is he justified in standing on this ground? He told the House that a Royal Commission in Great Britain had passed upon the question and that a Bill is about to be brought in. As a matter of fact Mr. Speaker, he is a long way ahead of the pace set in Great Britain in that regard. A commission, or a committee of the House, is, or has been, sitting on this question. They have not yet reported, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated in his Budget Speech that he was not yet certain whether or not the matter would be taken up in the way of legislation. But there is a vast difference between a levy on capital in Great Britain and a levy on capital in Canada. The difference, which is fundamental, is this: Capital in Great Britain is very largely of a liquid character. Great Britain has been for centuries the banker of the world, and there is concentrated in that country a great deal of liquid capital. During the war many individuals, for their firms, corporations and so forth, made huge profits, which came to them in the form of what I call liquid wealth. What is the condition of Canada? Nearly every firm, nearly every individual, that made money to any degree out of the war, have invested their profits in the enlargement of their plants. Investment was made by placing all their profits back in their business, enlarging their plants; and in very few cases —as far as I have been able to discover, and I have given the matter a great deal of thought—has there been any very large increase in what you might call liquid wealth. Now let us see? How would you assess or take this wealth? My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) was very silent on the question—he did not discuss it. He gave no indication that he had given it a moment's thought; he simply propounded it as a thing that would appeal to the popular ear. The taking of the war wealth! How would you take the war wealth? Let us get down to something concrete! Here is, we will say, a large factory like the Polson Iron Works in Toronto, or one of the large packing concerns. These people made money, a certain amount of money during the war. But what occurred? Those who were engaged, for instance, in the manufacture of munitions, in almost every case put that money into new machinery, or extensions of plant, and there it is to-day. If we were to assess their wealth, so called, the only way we could secure any portion of it would be by taking a portion of the plant, or forcing a liquidation of the plant. I will give a concrete illustration. I know of a firm—a saw-mill, a lumber company—with a capital of $100,000. They borrowed from the bank, $200,000 which made their invested and operating capital $300,000. Now when aeroplane spruce was being cut in large quantities this firm made a net profit of $100,000. You might say that was 100 per cent profit on the capital, and that they should pay a large sum into the treasury of the country. As a matter of fact, under the existing law, that firm is assessed at $64,000. Now, what is the result? The firm is faced with this condition: They have borrowed from the bank the last dollar of credit they could secure, $200,000. They are asked to pay $64,000 into the exchequer. They have not got it. Where is the $100,000? It is in extended plant, a new wharf, an increase of their machinery, the extension of buildings, and an increase of stock being carried in their yard. In order to pay the tax levy, or the assessment on their wealth direct, they would be compelled to close down and liquidate by the selling of a portion of their plant. I merely state that to indicate the difficulties facing those who take any stock in the proposal so lightly suggested by my hon. friend from Brome.

Now let me turn for a moment or two to the amendment, moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), and I think hon. gentlemen on both sides should give it the closest attention. What is the significance of this amendment, what does it mean? My hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has moved that "all the words after, that (in the resolution) be struck out." Now what does that mean? It means this: That all the schedules, that all the proposed taxes, will be cut off supposing the amendment carries. There will be no such taxation imposed, and this revenue will not be raised—it will be abandoned. The amendment condemns the action of the Government in proposing this taxation, and repudiates the whole resolution submitted by the Minister of Finance. In other words, to make the amendment more direct and practical, hon. gentlemen opposite propose to strike out the ten per cent tax on luxuries, the fifteen per cent tax on automobiles, the twenty per cent tax on gramophones, etc., the twenty per cent tax on playing cards, the thirty per cent tax on patent medicines, etc., the $2 a gallon on liquors, the thirty cents a gallon on ale and beer, the $3 on champagne

They propose to strike out the provision for one per cent on sales; to strike out the increased tax on bills of exchange and promissory notes, and the tax on the transfer of shares. They go even further—they prevent the imposition of an increased income tax. They stop the repeal of the seven and a half per cent customs war tax, and they prevent the putting on the free list of books and appliances for the blind. That is what the amendment means—it means a complete and absolute repudiation of the total proposals of the Government for the raising of revenue in this country during the coming year.

Now, what do my hon. friends opposite offer in place of that? This I submit, Sir, is a logical and proper question to ask. Not one single word has dropped from the lips of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, the hon. member for Brome, or the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria, to say what they propose to put in place of the Government's taxation proposals. My hon. friends repudiate and reject all the proposals of the Government, and this is what they propose to adopt in their place: They express a pious wish in the amendment that substantial reductions of the burden of customs taxation may be brought about. Now let us consider that for a moment. Here we are in Canada faced by an enormous expenditure. What does that expenditure consist of? An enormous sum for interest on our war debt; a huge sum for pensions; large amounts of money for land settlement; and then there is the cost of carrying on the ordinary business of the country. These are the purposes for which the Government is asking money from Parliament. We must get the money, and hon. gentlemen opposite know that themselves. The Finance Minister shows that he will be able to raise a large portion of this money—what he proposes will meet almost the total of the ordinary expenditures—but he points out that in the fall there is accruing due some $70,000,000 of short term loans, and those of us who have given the matter any consideration at all know that next year, and the following year, 1922-3, there are other sums coming due. Is it not only wise but prudent on our part to make adequate provision to meet these short term loans? We must do so, or else go into the market and borrow with the result of enlarging our debt, increasing our burdens, and following a line of action that is not being adopted, I am glad to say, by any other country in the world of the standing of Canada. So, Sir, my hon. friends opposite, by their amendment—and I wish to make this absolutely clear; they know it, I presume, but apparently are ignoring it—repudiate every proposal that has been submitted for the raising of this money. If my hon. friends opposite vote for that amendment, as possibly they will, then they repudiate the very measures that they advocate in their own platform, a direct tax of one kind or another, and I shall deal with that a moment later. They not only do that, but they fail to submit one single suggestion of a concrete character to take the place of these enormous reductions that must come about. Is that the whole story? It is not, for there is this much further: They propose a drastic and a definite reduction of customs duty. What does that mean? Can they reduce the customs duty without reducing the revenue? Our revenue from that source is in the neighbourhood of $150,000,000. If they make any tariff reduction that is worth while—30 per cent would not be an unreasonable guess at what they are aiming at—it would mean $50,000,000 additional reduction. And not a single word as to what source of revenue is to take its place.

I invite hon. gentleman opposite to give consideration to this amendment, I invite them to give consideration to the absolute and imperative necessity of carrying on during this year and meeting some of the obligations to which I have referred. Surely we can fight out the points of differences on methods without absolutely abandoning the needs of the country; surely, Sir, we could produce to this House some suggestions which might be different from these proposals without rejecting the latter in toto; surely there is some merit in the proposals of the Government. I hold that those proposals, as far as we have been able to judge, have been received throughout the country with general approval, and I doubt if my hon. friends will get very much credit from the people in their efforts—which will fail—to land the country into the lamentable position which their amendment would produce if adopted.

We have heard a great deal during this debate about the Government not keeping faith in connection with tariff reform. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am independent enough and radical enough to criticise the Government if I consider it is derelict in its duty—and I have done it when it has not perhaps resulted in any particular good to myself. But let us look at this thing fairly. Last year the right hon.

member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White), then Finance Minister, made a statement in his Budget Speech—a carefully prepared statement, in which he said, among other things:

> Within a year conditions will, I hope, have become stabilized so as to permit of a general revision of the tariff.

And he wound up by saying:

> My own view is that it might well commence in the fall.

My hon. friends opposite charge the ex-Finance Minister with having broken faith, with having made a promise which has not been carried out. But that statement of his was based on conditions becoming stabilized. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen seriously if ever there was a time in the history of the world when conditions were less stable than they are to-day—or than they were in January and February, because they have, I am glad to say, improved a little since? Was there ever a time in the history of this country, even during the Crimean War before Confederation, when the conditions were less stable than they were in the months of January and February? Exchange was so demoralized that the whole world was temporarily in a panic. The only thing that saved us from a serious panic in the United States and Canada was the fact that the Old Land, with its usual buoyancy, was able to ship to New York large quantities of gold in the last few months, somewhat temporarily, at least, stabilizing conditions.

But would any hon. gentleman suggest seriously that this was a time to reduce the tariff? How could we reduce it, looking at it from a practicable standpoint? Could we take up the schedules covering the imports from the United States under the present abnormal conditions with exchange against us; or the schedules which naturally cover importations from France, or from Belgium, or from any of the other European countries where the discount against them ranges from 60 to as high as 90 per cent? While I am strongly in favour of a revision of the tariff, I think the Government would have been derelict in its duty had it precipitated a revision under those conditions. Not only would it have been derelict in its duty, Sir, but it would have attempted an almost impossible task.

My hon. friend from Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie) quoted a statement made in 1911 in connection with a Bill then before the House to create a permanent tariff commission. That Bill was killed in the Senate,—not by supporters of this Government or of the Government to which this succeeded, it was killed by his Liberal friends in that Chamber at the instigation of his friends in this House. He referred to that, and then he said that we had gone for eight years since and no effort had been made to appoint a permanent tariff commission. I again invite the House to give that statement consideration. Has there been any day from the 4th of August, 1914, down to the present time when a revision of the tariff was a practical measure? What would my hon. friends have said if in the year 1918, or 1917, or 1916, or even last year, this Government had stated to the House, "We propose to revise the tariff," Why, they would have told the Government very plainly that it was out of its mind to attempt such a thing under the circumstances. There was not a day from the 4th of August, 1914, down to the present time when it was a reasonable proposition to attempt a revision of the tariff; and I very much doubt whether it will be possible within the next eight or ten months.

I am firmly of the opinion that the Government should surround itself with tariff experts. I know they have some already who are second to none, but I think they might perhaps enlarge this staff a little, and secure, as soon as conditions are reasonably stabilized, the fullest information. I think the Government could go this far: they could prepare the machinery which would undertake this investigation, so that when conditions become stabilized in the next five or six months this machinery could be put into motion and we might have some results later on. But for the Government to have undertaken this proposal at any time up to the present moment would have been unwise, impractical and injudicious.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to address myself briefly to what is known as the Farmers' platform. I approach this question not with any desire to be hypercritical of my hon. friends, but rather to draw attention to some striking things in connection with this so-called platform. First, however, I wish to say a few words to the members of that party in this House, which I trust they will receive in the spirit in which I tender them. In that platform they make a rather extraordinary and sweeping statement, and I invite my hon. friends to consider this statement in the light of the additional experience, perhaps, which they now have. I am sorry the hon.

member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) is not in his seat, because I shall direct my remarks more particularly to him than to his supporters.

In this platform, and also in public speeches made by the hon. gentleman we find this statement—a statement, Mr. Speaker, given to the country at large as a statement of fact, a statement which is supposed to have the careful and the thoughtful support of the hon. gentlemen who are members of the party which hands it out. The statement reads:

> The protective tariff has been and is a chief corrupting influence in our national life, because protected interests, in order to maintain their unjust privileges, have contributed lavishly to the campaign funds, thus encouraging both political parties to look to them for support, thereby lowering the standard of public morality.

I have also under my hand speeches made by the hon. member for Marquette in which similar statements are made. Now, that is a very serious charge—it is not merely a statement. The charge is that those engaged in manufactures which the tariff affects are the chief corrupting influence in this country. Most of my hon. friends have been in this House for two or more sessions. They know that there are in this House a large number of hon. gentlemen who represent, not in a political sense but in a personal way, the manufacturing interests; that is, there are manufacturers in this House just as there are farmers. Now, let me ask them this: Having in mind this charge; having in mind this serious statement, will they on their responsibility as members of this House say that the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne), the member for Toronto East (Sir Edward Kemp), the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea), the member for North Essex (Mr. W. C. Kennedy), the member for Waterloo South (Mr. Scott), the member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor), the member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) and others—will my hon. friends say that these men have been and are the chief corrupting influence in this country? All these hon. members are manufacturers. They are honourable members of this House; some of them have been here for a great many years; others for a shorter period. If these gentlemen have corrupted the country; if they have been guilty of corrupt practices, there is a way of penalizing them, a way of exposing them, and that is for an hon. member to stand in his place in the House and say that this hon. member or that hon. member has been guilty of these practices. They are here; they can be called before the bar of public opinion; those who make these charges have an opportunity of proving them. Mr. Speaker, I hold most tenaciously to the principle that no man has a right to make general sweeping statements about his colleagues or his fellow-citizens; to make general statements of condemnation or charges of corruption; to say that which, if not proved, may constitute defamation of character, unless he is prepared to show that the charges he makes are well founded. If a member of this House or any one outside of the House undertakes to make charges which are derogatory of the character of any fellow-citizen, he must either prove his charges or lay himself open to the charge of being unfair and unworthy of citizenship. I say that somewhat forcibly, perhaps, but I think the time has arrived when these sweeping charges should be abandoned.

If I have anything to say to my hon. friends as to their conduct, I will give them chapter and verse; I will tell them what I think of their actions. Let me say a few things in this connection to illustrate my point. My hon. friends opposite, every one of them practically, have stood four square for the control of the sale and handling of wheat in this country. They have insisted on the control exercised by the Canada Wheat Board. Now, what is the result? If the operations carried on by the Canada Wheat Board has been carried on by a board of manufacturers, the country would have heard of it from one end of the land to the other. The Wheat Board was supposed to be a medium that would eliminate all possibility of undue profit or unreasonable charges. That is the principle upon which it was based, but what do we find? We find that in the conveyance of the wheat from the farmer's wagon to the seaboard or to the European market, all those things in respect of which charges are usually made under so-called speculation, under private control, were carefully preserved in connection with the Wheat Board. There are hon. gentlemen in this House closely identified with the Wheat Board. There are here representatives of the Saskatchewan Co-operative Association, of which Mr. Riddell is the moving spirit; he himself controls three hundred or more elevators. Now, I am not making any charges; I am simply making a statement of fact. But what did the Wheat Board do? Instead of abolishing, as they might properly have done, the brokerage fee of one cent a bushel which

was usually charged in connection with the commission business in Winnipeg, that fee was carefully preserved by a specific action of the board, and for what purpose? Because the largest beneficiaries of it were the large organizations or combinations such as the Grain Growers and the Saskatchewan Co-operative Association. Moreover, they very carefully provided for a spread of from five to ten cents a bushel for wheat bought in the country elevators. Five to ten cents a bushel is a mighty fine profit on wheat handled in large quantities. In connection with the commission wheat which moved forward to the head of the Lakes there were the storage charges. In Alberta and Saskatchewan elevators have been kept full of wheat all winter; there has not been any very great effort to move it, because the Canada Wheat Board pays the elevator a storage charge for every hour that that wheat is in the elevator. But that is not all. Last year I brought to the attention of the House the fact that the great elevators at the head of the Lakes had, in a period of between five and seven years, taken illegally, contrary to the Grain Act, $15,000,000 in overages out of the pockets of the people; and every one of my hon. friends opposite leaned to the support of that action. Not only that; they induced the Minister of Trade and Commerce to make an amendment to the Grain Act which legalized what had up to that time been an illegal act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is this: My hon. friends may not have started out deliberately to do these things. The very basis of their organization was indignation at the operators in Winnipeg and at the head of the Lakes; indignation with regard to dockages; indignation with regard to the unfair seizing, taking or appropriation, whatever you like to call it, of the screenings. These were the cries upon which they inspired so many farmers to join their organization. But once they got into the business they did exactly what all other terminal elevators did. If the Government would appoint the Price, Waterhouse Company to make an investigation into the country elevators, (the so-called line elevators) similar to that which they made into the terminal elevators, they would expose to this country a surprising and startling condition. I have heard people say: Well, it is only a matter of a half cent here and a cent there and two or three per cent somewhere else. But I will guarantee that from the farmer to the head of the Lakes deductions to the extent of ten per cent are made that ought not to be made, representing amounts which, if these operations were carefully restricted and properly controlled and directed, would accrue very largely to the farmers. Take, for instance, this question of overages. Last year, a very poor year, at the head of the Lakes over $2,000,000 worth of grain were taken from the farmer, taken from the person who shipped it there, absolutely illegally—at any rate, the action was illegal prior to the adoption of last year's amendment making it legal—I will say, unjustly. Not only that; the Canada Grain Act shows that these screenings should be accounted for where there is a larger dockage than three per cent; but they never, if they can possibly avoid it, account for screenings. I am trying to point out to my hon. friends that there is an axiom in law that when a person comes into court to make charges against some one else he shall come with clean hands. I say also that if the manufacturers of this country could be exposed as having practised these things, it would be known from one end of the country to the other. I conclude this portion of my remarks by saying that as soon as my hon. friends got into the business they carried on the practices which they had previously condemned, even to the extent of gambling in futures, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the grain, for, in one year, my hon. friends' company lost in New York $250,000, and, at the head of the Lakes, other sums amounting in all to about $43,000, in a practice, as regards which some of them at least petitioned the Government of Canada about 1910 to amend the Criminal Code to make gambling in futures a criminal offence. Before these hon. gentlemen publish to the world that the manufacturing classes generally (including some hon. gentlemen whom I have named and who have been honoured members of the House for years) are the corrupting and immoral influence of the country, they want to be mighty sure that their own hands are just as clean as they were before they got into these large avenues of business.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. STEVENS (Resuming): Mr. Chairman, I wish to go a step further in connection with this Farmers' platform. I find in it this clause:

That all corporations engaged in the manufacture of products protected by the customs

tariff be obliged to publish annually comprehensive and accurate statements of their earnings.

I have no particular objection to a requirement of that kind. But what I do object to, and what I would impress upon my hon. friends who advance this platform, is this, that it is decidedly unfair, undemocratic and unjust to limit the publication of comprehensive and accurate statements of earnings to the manufacturers. Why the manufacturers more than any one else? Why should the manufacturers any more, for instance, than an operator of a grain elevator, or a large wholesale implement dealer, a coal dealer, a dealer in flour, in lumber or in other commodities commonly used by the people, be required to do this? Why should not these, as well as the manufacturers of the country, publish comprehensive and detailed statements of their earnings? In substantiation of this, and again to point out to my hon. friends that they are not coming before the House with clean hands in this regard, I wish to draw to the attention of the House some figures in connection with the operations of the United Grain Growers and subsidiary companies. There is a company, the stock of which is owned and controlled by the United Grain Growers, known as the Grain Export Company. It is a New York corporation and all of its stock is owned by the United Grain Growers' Company. This Grain Export Company has an authorized capital of $250,000, but its records show, and the sworn statement of Mr. Rice Jones, the secretary of the company, also shows, that the company had a paid-up capital of $100,000 and the balance of $150,000 was paid out of stock dividends. At this point I pause to bring to the attention of the House another clause in the platform of my friends, a clause which is very interesting in the light of this method of financial manipulation:

> That in levying and collecting the business profits tax the Dominion Government should insist that it be absolutely upon the basis of the actual cash invested in the business and that no considerations be allowed for what is popularly known as watered stock.

Mr. J. F. REID: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend says, "Hear, hear," and I agree with him absolutely. But the point I am making is this: If those gentlemen are going to include in their platform a statement of that kind, if in all their speeches, in the speech of the president of the company on the occasion of its annual meeting, and in the public speeches of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar), they are going to condemn the practice of creating capital which does not represent cash invested, then I say we are justified in reviewing the operations of some of their own companies. Now, I bring this particular company to the attention of the House. What is its financial history? Briefly this. It has an authorized capital of $250,000, of which $100,000 was paid up in cash and $150,000 was paid in the form of stock dividends. Had that been a concern in which, let us say, my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) or some other hon. member representing a manufacturing company was concerned, that would have been considered watered stock, and it would have been condemned as an unreasonable and unfair imposition on the public. It would be charged against the manufacturer as being an extortion from the people. But that is not all. I find in the sworn statement of the secretary the following:

> In addition to the stock dividend of $150,000 this company paid to the parent company $300,000 in cash.

That is pretty fair earning. As a matter of fact, in one year's operation this Grain Export Company, with an actual cash investment of $100,000, made $500,000 of profit. I repeat to you, Sir, and I draw the fact to the attention of hon. members, that if we were dealing now with a manufacturing company some hon. gentlemen would have ample ground for denouncing all manner of crookedness, extortion and exploitation. I am not laying this to the charge of my hon. friends, but I simply say that if they are going to attack the manufacturing interests of the country we will view their own operations and see whether or not the same general principles of finance are applied to their own business, and applied in a more successful manner than in the case of any manufacturing concern I know of. That being so, then I say to my hon. friends that they should withdraw the aspersions contained in their platform and in their speeches against the manufacturers.

I proceed a step further. I intimated this afternoon that my hon. friends opposite came to Ottawa—I think it was in 1910—and presented resolutions demanding that it be made a criminal offence to deal in futures on the grain exchange. We find this Grain Export Company, a subsidiary of the United Grain Growers, making a loss in one year of $245,000, a loss, according to the sworn statement of Mr. Rice Jones, due to the lack of sufficient margin in their gambling estimate of the matter. I am using

their own words that are crystallized into resolutions by these very gentlemen, and not my words. But in spite of that loss they succeeded in turning over to the parent company $300,000, and in paying a stock dividend of $150,000, and in addition to that, a year ago, they had $150,000 or $300,000 in reserve—the secretary said he knew it was $150,000, and possibly it was $300,000. I say to hon. gentlemen who make charges of unreasonable profits against the whole world and particularly against the manufacturing interests, that we cannot find, in the wildest romance of manufacturing in this country, a more extreme type of profiteering than that.

Let us turn to another phase of their operations. I refer hon. members to a report laid on the table of the House last year to which I have already referred, namely, the report of Price, Waterhouse and Company, the auditors in connection with the elevators at the head of the Lakes. What do we find there? We find our friends, some of them in the House, operating a grain elevator leased from the Canadian Pacific Railway upon which they pay a rent equal to about six per cent, or seven per cent now, on cost of construction. On the operation of that elevator in one year they made a net profit of 211 per cent. Deducting from that profit of 211 per cent the losses they made on margins in speculating on grain that did not belong to them, it left 187 per cent. Why do I say speculating in grain that did not belong to them? This is a point which I wish the House to understand clearly. I could not emphasize it last year when I tried to place before the House the iniquitous character of this and other proceedings. It is contrary to an Act passed by this Parliament for any terminal elevator company at the head of the Lakes to deal in any grain overages in its care. The grain that is there is not their grain; they are not allowed to buy a bushel of grain; it is grain in transit; it is grain in trust. But the terminal elevators used to sell, in July or before the end of August, the anticipated overages. Once in a while they would get caught. One year the elevator of my hon. friends got caught and made one loss of, I think, $23,000 and another of a smaller amount. You may scrutinize with the utmost care the operations of my hon. friends in business and you will not find one single iota of deviation from the general methods of doing business by those whom they previously condemned. In issuing a pamphlet, and in subscribing to a platform of this kind, they have no right to condemn those other operators when they are themselves indulging, infinitely more successfully, in the same practices and the same methods.

Going on a step farther, and coming to the parent company. This is a co-operative company. It was the father of this whole movement and the parent of this platform. That company has paid ten per cent since 1911, and it has an accumulated surplus of $1,700,000. It may be said, and it will be said if anybody chooses to reply to my remarks to-night, that there is a premium on the stock. According again to the sworn evidence of Mr. Rice-Jones a large portion of this premium on stock amounting to $400,000 was paid out in commissions for the sale of stock. That might reduce the $1,700,000 by $200,000, but after that is done you still have $1,500,000 of a surplus. That is a very handsome surplus. But that is not all of the story. The balance of the story is that in addition to the main operations of this concern there are branches such as the Grain Growers' Guide, a perfectly legitimate enterprise, that make losses and have made losses for years and years. Those losses are hidden by and absorbed in the general prosperity of the company. The point in all this is that our hon. friends in advancing to this House and to the country this platform should delete all references carrying insinuations of corruption and insincerity on the part of their fellow-citizens, guilty as they are of exactly the same methods and practices but with enhanced success so far as results are concerned.

I find another plank in this platform; that in reference to the publication of election campaign fund contributions. I have no objection to that, I think it is perfectly proper. If I am not mistaken the Bill before the House is very clear on that point. It was introduced by this Government and we are supporting it. But let us examine this question of campaign funds. From one end of this country to the other speeches have been made. I have under my hand reports of speeches by the hon. the leader of the National Progressive party, the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) in which he makes charges similar to those in the platform in referring to corruption in connection with campaign funds.

Let me carry my hon. friends back in history about fifty or sixty years. The first lieutenant of the hon. member for Marquette is the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who, I am exceedingly sorry to learn, is sick and in the hospital; I know

we will all regret that fact. The hon. member for Red Deer traverses this ground so frequently that I think I may be permitted a passing reference. I am sure that I shall not be criticised for quoting Morley, John Bright and Cobden, because they are without any question the very gods of the party referred to in this platform. In the great campaign for free trade, commencing about 1841, or reaching the storm point about 1841, John Bright secured a campaign fund from the manufacturers of Manchester and Birmingham of £750,000 sterling, or nearly $5,000,000, at that time worth perhaps three times what it is worth to-day. He went into Bristol and London and got another £500,000. John Bright was the apostle of political purity, the man held up to this House as the ideal character for all of us to follow, whose doctrines were so unselfish and whose ideals so high that we are called upon year after year and almost month after month whenever the hon. member for Red Deer speaks, to follow in John Bright's footsteps. Yet £1,250,000 was raised by this gentleman for a campaign fund and it was used for the purpose of disseminating the views that he held. I am not criticising this action; I think a man has a perfect right to subscribe to a fund to support, spread, advocate and disseminate the doctrine which he thinks is right. My hon. friends opposite—and I am not saying anything that is hidden; it is well known—have an organized method of getting a large campaign fund. What for? For teaching the doctrines in which they believe. They have a perfect right to do that. They are asking—I was going to say "compelling" but I will not use that word, but there is a very strong pressure at least being brought—every one of their members to subscribe $7 to the campaign fund for promoting the political aspirations of the leaders of that movement. It is perfectly legitimate in so far as I know and I have no criticism to offer. But when our friends advocate a free trade policy, point to the manufacturing interests of the country as a corrupting and immoral influence, and declare that steps should be taken to suppress them, they should look over their own history and the history of their own movement and see what they themselves are doing. What difference does it make whether I subscribe $10, or $100, or $1,000? If I am legally entitled to subscribe $100 there is nothing to prevent me from subscribing $1,000, if I wish to, for the purpose of teaching, disseminating and spreading a doctrine in which I believe.

As long as a campaign fund is kept within the bounds of decency and honesty no man can criticise it. But if such a fund is used illegally for corrupting purposes and if that is known by our hon. friends, then the duty rests upon them to put their finger upon that corrupting individual, or influence, and expose him to the eyes of the world. There are laws in abundance to protect them. Therefore I say that these pious expressions from my hon. friends are scarcely warranted; they are not warranted in this platform. I bring to the attention of my hon. friends another matter which I think has a sentimental and, I was going to say, almost a moral bearing. It is this: The pioneer of the prairie— for I have been West, Sir, for twenty-seven years, and I know something about prairie life as well as about life on the Pacific coast—the pioneer on the prairie had a pretty hard time. In the outlying districts he has a pretty hard time to-day. It takes quite a bit of grit to get located and, Mr. Speaker, it takes a little grit to get a plough, a team of horses, a reaper, a mower and a few other implements. Will my hon. friends of the Co-operative Society give him credit? You, Mr. Speaker, or any person, go and locate on the prairies and see if they will sell you a binder, or a mower, or a plough, or a harrow, on credit. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and my hon. friends from other parts of Ontario have millions of dollars out on credit on the prairie—millions of dollars. They carry the farmer out there for six months, a year, two years. I remember a few years ago seeing figures aggregating something like $8,000,000 around the prairies, some of which paper was three and four years old. Sometimes owing to a bad year there is no return in crop, and there being no possibility of payment the notes are renewed. The manufacturers, as I say, carry these farmers. But, Sir, this great corporation, this co-operative society—according to the sworn evidence of Mr. Rice-Jones last year—will not give one cent of credit: you must put your cash down and take your machine away or you do not get it. I say to them that in condemning the manufacturer, in making this schism through the country, creating a feeling of bitterness against the manufacturers and imputing to them corrupt purposes, they might as well scrutinize and view the moral character of their own transactions as regards assisting the man who is hard up, as compared with the

extremely liberal credit given by these operators that I have mentioned.

Now, in further reference to this platform I shall very briefly refer to several items. My hon. friends have on their platform "A Graduated Income Tax." We have had that for two or three years, and a mighty steep one it is. "The Business Profits Tax." It is on, and bearing heavily, Mr. Speaker, upon the industries of the country. I would like to take time to discuss that question, but I shall not do so: The tax is there and there is no use now complaining—in fact, Sir, the business men of the country are not complaining very seriously. But it is a difficult tax. These things are very easy to advocate in the way of theory, but when you come to apply them, when you come to give an equitable and just application of them they become very difficult measures to apply. However, a business profits tax has been applied since 1916, and is still in existence, so my hon. friends cannot complain of that. Then they advocate "A Graduated Inheritance Tax." But, Mr. Speaker, that field is occupied by the several Provincial Governments. We cannot superimpose upon the inheritance tax of the Provincial Governments another inheritance tax. A serious error very frequently made in this House is to liken, or attempt to liken, the taxation of Great Britain with that of Canada, and in doing so it is always conveniently forgotten by the critics that in Great Britain the Government has the whole field of taxation to itself, while in Canada that field is shared by nine legislatures and the Federal Parliament. Very, very frequently the provincial authorities occupy a field of taxation and we cannot occupy it except with hardship. That is the situation in the case of the income tax; and I think that the Federal Government and the governments of the several provinces might well get together and review this Income Tax law with a view of making it equitable throughout the whole Dominion. Let the provinces abandon the field or the Dominion abandon the field, and if they both wish to have the tax let us have one overhead charge for collection, then collect the tax in the most economical manner, and divide the proceeds. In any case, Sir, it is a fair subject for investigation, and for study and thought.

Then my hon. friends have a plank in their platform referring to returned soldiers. E-ery suggestion made is already in operation, is already being carried out: Land settlement—the care of the sick and the crippled—vocational training—pensions, and so forth; and at this moment a pensions committee, composed of impartial members from both sides of the House, is sitting and will shortly, we hope, bring in a report dealing with this question in an up-to-date manner.

And so we go on through the whole platform. I find one very interesting plank to which I would like to make brief reference. It is a plank that is always seized upon when a party, or a group, have very little else to recommend them to the public. It is the "Reform of the Senate." It is a plank, Mr. Speaker, that one can always dilate upon in any place and under any circumstances. In regard to it I would like to say, Sir, that whatever criticisms may be offered of the organization of the Dominion Parliament as it is at the present time, I am not at all in favour of the abolition of the Senate. It may be, Sir, that the Senate—its organization, and the method of appointment of senators—might be improved, but it is a subject which calls for very great care and very serious thought before action is taken, in order that rash action may be avoided.

There are numerous other planks which are of minor importance. What I would say to my hon. friends, however, before I leave this platform is, that in our present Budget we are giving effect to direct taxation to an extent not suggested even in their platform. We have met nearly all the points that are there of a constructive character. We have made a substantial reduction in the customs tariff of approximately $30,000,000—that is what the removal of the seven and a half per cent customs duty will amount to approximately, I am told. Well, $30,000,000 is a pretty sweeping reduction for one year, and I would suggest to the leader of the Opposition that he should consider the amendment before the House in the light of that reduction. When you ask indefinitely, in a sort of pious manner, for a general reduction of the tariff, it may be well to see what this seven and a half per cent reduction really means. It is a serious reduction, Mr. Speaker, and one which I think, in the aggregate perhaps, will measure up well with any suggestion that could possibly come from hon. gentlemen opposite. It meets the platform of my hon. friends, because they say: "We do not intend to reduce the tariff all in one year." They realize, I think, that if they wiped out $160,000,000 of revenue they would be simply at sea—completely lost—they would find it impossible to replace that revenue from other sources. The other fields of taxation are pretty well occupied, and so they dare not tamper with the tariff

carelessly from the purely revenue standpoint. And so my hon. friends will find that in this Budget we are pretty well meeting the whole of this platform.

Now I wish to say a few words in connection with the Wheat Board. One criticism I have to make of the Wheat Board is that it is duplicating another board already in existence, namely the Grain Commission. I am not suggesting that in time of war it was not wise to appoint the Wheat Board, because under war conditions, under the exigencies of war, you are bound to do things which perhaps upon maturer thought in times of peace would not be done. The Wheat Board was appointed in war time. And now the war is over. The function of the Wheat Board is to market the wheat of Canada. I hold that it is an expensive luxury. I hold that if you are going to market wheat through governmental agencies, the Grain Commission can perform that function. If they are unable to do it—if the personnel of the Grain Commission is such that they do not understand the business of marketing this grain, then the commission might be enlarged for that purpose. But in connection with the Wheat Board I find a situation that might well occupy the attention of the Government. For instance, the secretary, Mr. Young, is receiving $6,000 a year from the board. He is receiving an additional salary from the Lake Shippers' Clearance Association of $10,000. He is a pretty well paid official. I do not think, Sir, that he can successfully serve both masters; I do not think he can give to the country that impartial service which such a commission, almost of a sacred character in its functions and duties if properly conceived, should give. Therefore I think the Government might well at a very early date consider the abolition of this board. It is a costly experiment and has served its purpose. The test is this: Did the Wheat Board lower the cost of marketing our wheat? I have gone into the case with considerable care, and I submit that it has not done so. I believe it was the intention of the Government that it should effect an economy in that direction. What are the facts? The bank interest and exchange in connection with wheat transactions is exactly the same as it used to be; insurance—marine and fire—and storage, are still there under the Wheat Board as under private operation; freight by land and by water is exactly the same. Now in regard to wheat that is sold direct to a country elevator, mark you, the Wheat Board has provided that there shall be a margin allowed of from five to ten cents a bushel. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that these figures convey to hon. members an adequate idea of the magnitude of this margin. I am told by those who understand the business and are familiar with its every angle that it means an average of between seven and eight cents a bushel on all the wheat that is handled in the West and, in fact, in the East too, I believe. That margin is allowed where wheat is bought by the country elevators, and it is an extraordinary allowance. And, let it be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Riddell, the deputy chairman of the board, is the manager of three hundred of those country elevators, and that other interests represented on that board have under their direction another four or five hunderd. That board provides that the elevator carrying wheat through shall be paid from a certain period allowed by the Act—I think 15 days, which is covered by the first charge—until the wheat reaches its destination at the head of the Lakes.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): Might I ask the hon. member a question? Do I understand him to say that the company handling the wheat is allowed storage charges until the wheat is landed at the head of the Lakes.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, Mr. Speaker; and I am absolutely accurate in my statement. I might just point out to my hon. friend from Mackenzie that very rarely will he give place to a member who desires to ask a question, and I trust that he will appreciate the fact that I, and other members, have granted that favour. I would inform him that whenever he chooses to ask me any questions he will always find me willing to give him the floor, and I would suggest to him that that is a little item in the ethics of this House which it is always desirable to observe.

My statement, I reiterate, is absolutely accurate, and for the benefit of my hon. friend I will repeat it: That this Wheat Board, composed of gentlemen who largely control the line elevators of the prairies to the number of 800 or a thousand, provides a special storage charge, which is calculated from, I think, the 15-day allowance in the original charge for handling until the wheat is landed at its point of destination at the head of the Lakes or at the mill, wherever it may be. And let me say this, Sir, that that storage, including the 8 cents a bushel I have referred to, has resulted in enormous earnings to these line elevators. My hon. friends talk about protect-

ing the interests of the farmers of the prairies. Why, Sir, they are to-day hoodwinking those farmers. The farmers of the prairies do not realize the extent to which they are paying for this Co-operative Association, but the time has about arrived when they should know the actual facts in dollars and cents.

Now, on consigned wheat, mark you, going direct to the Grain Board—a transaction in which no other persons are doing anything—that consigned wheat being shipped direct from the elevator to the Grain Board at the head of the Lakes, forsooth there comes in a one-cent brokerage charge, which goes to another party. Then we find that the brokers at Winnipeg are taken care of, they receive their fees just the same as if they were doing the business. We also find that the shippers and the exporters have their fees protected in the regulations of the Wheat Board—all at the expense of the farmer. I suppose my hon. friend will in a few minutes cite one of these items of $\frac{1}{32}$ of a cent a bushel as a small item. But when we add these $\frac{1}{32}$ and $\frac{1}{8}$ and 1 cent, and 2 cents and 8 cents, in the aggregate they soon mount to a very handsome sum; and then when we add to this 6 or 8 per cent which is deducted at the head of the Lakes and paid to the elevators of these gentlemen, the total amounts to a very considerable sum. Then they have provided for fees to the Lake Shippers' Clearance Association, of which forsooth this $6,000 and $10,000 secretary is an officer—one and the same individual—and is on this Wheat Board to see that the members of his association get their proper allowance. I do not say this in an unkind or critical spirit, but I suggest very seriously to the Government that it would be very desirable to have the audited statements and all other papers of the Wheat Board laid on the Table so that some of us, at any rate, might have an opportunity of examining them.

I find there is only one decrease—brokerage, reduced from $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent to $\frac{1}{32}$ of a cent a bushel. I want to be perfectly frank, that is the only decrease that has been secured by the Wheat Export Board over private operation.

Now, I want to point out that the need of this Wheat Board passed with the signing of the Armistice. It never did lower the cost of handling our wheat; on the contrary, it enhanced that cost. I hold that after the term of this Wheat Board expires next August the marketing of our wheat should be left to the ordinary course of trade. There is where I believe in the freedom of trade. And I would just like to pause a moment to give my hon. friend opposite a short dissertation on free trade.

The name free trade is an utter misnomer. Free trade started with the efforts of individuals centuries ago to get rid of embarrassing trade control. It was in the Hanseatic League and the free cities of Europe that freedom of trade first saw the light of day. The manufacturers, and shippers, and importers of those free cities found they were interfered with by the petty restrictions of feudal barons and despotic governments, and they started a movement for the freedom of trade. In the early part of last century that movement developed in Great Britain into an attempt to free trade from the embarrassing restrictions which then hampered it. And so with regard to the Wheat Export Board, I would say to the House and to the Government, I believe absolutely in freeing our wheat business from this control. I believe absolutely in the freeing of our wheat business from control at this time. It may be said that I am giving voice to the opinion of an amateur. I refer the House to a recent report of one of the members of the Imperial Government who stated to the British House that after the most careful thought and study it was believed that the control of foodstuffs, the control of the purchase of wheat, had increased the cost of living, had increased the cost of food, and had in no way contributed to the welfare of the people at large.

Now, a word or two of a general character. This is a time when we should look facts in the face. There is no use in blinding our eyes to the fact that we have an enormous public debt. I think I can give the House a few figures which are somewhat startling. I was pleased when the Minister of Finance stated frankly to the House that it was useless to follow the custom that had been followed by the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and by every other Finance Minister, that of giving the net debt. What we want to know is what our liabilities to the public are, and when we know that, we shall know what we are required to pay. As near as I can figure it from the statements which I have secured, we have a debt of $2,500,000,000. That is what we have to take care of. We may have assets in addition to those which I have deducted from the gross debt, but they are not convertible. In fact, Sir, to this figure ought to be added the circulation of the country, because, after all, the Do-

minion notes that we have in circulation are not available to pay or to be applied to the public debt. If we withdrew the Dominion notes from circulation, where would the business of the country go to? The Dominion notes we must keep in circulation; in other words, it is not an available asset. Therefore you ought to add another $125,000,000 or $130,000,000 counted as part of our public debt. But leaving that out, $2,500,000,000 is the debt that this country has to face.

But that is not all. I find that the provincial debts amount in the aggregate to $270,000,000. You may say that that does not concern us. But it does concern us, in this way: wherever we go for credit; wherever we look for taxes to pay our own debt, we are faced with Provincial Governments seeking the same thing for their debt. It is all one country, so what is the difference? So from the national viewpoint, and to look these problems in the face, we ought to add to our national debt the sum of $270,000,000, the total provincial debts. Then, I find that the net aggregate debt of twelve cities of Canada is $393,000,000. Wherever the Finance Minister goes for money he is faced with the fact that that enormous debt is being financed in New York, in Toronto, in Montreal, in other great financial centres. The point I am getting at is this: whether it is municipal, provincial or federal, this enormous debt is on the country and it must be faced.

Now, what we are called upon to do as a Parliament is to face this question and to devise ways and means of dealing with it. There are two problems before us, one the financing of the demands for the ensuing year; the other that of trying to provide finances for the future and to liquidate this enormous debt within a reasonable time. There is a school of finance, I know, which holds to the view that we should pay no attention to the debt; let it go on to posterity. That, I consider, would be an exceedingly unwise course to follow. For this reason: Canada is a growing country; its needs in the way of public works, in the way of expansion of facilities for handling trade and so on, will be enormous. As population increases trade increases, and the demand upon the exchequer increases accordingly. I hold that we will require to employ all the resources of this country to keep pace with the great development which, we are confident, will be our lot in the near future. So I say that we should make every effort to meet this accruing bonded indebtedness as from year to year it becomes due. That means that within a few years we should pay off about $300,000,000. An effort should be made to provide a fund out of which this money can be paid.

I have a suggestion to offer. It has been discouraged and rejected by some to whom I have talked about it; by others it has been approved. I know that it is easy, Sir, to talk; it is easy to suggest and sometimes very difficult to carry out. But during recent years an expression very commonly used is that our national debt must be taken care of out of our natural resources. In the abstract, Sir, that is perfectly true; it is a statement with which we can all agree. But it is of utterly no value unless some concrete and definite method of extracting that wealth from the natural resources is advanced. It is just as useless to point out that the coal in the ground is of certain value; in fact, it is of no value until capital is applied to it and it is extracted from the ground and put upon the market. So it is with our minerals; so it is with our oil, our fisheries, our forests. But throughout this country we have immense natural resources which are undeveloped. A man is supposed to be somewhat of a fool who will venture a prophecy to-day, but I will venture the opinion that in the next ten years Canada will see greater development of its natural resources than it has witnessed in the past fifty years. Now, what should we do? I hold, Sir, that we, this Parliament, the Government, are saddled with a grave responsibility in that we must see to it that out of these resources a fair share of any profit made goes to the State exchequer. Mr. Speaker, in making that statement I have not gone far enough; I have still left unsettled the modus operandi. I have a further suggestion to make,—not dogmatically, not as a final thing, simply as a contribution of thought, and if others have contributions to make I think that during the course of this debate would be a very suitable time to make them. I suggest that all concerned holding the privilege or operating directly on the public domain, such as those engaged in lumbering, fishing, mining, oil operations, electrical water power development, and so on, should be taxed a portion of their surplus earnings. My hon. friend behind me suggests that I am leaving the farmers out. I am speaking, Sir, of large operations. I am not rough on the farmer; I do not include his personal operation. I refer only to large operations which involve a direct application of capital to the public domain

and its development. Where profit is made; where large earnings accrue, I hold that all above a reasonable sum should be divided with the Government.

That is not a new suggestion; it is embodied in the business profits tax. But an objection suggests itself. It is stated that if you take away the profit of those engaged in these operations, there is no inducement for them to go on; you prevent the company from expanding and applying its earnings to the extension of its plant. That is perfectly sound, and I meet that objection by saying that where you assess say forty per cent of surplus earnings of a given corporation, that amount shall remain in the company, if they so choose, and be capitalized, and upon that capital surplus the company shall pay a dividend to the State. This will perhaps not bring immediately a large revenue; but, in time, it will bring to Canada a large revenue, and where large profits are made, such as those which have been made by the nickel companies and by some of the steel, coal, iron and other companies, the State will get a share.

Another thought is this. In that great hinterland to the north of Edmonton in Northern Alberta, we are told upon the very best geological advice, we have oil fields equal to anything on this continent. If that be the case, the Government would be well advised to enter into partnership with any companies that may open up that country and engage in extracting from the ground the immense wealth contained in those oil fields. If oil be there, as our geologists say, in a few years immense fortunes will be made, and the State should share in those fortunes. There are other classes of business that I think Parliament might well consider as a legitimate field of operation. For instance, all concerns holding a special and exclusive franchise from the State, such as banks, insurance companies and so forth. These concerns have, in a sense, a monopoly; they have in a sense exclusive control over their particular field of operations, and at the same time they are of a quasi-public character. In so far as they earn surplus profits, the State should share in those profits. I am not going to pursue that thought any further; I simply make the suggestion that before the House at this time there is a dual duty; the first duty is to provide for this year; the second duty is to look into the future and to seek to provide a permanent source of income.

I conclude by again appealing to my hon. friends opposite and to hon. members forming the new group at this end of the Chamber, that if they vote for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), they shut out absolutely the taxation propcsals for the coming year and in their place the only thing they offer to the country is an old, bare bone, a sort of pious wish that the customs tariff might be reduced. At a time when we must have funds, not only do they stop us from getting the funds we are reaching out for, but at the same time, they reduce the existing revenue. I cannot conceive that this amendment has been seriously proposed; I cannot consider that an hon. gentleman of the experience of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's and other hon. gentlemen around him can possibly seriously propose or think that this amendment should carry. It should be defeated; it should never go to a vote in this House, because if the thing is serious at all, it has not the hall-mark of commonsense upon it.

Mr. L. J. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville): Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to have the honour of replying to the speech to which we have just listened, and which has been kept to the height of the high plane which this debate has maintained since its commencement. I will do my utmost not to lower that plane, and although I may differ from hon. gentlemen on the other side, I wish my remarks to be taken as they are offered, and in the same spirit which animates me in making them.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Stevens) has divided his remarks into three parts, one of which was a lecture that he thought it his duty to give to the Farmers' group. It is not my intention to interfere in that regard; I will let the representatives of the Farmers' group settle their differences with the hon. gentleman. But may I be permitted to state that I was amazed to hear the hon. gentleman stating that the United Farmers were profiteers, and that their association was, in the question of overages, committing an illegal act. If this be true, how is it that the Government supported by my hon. friend allows the United Farmers to be profiteers without taking them to task? And how is it that these United Farmers committing illegalities are permitted to continue committing illegalities and that the Government, which is responsible for those illegalities, still has the support of my hon.

9 p.m.

friend? His position in this regard is not logical.

My hon. friend has taken a great deal of pains to show to the House and to the country that there was a contradiction between the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). Any man belonging to a party and speaking in his individual name has a right to give his individual opinion; but if he belongs to a party and if he wishes to remain in that party, he must adhere to the platform of that party. The Liberal party held a convention in August of last year; they propounded their policy, and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's and the hon. member for Brome, when they speak for the Liberal party, must adhere to that party's platform as propounded at that convention. But it is strange to me that my hon. friends would go to such pains to find contradictions in the policy propounded by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, when he himself declared to the House and to the country that he is going to support this Government which has no policy at all. What is the policy of the Government? Last year they promised the House and the country that there would be a general investigation into the affairs of the country and that revision of the tariff would take place. The hon. gentleman replies by saying: It is very fortunate for this country that this investigation was not held, because in the month of January the affairs of the world were more unstable than they ever were before. But he adds that he is glad to see that actually the situation in world affairs is now on a sounder basis. This is a poor answer. The pledge was given by the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) during the first session of last year, and if the investigation had been carried on according to that promise, there would have been no necessity for the Government to do anything at the present session—at a time when, in the judgment of my hon. friend, the affairs of the world are in a better condition—other than to bring down legislation based on that investigation. But if the Government have had no policy—and the proof that they have no policy is that the ex-Minister of Finance promised last year that an investigation would be held and that a revision of the tariff would take place—in what situation are we this year? We are in actually the same situation. The new Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) says to the House: We are going to hold an investigation. Why? Because every one admits that there is a feeling of unrest in this country as in the rest of the world; that something must be done. If my hon. friend is as pious and good as he wants us to be, I wonder why he supports a Government which, with their policy, have been unable to cure the unrest or to foster the best interests of this country? They have a policy of doing nothing; they have a policy of promising investigations, and all the while the unrest keeps on growing and growing every year. That is not extraordinary. Do you believe, Sir, that business men are going to put their money into undertakings when they do not know what the policy of this Government will be? If you wish to have stability in this country, you must give to the trade, to the industries of Canada the assurance that they will not be disturbed. Otherwise they will stand back and wait, and when they wait the workingmen of this country are suffering more and more every day under the high cost of living; the people are suffering by reason of the taxation which is being imposed upon them and which is increasing year by year, and the capitalists of the country are afraid of the Government because they realize that although the Government are making a great cry that they have the confidence of the people, they have not that confidence as a matter of fact, and furthermore they do not deserve to have it, as I shall try to prove in the course of my remarks.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Stevens) says that the Wheat Board ought to be abolished because it was created as a war measure. Well, Sir, if that argument can be properly applied to the Wheat Board it is eminently more fitting to apply to the Government. They were elected to win the war and they pretend that they won the war, but after having won it they cannot restore peace in this country; and I really believe that as the Wheat Board ought to be abolished, so too should the Government be put out of existence, or at least, they should have a renewal of their mandate only if the people are willing to renew it. I believe that one fact that will not be disputed by any thinking person is this, that confidence is one of the basic essentials of human life; if you want to succeed you must have confidence in yourself, you must have confidence in your associates. But confidence, to be worth anything, must be reciprocal in character. And when I hear ministers saying that they trust the people, that have confidence in the people, I know but too well that they cannot add that they know that the people have confidence in them.

What have this Government done to win the confidence of the people? What have they done in their legislation, in their administration, and in the official declarations of the ministers of the Crown, and of their partisans? I believe that on this question of confidence we can derive some good lessons from the late war. The Allies won the war because there was mutual confidence between the commanding officer and the common soldier, and this confidence, mutual and reciprocal, created a unity of action. So long as we were not united in action, so long as unity had not been secured by any confidence of the Allies in one another, we must admit, our cause met with no great successes. Sir, this war has been marvellous from more than one standpoint. There is not a man, there is not an army corps, there is not a country that can rightly boast that the winning of the war was due to any single individual or nation. It was due to the concerted action of all of the Allies. The Allies were so united that they secured unity of action, which came from the confidence they had in one another. If I were permitted, I could give a few examples to show what confidence did in the late war. When at the Battle of Mons the small "contemptible army" of Great Britain, as it was named by the German war lords, sustained the orders and carried the fight in that murderous and atrocious retreat, every one admitted that that army was composed of heroes. But there are other examples. These British soldiers, having the fullest confidence in their commanding officers, remained at their posts because they knew that their officers would not permit a single sacrifice that was not necessary for the glory of the British arms. Take the example of the Argonne. When the Germans decided to crush Verdun, with the hope that the defeat of Verdun would mean the defeat of France before Great Britain could put forth all her effort to help France and before the United States could come to the rescue, what saved the situation? When the forts of Douaimont and Vaux were crumbling under the raging fire of the German artillery the French soldiers offered themselves as a living barrier to stem the wave of the German army, and they won the day because they had confidence in their commanding officers. It is the same in every phase of life. Now that the war is over every country must look to its own salvation, and it is the duty of a government to come to the rescue and save the situation. What has this Government done in legislation and in administration, and what are the official declarations of its ministers?

Mr. McMASTER: They forbade bees to eat sugar.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Every nation of the world is now seriously grappling with the problems which have been created by the war. Everybody knows I am not supporting the Government, but although I am opposing them I will not charge them with every possible crime, I want to give them credit whenever they deserve it. I am not going to charge them with being responsible, as some say they are, for the inflation of the Canadian currency. The problem of the present hour is the question of inflation. Some economists claim that inflation of currency has created the high cost of living. I believe with the Rt. Hon. Reginald McKenna and Professor Nicholson, of Edinburgh university, that instead of the high cost of living being the result of the inflation of currency inflation of currency is the cause of the high cost of living. This Government has done, on the question of the inflation of currency, as Governments have done all over the world.

After war was declared, and when, during forty-two months, 20,000,000 people were called to the colours, the rest of the world had to produce the food for these 20,000,000 men and the population back of the battle front. The men who responded to the call were the flower of the world's manhood. During the long period of peace the world had accumulated an enormous reserve of goods of all kinds. When the soldiers went to the front they ceased to produce and they consumed ten, fifteen, or twenty times more than they were producing when they were at their work. We had to replace them by old men, young men, and women, all of whom have done their duty, but there was a loss of raw material, there was a loss of time, there was a higher cost of production. There was a higher cost of production also because the purchasing agents of Europe were coming to this country and buying at any price at all all kinds of goods that we could supply. All that we could produce was bought in advance at higher and higher prices. The consumer at home had to pay these new prices. Inflation of the cost of living brought about inflation of wages. The working men could not live on the wages they were earning before the war and wage scales had to be readjusted.

In the face of the enhancement of prices for foodstuffs, in the face of the higher cost of all commodities the governments of all countries had to have recourse to the inflation of currency, and instead of remaining on a sound gold basis they have had to issue what is called by the economists irredeemable currency. It has been issued to an immense amount. People are talking of inflation of currency and I believe it would be nothing but right if I should insert in Hansard the figures that have been quoted in the London Statist showing that up to the 31st December, 1919, the countries of the world had, in round figures, issued paper money to the amount of £2,000,000,000 more than the gold reserves that they had accumulated.

It goes without saying that we are on an unsound financial basis but we have had to do it; we have done it; and now that the war is over it is the duty of this Government to pass legislation first of all to lower the cost of living.

Who are responsible for the high cost of living? The profiteers. What kind of legislation did this Government enact against profiteering? The hon. gentlemen were very fond of issuing Orders in Council to replace the laws passed by Parliament, but where is the Order in Council that they have passed compelling cold storage warehouses to be opened and the produce that has accumulated there given away at a fair price to the consumers of this country? There is none, Sir. But that, I say, is legislation which a Gov rnment like this one should enact. They should pass laws to compel the profiteers to cease trade practices which have added to the miseries and sufferings of the whole population of Canada.

When we talk about profiteers the hon. gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches do not even listen. They do not want to do anything against the profiteers, they have done nothing and will do nothing. They will not tackle the profiteers but they will go on piling the burden of taxation heavier and heavier upon the shoulders of the poor consumer in this country. One tax after another has been imposed but the profiteer is allowed to keep on at his nefarious trade. He can go along as he pleases; he should not be bothered by this Government! The common people, who do not want to be anything but good citizens, will carry the burden of heavier and still heavier taxation. The policy of the Government has been inadequate to deal with the unrest that is prevailing in this country. If their policy has been ineffective and inefficient it should be changed. But the Government do not want to change it. They say: "We are going to remain as we are and we will appoint a commission to investigate." The Opposition say to the Government: "You promised that an investigation would take place last fall; you did not carry out that promise, that pledge, and now that you have promised a new investigation, while that investigation is going on, you should reduce the cost of living by reducing the tariff." But, they will not accept that. They are determined to keep what they have. They do not want to tackle the profiteers; they do not want to help the consumers. They were elected to win the war; they won the war; but they keep power which they got under the pretence of winning the war and they still hold to their seats in the hope that something will happen and that the situation will take care of itself. The Government is in a position to enact legislation to help the suffering classes of this community but it does nothing and it is not doing its duty when it neglects to bring in this legislation.

When talking of profiteers I want to make myself understood. I admit that governments that have been at war for forty-two months that have exhausted their reserves and that have engaged their credit for fifty, sixty or a hundred years to come, must take means to reduce their debt. I admit that they must take the means to reduce their taxes and to keep their industries going. And are the governments of other countries—whether it be the government of Great Britain or the government of United States—to be classed as profiteers because they have taken control of all the hides, all the wool and all the cotton that was in sight? They have done this to stimulate production so that by selling their manufactured products they might at the same time provide work for their working people and write off a part of their debt. But the profiteers I condemn are the individual profiteers who, under the pretext of doing something good for the country, are piling up money, and, as the hon. gentleman who immediately preceded me stated, are able—after having taken care of all the needs of their business—to sell on credit, four, five and even six million dollars' worth of agricultural implements that are not paid for until five or six years have elapsed. These are the profiteers that the Government should get after. These are

the profiteers that should be called to account.

If we look at the administration of public affairs by this Government what do we find. Take for instance the Canadian National Railway system. There is an undertaking in which immense amounts of money have been sunk and the operations of the past year have resulted in a deficit of $47,000,000. I say, Sir, that it is an injustice to charge that deficit to the whole of the community. If this deficit of $47,000,000 were divided among the population of Canada it would mean a charge upon every man, woman and child in the country of $5.25 or thereabouts. Look at the charge which will be imposed upon the riding which I have the honour to represent, a county with a population of forty thousand, but which gets no service from the Canadian National Railway system. In considering the matter from the viewpoint of the interests of one's constituency one may be accused of egotism; but I claim that to place the defict upon the country at large is not only an injustice to the community but is an injustice to a rival company, the Canadian Pacific. On this matter I speak with perfect freedom; I hold no brief for the Canadian Pacific; it is a company which can take care of itself; I do not own a share of stock in that company. But I ask, is it fair to them or to the people at large that this deficit of $47,000,000 on the operations of the Canadian National Railway system should be charged to the whole Canadian community? What does that deficit mean? We have been told time and time again that the Government were securing the best men available to place at the head of the management of this railway system. We are therefore forced to this conclusion: If with such "best management," and with the existing rates, the operation of the Canadian National Railway system has resulted in a deficit of $47,000,000, how can it be expected that the Canadian Pacific, which can have no better management or no higher rates than the Government system, can keep on maintaining and developing its system on the basis of the existing rates? What will be the result if such a policy is pursued? The result will be the ruin of the Canadian Pacific. Here is a company which during the war was more successfully operated than any railway on this continent. When the Government of the United States took over the railway lines in that country they could not afford to maintain the efficiency of those roads or to properly equip them on the existing rates, and they increased both the freight and passenger rates to the amount of $750,000,000 per year. Nevertheless there were deficits to the amount of $850,000,000 per annum; and when the Government restored those railways to their owners they gave them a bonus of $500,000,000 to compensate them for the deficiencies in the maintenance and for the equipment which should have been, but had not been, purchased during the period of government operation. Now, Sir, during all this crisis the Canadian Pacific was able to maintain its standard, to keep its equipment up to date and continue the high character of its service. Its service did not, during that trying period, fall back but rather went ahead. Yet, the Government of this country, in order not to offend a certain portion of the electorate, are going to throw the burden of the deficit accumulated by the Canadian National railways on the people as a whole. What will the Government intend to do with the other company? Is it their intention to ruin the best managed railway there is in the world? Will the Government compel the Canadian Pacific to operate their system on the basis of rates which resulted in a deficit of $47,000,000 for the Canadian National railways? Surely such a deficit is proof that the rates are not what they should be. If the rates are not adequate for the Government railways we must conclude they are not adequate for the Canadian Pacific. But here is the difference between the two systems: If the operation of the Canadian Pacific results in a deficit it cannot charge the burden upon the community as a whole, but that is what the Government propose doing in the case of the Canadian National railways. I say that this is an injustice. It means the beginning of the ruin of the Canadian Pacific, and such a policy ought not to be tolerated after all the company has done for the development and expansion of Canada. True, the country has been good to the Canadian Pacific, but the Canadian Pacific has also been good to Canada, and it is a matter of pride for this country to have such an efficient railway corporation within its borders. If the Government persist in their policy the company which has given this country a first class service —in fact no other system could do better— will be compelled to operate its lines at a disadvantage owing to governmental mismanagement.

Now I wish to join issue in a certain matter with the Minister of Finance. The disease, characterized as "inflation," has been applied to the high cost of living, to

wages, to currency and to credit; but really the minister himself has exhibited the worst symptoms of that disease because he has given to the House and to the country in an official statement which can be found on page 2557 of unrevised edition of Hansard, what I would designate as the inflation of the gold reserve. I understood that wages could be inflated, that paper could be inflated, that credit could be inflated; but I never thought before that the gold reserve of Canada could be inflated.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Who said it was?

Mr. GAUTHIER: The Minister of Finance.

An hon. MEMBER: Where is he?

Mr. GAUTHIER: I do not know. What brought this to my attention, Sir, was a statement on the financial page of the Montreal Gazette of Monday last, where it was shown that the gold holdings of Canada were in the proportion of approximately 32 per cent of its currency. The next day I was amazed to hear the Minister of Finance state to the House and to the country that our gold reserve was 43 per cent. I have much confidence in the Minister of Finance —and I have much confidence in the Montreal Gazette. That journal to my mind could not have printed that statement without the knowledge, officially or officiously, of the Government. I look again at the public documents, and here is what I find as stated by the Minister of Finance: That our Dominion note currency on the 31st of March, 1920, was $311,932,791; our gold holdings at the same date were $100,286,280. Therefore, according to his own figures, our gold holdings would be approximately as the Gazette states, 32 per cent. But by what operation did the Minister of Finance put the figure at 43 per cent? He calculated the gold reserve of the banks with the gold holdings in the central gold reserves. But, first of all, from the total circulation of the paper money of the Dominion and of the banks he had taken off $97,700,000, the statement reading, "Less Dominion notes held in Central Gold Reserves, $97,700,000." I admit, Sir, that according to financiers our gold reserve should be at least 40 per cent. But when we take in the whole issue of our paper currency, we must balance it with the total gold reserves held by the Government, and nothing else. Why should the Government compute the gold held by the banks as security for their own note issue so as to depreciate the difference between their circulation and their gold holdings? Furthermore, why should the Government be allowed to take out of its note issue $97,700,000 of paper money and deposit it in the Central Gold Reserves?

Well, Sir, if such a statement as that can be published broadcast by the Minister of Finance, I say that the Government do not trust the people. Why do they not state our financial position frankly? At the time of the war there was no secret made of it; every one knew what was the situation. Every time the Government appealed to the people, whether to secure men, whether to secure credit, or whether to secure endorsement of certain legislation, they got everything they asked for. The Government had received a mandate to win the war, and in execution of that mandate they could ask for anything they wanted, and they were sure to get it, for the people had confidence in them. Why not proceed in the same manner to-day and tell the people frankly what is our position? Every one knows that we have an inflated currency; every one knows that it will have to be deflated; and before assuming the heavy burden of taxation that the Government intend to put on the shoulders of the people the situation should be frankly stated to the country. And it is not good management on the part of the present Administration to curtail the gold deposits of our banks in an attempt to show that our inflated currency is less inflated than it really is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take up so much time, and I will conclude with these few words. I would say to the Government: Stop the profiteers and you will strike at the root of the high cost of living; there is no other way. You cannot instantly deflate your currency because it would mean ruin to the country; but strike at the very root of the evil and you will cure the unrest which that evil engenders. I say again: Reduce the tariff and you will help to reduce the cost of living. The policy followed by this Administration has had the result of creating an unrest which continues to grow every day and every week, and this policy is proved by its results to be wrong. Change it; reduce the tariff, and you will reduce the cost of living. Be prepared to recall your inflated currency according to a gradual and progressive method and come back as soon as you can to a sound gold basis. Trust the people, lead them wisely and firmly; enact legislation which will appeal to them; give to this country that management of national affairs which will appeal to the electors, and you will regain their confidence. It is the bounden duty of

the Government to secure peace, and to command the confidence of the people, and this you cannot do if you continue your present policy of legislation and administration and of making official declarations which at sight do not correspond with the official figures that are given to the country.

Mr. JOHN H. BURNHAM (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, in speaking well of the Budget I should like also, before going on, to refer in as complimentary a way as possible to the speech of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) and that of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens). The member for St. Hyacinthe, on rising, expressed a desire to maintain the high plane reached by the member for Vancouver. I can assure him that before he sat down he had reached that high plane; he furnished us with as much argument as any man possibly could furnish hostile to this admirable Budget.

It must be remembered, in criticizing this Government for having no policy, that their policy for years has been that of war, and on the return of peace it was necessary for them to formulate a peace policy. This peace policy has been formulated and announced in the Budget, and it is the most admirable combination of protection and free trade that a man could possibly wish for. I do not think that any Budget that was ever announced in the Parliament of Canada has secured the commendation and praise from the people of Canada that this one has. Everybody was curious to know how in the face of the universal high cost of living and general taxation the Minister of Finance would secure the necessary revenue through taxes to carry on; but he has surprised us all, not only by securing the necessary taxes, but by doing it in such an easy, offhand manner that it is doubtful if it will be felt at all by the people. No more skilful handling of finances could, in my humble judgment, possibly be imagined, and every praise should be accorded to the minister for his most admirable work.

The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville has told us that there is serious unrest in the country. He did not compare Canada with other countries; if he had done so he would have seen, and we all would have seen, that the unrest in Canada was as nothing in comparison with the unrest in other countries, Britain and the United States included. If we had had in proportion to population the fatal clashes between the people and the military that have occurred in the United States, there would have been calls and cries for special sessions and the very winds of Heaven would have been called to the aid of the Opposition, as has so frequently been the case in their denunciation of this Government. But in Canada there has been nothing worthy of the name, except, perhaps, a little centre of disturbance here and there. The unrest in this country is a minimum; certainly a minimum in comparison with the unrest in other countries. In all fairness, due allowance should be made for that, and observations and criticism should be tempered accordingly.

This Budget has the honour of giving birth to the newest and biggest party that ever arose in Canada, the People's party of Canada. We have the Liberal party, the Progressive party and the People's party. We do not wish in future that there should occur in the councils of Canada what has occurred in the legislature of Ontario, where a party 245,000 votes in the minority undertake to govern the province. The Liberal party are proud of their old record, and well they might be. The Liberal party, successor to the Whig party, was founded upon freedom and it has more or less maintained that tradition to the present day. It is the one great merit of the Liberal party that it stands for more or less of the great principles of freedom. But it has received a serious set-back. It has been divided, and out of its rib has been created the Farmers' party of Canada. At the next election the contest will be between the People's party and the Farmers' party. I appeal to the Liberals of Canada to join the People's party of Canada——

Mr. LAPOINTE: Nothing doing.

Mr. BURNHAM: —join the People's party of Canada in withstanding the assault of any class upon the centre of government.

Mr. BUREAU: You assume the paternity of that party?

Mr. BURNHAM: If I do, the hon. gentleman will assume the maternity of it. He comes nearer to being an old woman than anybody I know.

Mr. BUREAU: The only thing Parliament cannot do—change a man into a woman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BURNHAM: The high cost of living in Canada does not compare with the high cost of living in the United States. All the reciprocity and all the throwing open of the doors of the tariff would make

no difference in that particular in favour of the United States. Articles in the United States have been vastly more expensive than corresponding articles in Canada. Let me direct the attention of the Farmers' party to a very singular thing. I do not propose to repeat any of the arguments so admirably made heretofore on either side, but in connection with the United States free list there is something well worthy of notice, and that is that on the list there are seven manufactured articles and twenty-one farm articles, that is, twenty-one articles of natural produce and only seven manufactured articles. Now, if we reverse that we will have seven farm articles and a corresponding number of manufactured articles on the free list in Canada, and we will let loose the whole world on the farming population of Canada. Manifestly that would be unfair, unreasonable and illogical. However, if the Farmers' party think not so, they will in the course of time, no doubt, explain that. But we have agricultural implements, barbed fence wire, leather belting, cement, leather of all kinds, sewing machines, twine—free on the American list. We have anthracite coal, bacon, beef, beans, bituminous coal, broom corn, buckwheat, copper, flax, flour and grain seed, hides of cattle, natural iron products, raw materials of all kinds, mutton, pork, potash, potatoes, pulpwood, rye, swine, tea and veal,—all free on the United States list. So that the American idea has been to make natural products free, but not to make manufactured products free. This must be borne in mind when we appeal to the United States free list. It seems to me that if some hon. gentlemen in the Farmers' party had proposed a resolution something like this, it would have gone a long way to meet the case. Of course, it is contrary to the rules and therefore could not be done, but if we assume that such a thing might have been done, it will serve the purposes of this discussion.

The Farmers' party and all free traders assert that taxation falls in the last analysis upon the land. Is that not so? The Farmers' party looking me squarely in the face do not deny that. We all admit that; it is an economic and natural law. They have criticised protection in the past because whilst an indirect method of collecting taxes, it was very expensive. Therefore, let the Farmers' party get up if they like and propose that all taxation should in the first instance fall upon the land. Let them say that:

Whereas, it is an economic law of taxation that taxation will fall ultimately upon that class of property which is unable to shift the burden elsewhere; and

Whereas, that class of property is natural property, the resources of the country, such as land, minerals, water-powers and so forth; and

Whereas, it is now desirable that this form of taxation should be levied, and—

To which proposition I would agree, but to which they would not.

Whereas, it is also desirable that employment should be secured to people developing their own country;

Therefore, be it resolved that all taxes be placed upon natural property in the first instance, and that other means should be taken as will secure employment to the people.

If these hon. gentlemen will follow out that suggestion practically, let them crystallize into an argument those things which they maintain, namely, that taxation falls in the last, and in the first instance as well, upon the land; let them propose that to the House and to the country and see what the country thinks of it, and above all, let them see what the farmer thinks of it. It may be an economic law, but it will never commend itself to the farmers of this country. But these gentlemen—and I say this with all due respect—dare not follow out logically the theories which they defend, the suggestions which they make from time to time. Those theories are too hazardous, they are unfair, they will not work out equitably; and while they do very well as basic theories to announce, they are wholly impracticable and unwise. I would, therefore, appeal to the Farmers' party not to oppose the People's party, but to join with us with one accord in universal political harmony and secure the best possible government for this country. There is going to be a great deal of strife. The unrest that has existed heretofore is going to be as nothing in comparison with the unrest in the future; and as a patriotic Canadian speaking to patriotic Canadians, I implore you all not to divide yourselves up further, not to promote further strife, but to join in one great party in going to the country for an expression of the opinions of the people. I agree with the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville. If I were this Government I would print, at the public expense, this whole debate and send it to the people and let the people see what the Government side and the Opposition side, both Liberals and Farmers, think of the matter. Then I would go to the country, and I would ask the people to return members accordingly and see what they would do. Unquestionably, I would do that now, for the very simple reason that we owe that

to the country. Here is a new and a great policy and a great party that has discarded for the nonce its old partisan name in order that it may embrace all forms of thought, in order that it may offend no one, but in order that it may secure, without any invidiousness, the support of every man who thinks well of the proposition laid before him. I do not think the Opposition would oppose that; I think the Opposition would agree that this debate might very well be printed at the public expense and scattered broadcast amongst the people. This is not a campaign document; it is a general expression of the thought of this House, and I think the people are entitled to know what we think, not simply through the medium of partisan speeches sent here and there or through the medium of partisan newspapers, but through the general official note which is taken by independent people for the benefit of the record, and from which the people themselves could get an accurate and proper idea. Then, I say, I would go to the country, and if the people want to return a lot of groups, so as to repeat what happened in Ontario,—and a group might be 500,000 votes short and yet presume to govern the country—if that is what they want, let them have it; but I doubt very much if the people will continue to endorse any such system.

10 p.m.

I should like to call the attention of the free traders in this House, if there are any, to what is said by the Women's Journal,—and let me tell the House that the women are going to cut some figure in the next election.

Mr. McMASTER: They always have.

Mr. BURNHAM: They have not so far been referred to in the debate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMaster) is hastening to interpose in this particular, but he has taken great care not to mention them hitherto, and no one else on his side has done so. As a humble individual I shall be the spokesman of the women in this debate. With their feminine subtlety they refer to one or two points, and I hope due note will be taken of them. The Woman's Century is the official organ of the Women's Council of Canada. The chief patronesses are Her Excellency and the wives of the Lieutenant Governors throughout Canada. The directorate itself is very large and general, and it is hardly necessary to state that this is the chief, indeed, the only really great official organ of the women of Canada. In the editorial comment of the issue of April, 1920, this is said:

What is probably one of the bitterest party fights in Canadian political history is now on, to last till its climax at the next Dominion election. On one side the farmers, with their money and brains, have perfected their party machine, which their opponents say is a giant plough, intended to plough up Canadian cities, and presumably sow the sites with salt, as the Romans did once to Jerusalem. In other words, the farmers are furious at the "trough feeding" of the Canadian manufacturers under the present policy of protection, and they intend to do away with the tariff "on all agricultural implements, fertilizers, coal, lumber, cement, lubricating oils, etc." However, they have not the least objection to the "trough fed," highly protected manufacturers of the States. Soothingly they tell the cities that the States must "soon become a food importing country," and if we only have free trade with her, look at the cheap food you will get, etc. They omit to say, however, that food prices are higher in New York than Ontario. It is a pity. There are so many good things in the Farmers' platform that many of us will have to vote against, because we cannot see the sense in hitting the Canadian "trust" and patronizing the American one.

To my mind, that appears to be a very sensible comment, and I would recommend it to the consideration of the Farmers' party.

I should like, lest I forget it, to refer now to something which one would think that nobody could forget, and that is the return that is due to our soldiers. I do not propose to repeat anything of what has gone before, but the great general, Sir Arthur Currie, said recently that the best memorial that Canada could raise to her fallen heroes was the care that she would take of the soldiers' dependents, of the widows and orphans of the dead. I think that this should be borne in upon the Government, that whatever sacrifice has to be made should be made, and that no dependent of any soldier, certainly no dependent of any dead soldier, should be allowed to go for one moment in want. We must see to it that no such case is permitted, and I am quite sure that neither the Government nor the Pensions Committee, nor any of those bodies having to do with the soldiers will forget what General Currie has said.

Now, so long as people insist upon conducting trade on the theory of profit, just so long will one man try to grab from another as much as he can get; and just so long will quarrel and strife continue in the world and hope of equilibrium in domestic affairs fade away. It is utterly and absolutely impossible to expect a system of trade and commerce, domestic and foreign, conducted on the principle of highway robbery ever to produce good results. There is no denying the fact that profit is the taking of that for which no return has been

given. But few propose to give it up; and until such time as it is given up, in my humble opinion we are only crying peace, peace, when there is no hope of peace. The legacy left by the late war was the unfortunate one that in the last analysis force must and will prevail. Before the war people were inclined to think that the general cultivation of civilization, and the propagation of the doctrines of Christianity would have their ultimate effect. But when they saw the world drifting towards the great cataclysm which it ultimately reached, they said: "The rough-and-ready means for us is force. We will cultivate the civilization theory on the side as a by-product, an amusement, or entertainment or something of that description; but force is what appeals to us." Thereupon there arose a body in this country, as in the United States, founded upon the principle of force; and The Pioneer, which is the great organ of the force party in Canada, admits in its issue of May 7 that the day of individual liberty has gone. It says that it is not the assertion of individual rights, but the subordination of these to the rights of others, that represents the community of interests and the higher social untiy. Hitherto, wherever sacrifice was made it was made by the individual. It was pointed out to him what a noble thing it was for him to sacrifice for another. But since he did not observe that doctrine with the alacrity which some people desired, they reached out and seized him by the hair of his head and dragged him out of his boots, and sent the policeman, the detective and the informer after him, saying: "Since you will not voluntarily give up your individual liberty we will make you do so." And this is the foundation of the alarm and unrest which exists in Canada. It is the foundation also —and I say it most respectfully—of the Farmers' movement; because since they see that the great area of debate no longer presents to them the most easy and effectual means of attaining their ends they have imitated the prohibitionists and propose to take what before they could not get. This is the theory upon which Canada and the Western world are now moving, and it is of course a most serious one and one that will produce serious results. Before the war, the Eastern world, Great Britain included, took its theology from Germany, and though Germany was beaten, a great many people have continued to emulate the German idea of force. We have not gone back to where we were before; we have gone forward into the age of force. Faith has disappeared. All the ordinary indirect means which have been used heretofore from the foundation of the world, and the great principles exemplified in the sacrifice of Christ himself, have been discarded in order that people may be made to do what hitherto they would not be persuaded to do. A people which founds its civilization upon unfair profit, which is robbery, and upon force, can expect no good result, and we may rest assured that they will attain no good results.

In conclusion, let me say once more that I value Canada far and above all party, and though it may sound invidious, nevertheless I say, as a man who has been always a strong protectionist, and a strong Conservative, I am willing to give up that honoured name and join the Peoples' party, and let the Opposition, both Farmers and Liberals, give up something too, and let us all join the Peoples' party.

An hon. MEMBER: Then there would be no opposition.

Mr. BURNHAM: Let us join together not as Unionists, not as Conservatives, not as Liberals, not as Farmers, but as the Peoples' party, and when the representatives are sent back they will come here as the people's representatives. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that it is to the honour of the Minister of Finance that he has not only given birth to the greatest Budget ever presented in Canada but he has given birth to the greatest idea that was ever conceived in this country. And I am quite sure that not only has he rescued the financial situation, but that he has saved the national and social situation as well.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I desire first of all to tender my congratulations to the Minister of Finance for the clear exposition which he gave in his Budget Speech. It was exceedingly satisfactory to have the position of the Government clearly placed before us, whether we agree with it or not. The minister is also to be commended, I think, for his clear realization of the great need that exists for raising more revenue. The Right Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) accuses the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) of having "afterthoughts" with regard to this need. One would suppose from his remarks in that respect that there had been no forethought shown by the members of the Opposition, while a reading of Hansard would

show clearly that during the whole period of the war we urged over and over again the need of raising more revenue as we went along.

I urged that need as strongly as I was able and my remarks will be found in Hansard of May, 1917, page 978. I found fault with the Government for not raising more money as they went along and suggested that after the war it would be necessary to raise $150,000,000 yearly to provide for pensions and interest on war debt alone. My suggestion was laughed at on that occasion as extravagant, but it turns out that I am considerably under the mark.

The minister is also to be commended for providing that a portion of his additional taxes shall be levied upon luxuries. We have heard the cry about the high cost of living and the cost of high living. This tax may not reduce the cost of high living but it is to be hoped it will act as a check on high living. We have waited a long time for this Budget, some of us patiently and some impatiently. The period of incubation has been unusually long, but that long period has not altered the nature of the chicken. It is still a pure bread protectionist. The Government may have provided the incubator, but it is easy to know the maternal ancestor from the appearance of the chicken. It is much like the other chicks raised from Canadian Manufacturers' Association eggs. It does not grant any relief from the burdens of protection. It does not take anything from the favours enjoyed by the manufacturers at the expense of the consumers. It was suggested by many that we were to have a real excise tax in this Budget which would to a certain extent reduce the favours to the protected interests. It was suggested that an excise tax might be placed on all articles of home manufacture enjoying the benefits of the protective tariff equal to from 10 to 25 per cent of the protection afforded. Had this been done there would be a tremendous increase in our revenue but then there would be less coming in to the manufacturers' pocket and that, I suppose, would not be tolerated by our manufacturing friends.

Government supporters are very critical of the cross-benchers.

It must be a tremendous relief to our friends of the regular Opposition group that the abuse of the Government side has been taken away from them and hurled at us over here. I think the members of the regular Opposition should feel thankful to us for having drawn the fire of the Government and relieved them to the extent that we have. If it pleases the Government supporters it does not bother us. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) had a great many things to say about this group. I do not propose to refer at length to his remarks but I will just refer to one thing he said which I think is a fair sample of what he has given us to-night. He rears and rears, and shouts and tears, and gets up on his hind feet and abuses us most terribly, because of the assumed fact that we oppose campaign funds. I never heard of a campaign fund being opposed in this part of the House although I heard somebody on the hon. gentleman's own side saying that campaign funds should not be allowed at all. I never heard any man in this party say anything of the kind. What we have said is that there should be publicity of campaign funds. Therefore my hon. friend misses the mark entirely in his criticism. And that is a fair sample of his criticism of hon. members belonging to this party. Government supporters, I repeat, have been very critical of the cross-benchers. I do not propose to reply to this criticism further than to say that the platform we support is before the public. It is clear-cut and shows the specific articles we ask to have placed on the free list. We are not at present asking for free trade in any others and the party is committed to nothing further than this platform.

It is said by Government supporters that there is a difference in the opinions entertained by different members of the new party. That seems, in their opinion, to be a very unusual thing in this House. I do not think it is anything at all. I think there is a greater difference of opinion among the members of the old parties than there is among the members of this party. We have agreed at least upon a platform laid down, and that is all we need to deal with at present. When we come to deal with further reductions in the tariff we will have an opportunity to see what difference of opinion if any, there is. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." Those criticisms I expect, will be dealt with by others before this debate closes.

The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) says that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) is playing the part of Romeo with the cross-benchers for his Juliet. The right hon. member expresses surprise

at some of the opinions he has heard from the Opposition side. I am sure that nothing he has heard from the Opposition side is more surprising than his comparison of the very guarded wooings of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's with the ardent protestations of Romeo. Who ever heard of Romeo warning Juliet of the necessity of subservience to others? Who ever heard of him cautioning Juliet not to ask for or expect too much? My recollection is that Romeo was much more ardent in his wooings than the leaders of either party. Government supporters are wooing us after a fashion. They would like a union of a sort with us but their wooing is somewhat after the fashion of the cave man who goes out after his bride with a club. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, while not possessing the ardor of a Romeo is rather more polite in his attentions than the Government supporters. It seems to me his wooing is more after the manner we would expect from a modern Turk. He seems willing to add this group to his political harem. Should he succeed, there will surely be a mixed political family—free traders, low tariff and revenue tariff advocates, moderate protectionists and immoderate protectionists. If my hon. friend expects much support from this group after he realizes his ambitions and finds the Liberals the strongest party in the House, he may as well make up his mind that he must drop some of his extreme protectionist friends and also that his pilgrimage toward the 1893 goal, "Free trade as it is in England", must be more rapid and consistent than during the fifteen years when he was in charge of the finances of this country.

Manufacturers profess a desire to come to an understanding with the farmers. That is quite simple. We ask for no favours. Let them do likewise and all would be well. We ask that there should be no protection on anything we produce. Will they do the same? If they do that, all will be happy as a marriage feast. The supporters of the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture ask that claims for tariff protection of any industry should be heard publicly before a special committee of Parliament. Surely that is a reasonable request, but will our manufacturing friends agree to it? They have hitherto asked us to assume that all manufacturers require protection. We deny that and say the onus is on them to prove their need and right to protection. Our platform has been promulgated by representatives of the farmers. Still the first and by far the most important item on our proposed free list is almost entirely produced by farmers. Surely in the face of that fact, nothing can be more absurd than the oft repeated statement that the farmers are asking for class legislation. There are many lines of manufactured goods on our proposed free list but we deny that it has ever been established that they need tariff protection in order to carry on their business. On the contrary Government returns abundantly establish the fact that most of them can thrive without such protection. The most extensively protected of all manufactured foodstuffs is wheat flour. During the ten years ending the 31st March, 1919 we exported from Canada flour to the value of $388,980,093. When the United States offered us free trade in wheat and flour providing we would give them the same, we were told that our flour millers would be ruined by such an arrangement. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce on the 23rd April, 1914, insisted that placing flour on the free list would place the Canadian milling industry in great peril, and he spoke of the danger that such a step would obliterate the milling industry, though at that time millers were exporting enormous quantities of flour in open competition with the whole world, which seemed to us to show plainly that they were able to carry on without any protection. Finally, however, the Government did yield to the demand of the western members and agreed to free wheat and wheat products. Were the millers ruined? The returns show that during the last two of the ten years mentioned our flour exports were nearly $200,000,000. We exported a greater value of flour during those two years after flour was placed on the free list than we had exported during the preceding eight years combined. That was one of the terrible effects of free trade.

We are also large exporters of the following foodstuffs: butter, condensed milk, bacon, meals of different kinds, biscuits, bread and prepared cereals. When we can sell these largely to outsiders in open competition with the world, why cannot we afford to give our own home labourers the advantage of the same open competition in buying the food to supply their families. I know some farmers ask for protection in the things they produce. They are anxious to be placed in a position where they can charge the labourers more for their food than it can be procured at from outside producers were the tariff removed. But the

supporters of the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture are not farmers of that kind. We are prepared to farm the land, but we don't ask for the privilege of farming the city labourer also.

We ask for free lumber. Surely no one can seriously claim that our manufacturers of lumber with their tremendous advantages are not able to compete with the world in supplying the consumers at their door. We exported farm machinery, carriages, wagons and parts thereof, fertilizers and cement to the extent of $5,361,726 in 1918 and $8,959,239 in 1919. If the manufacturers of these articles can successfully compete in open competition with the world where freight charges and national sentiment are against them who is going to believe that they are unable to compete at their own doors where freight rates and national sentiment are in their favour?

What right have Canadian manufacturers to legislation protecting them against competition at home when their own actions prove they can trade abroad without protection? Why should we favour the foreign consumer at the expense of the home consumer? That is what we are doing. The claim is sometimes made that the American manufacturers have wider markets and larger establishments than our Canadian manufacturers. There are probably a few American establishments that are larger than any of our Canadian establishments but we must also remember that the vast majority of American establishments are small. These small manufacturers in the United States have to compete with the large establishments. Why cannot our establishments do likewise?

Canadian census returns for 1911 show the number of manufacturing establishments in Canada in 1910, and the American census of 1910 shows the number of American establishments in the previous year. According to these returns we had in Canada 19,218 manufacturing establishments or one to every 375 of our population, while the United States had 268,491 establishments or one to every 347 persons. So the average Canadian manufacturer had more home customers than the American.

Now take the most extensive manufactured goods that we ask for on the free list. I find that the Canadian manufacturers of agricultural machinery and parts thereof had not so many home customers per establishment as the American, but they had a larger average output. In carriages, wagons and parts thereof, the Canadian had a wider home market and greater average output. In fertilizers the Canadian had a wider market, but turned out less per establishment. In cement the American had a wider home market and turned out more per establishment. In timber and lumber products the Canadian had a narrower home market but a larger average output. In flour and grist mill products the American had a wider home market and a greater average out turn but the difference was slight. These returns show pretty conclusively that the Canadian manufacturer does not suffer from the severe handicap he would have us believe in the matter of small establishments and limited home markets.

It is also worth while remembering that of the items we ask for on the free list the following are exempt from duty in the United States: agricultural implements, coal, fertilizers, cement, wheat and wheat flour, cattle, sheep, swine, etc., meat, corn, corn meal, rye and rye flour, fish, potatoes, milk, cream, eggs, lard, bread and biscuits, also most classes of oils. Our manufacturing friends tell us that they do not consider the tariff in fixing the prices and that free trade would not lessen prices. I notice however, that barbed wire, which is on the free list and which is extensively manufactured in Canada and also exported from Canada, is sold much more cheaply than woven fence wire which is not on the free list. A short time ago I inquired from a local dealer the price of various classes of wire fencing and got him to estimate the price per pound at which he sold the different kinds and found that woven wire fencing cost about 2 cents per pound more than barbed wire fencing. Woven wire fencing is dutiable; barbed wire is free. I asked him the reason and he could not tell me, but informed me that even the plain unwoven wire twisted like barbed wire but without barbs cost two cents per pound more than the barbed wire. What is the reason for that? Is there any other reason than that the manufacturers had considered the tariff when fixing the prices of fencing wire or other articles of the kind.

The claim that the manufacturers must close their doors if they get no protection is an old and oft-repeated cry, and here I must beg to repeat a portion of what has already been quoted by my hon. friend from Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie), as I am using it for a different purpose. When the so-called Fielding tariff was introduced Sir Charles Tupper (column 1291, Hansard, 1897), in speaking of that tariff is reported to have said:

> The result is that this tariff goes into operation and the hon. gentleman knows that the

industries in this country are already paralyzed in consequence, while the hon. members gloat—vindictively gloat, over the destruction of Canadian industries. I was reading the wail—the sorrowful wail—of these industries in the Montreal Gazette, where one manufacturer after another declared that their mills must close, and that they saw staring them in the face a return to the deplorable state of things that existed when the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House was in charge of the fiscal policy of this country. I say that a deeper wrong was never inflicted upon Canada.

The same sorrowful wail is repeated by our manufacturers whenever a reduction in tariff is suggested, but history has shown that there is no ground whatever for their fears. Many years ago in response to a popular demand cream separators were placed on the free list; still during the year ending 31st March, 1919, we exported cream separators to the value of $185,910. Binder-twine was placed on the free list, but we exported to the value of $2,574,734; of barbed wire, also on the free list, we exported during the same year to the value of $138,-857; and since we have placed flour on the free list our exports have been bounding almost out of sight. The 1897 tariff reduction, slight though it was, instead of injuring the manufacturer of Canada, made the country so prosperous that the sorrowful wail of the manufacturer was drowned out by the rolling waves of progress that overwhelmed him with a prosperity which he was unable to escape. The result of that tariff was that under it, from 1900 to 1910, the capital invested in Canadian manufactures increased by 179 per cent, the goods produced by 142 per cent, and the wages paid by 113 per cent. Not much to wail about, is it?—and I venture to predict that if the minister will adopt our financial platform—that is, the platform of this little group—the sad and sorrowful wails of our dismal-hearted manufacturers will be deluged in the same glad way.

Mr. F. B. STACEY (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, a year ago, during the debate on the Budget, I took occasion to state the attitude of four of the leading agricultural associations of Brtish Columbia toward the general question of the tariff. I do not purpose to repeat that statement further than to quote two sentences which I then read, and which are as follows:

Therefore, be it resolved that we farmers of British Columbia, as representing all the organizations named below, do not endorse or accept the tariff platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture. That we protest against any tariff legislation in the interests of any one class or industry without due consideration of the welfare of others and the progress of the Dominion.

[Mr. Thomson.]

At that time, Sir, I stated that it was not my intention to discuss the tariff. I believed then, and still believe, that there were before the House issues paramount to those involved in the tariff, and I said nothing whatever regarding the resolutions from my province further than to read them. To-night, Sir, I endorse the resolutions which I then submitted from those four organizations, viz: The Fraser Valley Milk Producers Association, composed of something over 1,000 producers of milk; the Provincial Dairymen's Association; the British Columbia Fruit Growers' Association; and the United Farmers of British Columbia.

Now, I do not forget that the U.F.A. have been persistently wooing the U.F.B. C. to accept their political platform. I do not think they have so far met with any success; of course, what the future may bring forth I do not know. But one thing I do know, Sir, that, should their wooing meet with a measure of success, to some of us who know the conditions under which the propoganda is being conducted, it will not be very difficult to explain what on its surface may possibly appear successful along the line I have indicated.

Permit me to say very briefly by way of introduction that in my earlier years I breathed a political atmosphere that was charged, if not, indeed, surcharged, with anti-protection gas. To-night I stand for the principle of protection, and in making that statement I can best illustrate my position and change of mental attitude by referring to my own province. British Columbia contains in itself practically all the essentials of true nationhood. Its population, I grant, is comparatively small—barely half a million. But, notwithstanding, British Columbia is a remarkable province, and I propose to try to show that what obtains with reference to that province obtains to a larger extent and to a greater degree with reference to the Dominion as a whole. I base my argument upon this fundamental mathematical axiom, that the whole is equal to the sum of all its parts; and I believe that what is true in mathematics is also true in economics—that what is true with regard to that physical axiom is also true in considering the nation's welfare and prosperity. I believe in the economic solidarity of the Canadian people, and that our true national prosperity can be secured only by having due regard to the prosperity of the component parts of this nation. In other words, we shall not reach

the measure of success and national prosperity that is possible unless we take into consideration the conditions prevailing in and the circumstances surrounding the various provinces, the various sections which go to make up the Dominion.

Now, with regard to my own province, and carrying out that illustration, I may say that it has an area of some 390,000 square miles. It contains vast resources of minerals. We have gold, silver, copper, lead, zinc and iron, in virtually inexhaustible quantities. The resources of coal are estimated at 76,000,000,000 metric tons. The value of the lumber cut in 1918 was nearly $28,000,000, while there is at the present time an estimated stand of saw timber and pulpwood material amounting to about 366,000,000,000 board feet. With regard to water-power it is estimated that there are some three millions of horse-power, of which only about one-tenth at the present time has been utilized. In 1918 British Columbia contributed about forty-one per cent of the total value of the fisheries of Canada, valued at nearly $21,500,000, exceeding the value of the fisheries of Nova Scotia by over $7,000,000 and that of the rest of the provinces combined by over $11,000,000. Only last year the value of the salmon pack was estimated at $15,000,000. The estimated value of our agricultural production in 1918 was $42,000,000, while in 1919 the estimate is $99,000,000. We have some seven thousand miles of sea coast containing innumerable harbours, many of which rank among the finest in the world. Of course, it is well known that during the past three years shipbuilding has been carried on in British Columbia to a very large extent. It would appear that when a province has such extensive natural resources it is in the interests of all concerned that these resources should be developed to the greatest possible degree and that when and where necessary such protection should be afforded those who are seeking to develop industries as will best bring about the result desired. This does not mean any unnatural or forced protection when there is no reasonable prospect of ultimate success and development. It does not mean that because someone wants to start an industry for which the province and the district is not suited, any protection or assistance should be granted But if there are reasonable grounds to believe that such an industry would be successful; if the natural resources are there and if the outlook is at all hopeful and reasonably bright, I maintain, Sir, that it is in the interests of the people of the province concerned to encourage by fair and legitimate protection or help, whatever may be regarded as necessary to bring about the highest possible development in such an industry. That protection is not necessarily eternal, it is not necessarily unchangeable; but it should obtain if required in the early stages of the development of that industry. What is true of a province is true of a collection of provinces—in other words, is true of the entire Dominion. The prosperity of the Dominion is contingent upon the highest development of the resources of which each section of the country is possessed.

Mr. Speaker, I am a lover of clean, manly sport. The other day there returned to this country a famous hockey team which had won the world's championship in the continent of Europe, the Falcons of Winnipeg. I want to read to you, Sir, and to this House a remark made by one of the Winnipeg boys who was interviewed, as reported in the public press. Speaking of the French team, he said:

> The other fellows may have been as good as us individually, but when it comes to winning hockey games it's the old club spirit that counts. And the Falcons have the club spirit to the last man on the team.

What is true in hockey is true in every other legitimate, clean sport. Individuals may sometimes apparently succeed in getting off some fancy stunt that will put themselves in the limelight and secure headlines in the daily papers. But the team that wins in the long run—and it is the long run that we are all making—is the team that recognizes the club spirit, the team spirit; the success of the whole depends upon the combination play. And I want to say to my friends opposite that the success and the prosperity of Canada will depend upon the combination spirit. They may think that by making some grandstand home-run play they will win the game; but, Sir, they will strike out every time. We shall win in the long run as a Dominion when all the national players recognize the team combination spirit. That will secure to us the largest possible measure of success in every province, there being at the same time due recognition by all of the claims and possibilities of the other sections of this Dominion.

Now, I come back to my own province—and I do not propose to cover the whole ground of trade or commerce. My change of attitude towards this question is not the result of reading English history; it is the result of my contact with Canadian people; my knowledge of the conditions

which obtain in the various provinces of Canada, especially of my having lived for ten years in the Pacific coast province. I said a little while ago that the agricultural production of British Columbia had doubled within the last twelve months. Allow me to say now, in a little more detail, that the agricultural industry of my province may be roughly divided into three sections: live stock, grain and vegetables, and fruit. Almost all the districts of British Columbia are suitable or may be made suitable for stock raising; some of them are more adapted to grain and vegetable growing; while some are specially adapted to fruit growing. My argument then is that the possibilities of that province—and what applies to that province, I have tried to show, applies to the Dominion—can be best attained when due regard is given to the promotion of those several industries as circumstances may seem to advise.

Let me now come a little closer to a question which for four years has been agitating the minds of hon. gentlemen who come from the Prairie Provinces. I will try to remember to-night that I have the honour of addressing not simply hon. members from the Prairie Provinces; I should like to take a hint from the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Burnham) and try to make myself believe that I am addressing all the women, the housekeepers, and also the farmers of the three Prairie Provinces who may or may not be represented in this House to-night. What I have to say now will be confined to this single phase of the development of our national life. Lest I be misunderstood by some one—not purposely, I presume—allow me to state that what I am about to say has no direct reference to the constituency which I have the honour to represent, because my constituency is not to any large extent, distinctively or specifically, an apple exporting district. I want thus to clear the ground so that no one can say that I am putting up a case for my constituency. I have now reference to what is known as the southern central portion of British Columbia, which is more commonly known throughout Canada as the Okanagan district. Possibly I should include the Salmon Arm and, at any rate, the West Kootenay district. These constitute the southern central portion of British Columbia which portion, in the main, is devoted to the apple industry. Forty years ago thousands of acres of that section of our province were covered by some hundreds or possibly thousands of cattle which were endeavouring to secure a bare sustenance from an unwilling soil. Some one fortunately discovered that if water could be put on that land it would produce fruit, and that was the beginning of the apple industry of British Columbia. Thirty years ago, or say, in 1890, there were in the entire province some 400 acres only devoted to the production of apples. Twenty years ago the number had increased, and in the entire province, there were some 8,000 acres devoted to the apple industry. Ten years ago that figure could be multiplied by four, or, say 32,000 acres. The value, roughly speaking, was, in 1900, $436,000, and ten years ago it had grown to something over $1,000,000. By 1914, the crop had increased another twenty-five per cent, but the value was reduced to less than $1,000,000. Five years ago the British Columbia Dparment of Agriculture estimated that the capital directly invested in the orchard industry amounted to over $20,000,000, while there were directly interested some 2,800 orchard owners. At the same time, large areas in both the Okanagan and the Kootenay valleys were being planted with trees with a view to the growing eastern business. As I said a moment ago, while the total output had increased, the total income, not relative but absolute, had decreased. The result of this was that a very serious situation was developing, and the fruit growers set about to discover the cause of that situation, and then if possible to ascertain the remedy. I shall not weary the House by citing the successive steps which were taken to secure the facts; I shall ,however, give the results, which after all I suppose the House is more interested in. It was assumed, when this investigation was undertaken, that the four western provinces of Canada constituted a natural and legitimate market for the apple crop, not ignoring or forgetting the fact that Manitoba had been and probably would be supplied in a measure for years to come by the Ontario crop. But in 1914—and I specify that year, because then the matter virtually came to a climax—the Ontario crop and the British Columbia crop were the largest on record. An enormous crop was the result of the harvest of that year. But what followed? Notwithstanding that fact and the fact that during that year prices were exceedingly low, we discovered that no less than 556 carloads of apples were shipped to the prairies by American growers. I ask hon. members to remember that, because therein lies the key to the whole situation; the solution of the whole apple problem of the far West is just at that specific

11 p.m.

point. The four northwestern Pacific States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and possibly Montana, were some five years ahead of us in the apple industry; they had and have larger areas for apple production than we have. By 1914, it was estimated that they had planted about 500,000 acres, or more than enough to supply their natural market. The question may be asked, and I face it very fairly and squarely as I always want to do; it has been asked by hon. gentlemen opposite; I have met it privately scores of times; it has been put to me in this form: If British Columbia can compete with the Northwestern Pacific States in point of quality of the article, why seek protection?—if it cannot compete with the Northwestern States, what is the logic or reason of giving protection to an incompetent or second-rate industry? I accept the question fully. Can British Columbia compete with the northwestern Pacific States? Yes, she has done so. British Columbia apples have taken first place in competitions open to the world, noticeably in the Crystal Palace Exhibition, not once, but more than once, and, Sir, Washington was an entry in that race. Therefore, I say, without fear or hesitation, that if it comes to a question of legitimate, fair, open competition, British Columbia can beat the world; she has done it. Then, hon. members may ask me; In face of that, why did British Columbia ask a protection of thirty cents per box? And I shall be delighted to answer. I said a moment ago that the Northwestern States had a very large output and they had in prospect a very much larger output because of their immense acreage. I should like hon. members to follow me closely when I tell them that the two finest grades of northwestern fruit have been for years marketed in the great American cities of the Middle West and also in the cities of the Far East; the growers have sent their extra fancy and fancy grades to the great American cities with marked success, but that left on their hands the third grade which they could not ship to those cities and for which a market must be found nearer home. Where did they look for that market? To the Canadian prairies. And having secured their profit on their fancy and extra fancy grades, they launched upon the Canadian prairies their third grade article at any figure which could be secured for that product. I am prepared to prove that they sold hundreds of carloads at a net loss. It can be shown by their own figures that in the Northwestern states during that time it cost $1.06 to produce a box of apples, and it cost in British Columbia at the same time about $1.15. Why? One reason is that we paid labour higher than labour was paid across the line, and another reason is that we paid more for containers than they did in the United States; and if hon. gentlemen ask for an explanation of those facts, I can tell them it is because they had a better organization than we had and beat us at buying. But notwithstanding the fact that it cost the growers in the Northwestern states $1.06 —I am not speaking in millions but in something I can understand, a dollar and a few cents—they were willing to contract for hundreds of carloads at a loss of from 40 to 50 cents per box. Why? Because they wanted to do two things: to get rid of a surplus stock, and then to secure the market for the future. With what result to British Columbia? British Columbia had to compete with that abnormal, illegal price —I do not know that I should call it illegal, but at any rate I will say, unfair. She had to compete with that reduced price for Northwestern stock on the Canadian prairies. It cost us $1.15 to produce a box of apples, and we were forced to sell at under 90 cents a box in order to get any sale whatever. How long, think you, Mr. Speaker, would an industry survive that was carried on under those conditions, at a loss of 25 cents or thereabouts on every box that was put upon the open market? There was only one thing to do. The dumping regulations would not apply; that fruit was properly stamped and graded. The Fruit Growers' Association and the legislature of British Columbia appealed to this Government four years ago and asked for a reasonable protection. I am not now speaking of revenue; I do not believe the Government got much out of it in the line of revenue; I am speaking from the standpoint of protection. In order to protect, which meant to preserve the life of, the British Columbia apple industry, this Government very wisely, as we thought, granted, in the session of 1916, a protection of 30 cents per box upon imported American fruit, with the result that that year we sold our apples at a bare trifle above actual cost price.

Now, I hold in my hand a copy of this famous platform, but I do not propose to read it all. With very much of it I agree. On page 13 I read under the heading "Definite Tariff Demands" a proposal that the tariff laws be amended "by placing all foodstuffs on the free list." May I tell my hon. friends, for their future guidance, that there is certainly no better foodstuff than

British Columbia apples? Now, Sir, I have something else which I desire to read to the House. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), who I regret is not in his place, is reported to have said in a speech delivered in the city of Regina on November 19, 1919:

> If the rich man wants to have grape fruit for breakfast he pays no duty. If you want to eat a baked apple for your morning meal you can have it in the face of a customs protection of somewhere around fifty cents per barrel. . . . The application of the principle of protection is unsound economically and retards the development of a country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STACEY: And hon. gentlemen applaud that! Think of it. The hon. member for Marquette says: "If you want to eat a baked apple you"—that is, the poor people—"can have it in the face of a customs protection of somewhere around fifty cents per barrel." By the way, I want to be perfectly candid and tell my hon. friend that he is wrong in his figures. The customs protection is 90 cents per barrel, or 30 cents per box. He should have said to them: "Gentlemen, if I had had my way, you poor people would not have got any apples at all." There would not have been a British Columbia apple on the prairies. The trees in British Columbia would all have been destroyed because the growers would have been producing at a loss. So soon as that had happened the American Northwestern States would have jumped the price up and would have controlled the importation because the Nash interests in the Northwestern States control the whole situation and there would have been apples on the prairie just according as it suited the Nash interest and in spite of everything else. Without that thirty cents a box, apples on the prairies would have been absolutely prohibitive. The people never would have looked at one. I am not talking poetry, and I have not the grace of oratory to make this go very far into your skulls, I am afraid; but what I am saying is solid truth, solid fact. The farmers, and indeed the entire population, of the Canadian prairies. may be profoundly thankful that the Government of Canada did four years ago grant this comparatively small protection of thirty cents per box, because it saved the industry to British Columbia and for the western prairies.

I want to emphasize that last word. There are 28,000 men who would have been put out of business in British Columbia. I suppose some of these hon. gentlemen regard that as a very insignificant matter. We believe in interprovincial trade. Our people, year by year, buy from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000 worth of stuff especially from the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. That may not be very much but it is a big thing for us especially under existing conditions. If those 28,000 growers had been put out of business what would have been the situation at the present time? They have in the Northwestern States a far greater acreage than we have, they have resources far beyond what we have and we could not imagine a better crop than we had in 1914. What would have been ahead of us? Nothing but absolute ruin. What saved the country, what saved the growers, what saved my own province, was that this Government, in 1916, did what we asked. The situation was saved and as a result the prairies had cheap fruit.

I do not forget while I speak that last year the price was high. But of all agricultural products fruit was the last one to respond to the general rise in prices as far as the producer was concerned. Our product last year was not as great as possibly it might have been. Shall I dare tell the House one reason why our product last year was smaller? I think I shall. Last May I went down through the Okanagan on some business. I saw ranch after ranch in the Okanagan that was growing up a waste—trees neglected and no crop worth speaking of. Why, I said at some of these ranches: "Where is the owner; and what is he doing?" Enlisted! I was told man after man deliberately got up and left his ranch, the whole proposition, and struck out across the seas. To give you one single illustration: I met an old hero; he was over sixty years of age, he had just got back and I took off my hat in his presence. He and his wife had gone overseas. She was a trained nurse. He had returned, being demobilized before she was, and he was expecting her in a few days. She had been promoted to the rank of captain. I looked into his face and said: "Ah, ha things will be different when she gets back; she is your superior officer." "Oh, no" he replied, "she will have to revert to private rank." My only object in mentioning that is to show that whole areas in the apple producing country were left to take care of themselves the best they could because the ranchers went overseas and hastened to get there at the earliest possible date. All honour to these men.

I am not talking politics. I am giving you facts and I am speaking to the populations of Alberta and Saskatchewan and, to some extent, of Manitoba. If there is one thing that the people of the prairies should be pleased over it is that the policy of this Government in 1916 saved them from an exorbitant increase in the prices of apples since that date. While I do not forget the fine quality of the apples in Ontario, Nova Scotia and Quebec, everybody knows that under normal conditions that product finds its market overseas. We are prepared to meet any honest Canadian competition; it matters not where it comes from. What we do object to, and what we have persistently objected to, is the unfair, unreasonable and unneighbourly policy of dumping third-rate stuff upon the poor prairie people and forcing the higher-quality fruit off the market.

How can we, in face of these plain facts, stand up in this House and say, as did my hon. friend who just sat down (Mr. Thomson): No protection on anything we produce is what we stand for? I claim that is a narrow policy. I claim that is not a team policy, I claim that is not a policy that will win in the long run for the Canadian people. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) in a speech made recently before this House said:

> What grown man should want protection anyhow? Our sons and brothers in the trenches did not want protection; it was the fellows they went up against that needed protection.

That was uttered, I presume in a burst of impassioned eloquence. But what is the fact to-day? Every steel helmet upon the head of a soldier on the continent of Europe is the refutation of that statement; and when a man foolishly, or otherwise, so disregarded the idea of protection that he stuck up his head a little too high he paid for his foolishness with his life. Protection! All civilization and all legislation is based upon protection. Strike out protection and we have anarchy. It is folly for a man to say that he denounces the idea of protection. The whole structure of our civilization, of constitutional government, and of everything we hold dear, rests upon some application of the fundamental principle of protection. It is legitimate, it is natural, it is necessary, and it is a proper application in the realm of economics.

With regard to the amendment, my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) spoke of its destructive character. I shall not repeat what he said; but in looking at what it proposes to do I, too, Sir, was struck with its vein of common generalities—the old expressions of the high cost of living and of the need for a general reduction in the tariff,—and I thought of Tennyson's words in that connection:

> Faultily faultless, icily regular, splendidly null.

With regard to the Budget, Sir, I can easily understand that any man with one eye on his pocket and the other on the Government's proposals could take his pen and draw a line through a great many of the clauses, and if three or four million other men did that we would have a beautiful Budget; the best men would be out of a job and the country would soon be a memory. We have an enormous debt, and as I—a plain, common working man—see it there is only one of two things to do; either borrow the money or pay it. I propose to do my part towards paying it. I believe, Sir, that while the people of this country may perhaps criticize some of the measures outlined in the Budget they will, on the whole accept it as the best possible solution of the great problem which confronts Canada to-day. If I might attempt to suggest for the consideration of the minister—one shall I say, amendment?—one thought, that might find a place in his mind overnight, it would be this: I would suggest to him to consider the advisability of making a provision whereby every citizen of Canada who reached the years of maturity should be compelled to pay a minimum Dominion Income Tax of, say, $2. I believe, Sir, that would link up with this country's financial interests every citizen from the Atlantic to the Pacific in a way in which they are not now linked up. There are hundreds and thousands who will not be called upon to pay an income tax directly. For their own sake, for the sake of the interest it will create in their own minds regarding the welfare and the development of this country and its future prosperity, I would have every man and woman over twenty-one years of age, without exception, asked to pay a small tax, or an income tax. That would identify them, continually and individually, with the economic and general welfare of the Dominion.

Mr. ARTHUR L. DESAULNIERS (Champlain) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I consider it my duty to join my colleagues of the left who have taken part in this debate in protesting strongly against the administration which obtains at the present time. This protest, Mr. Speaker, I must

utter in the name of more than fifty thousand citizens whom I have the honour to represent on the floor of this House, and particularly in the name of the many brave young men of my county who enlisted in the Canadian army for the defence of the Empire, and who now meet with so little recognition from the Government. I must voice it also in the name of the agricultural class and of the entire labouring class, who have worked and suffered through the great war, and who, to-day and to-morrow, will continue to work and suffer in order to meet the staggering debts heaped upon the country by extravagant expenditure and the awarding of profiteering contracts to favourites and supporters of the Government.

We might have believed, Mr. Speaker, that once the armistice was signed, which in reality meant the end of the war, the Government would have chosen economy for the first article of their programme. Thus, instead of assuming the pompous title of Government of Reconstruction, they should in all decency have called themselves an economic Government and have practiced economy in all things. But on the contrary, they increased expenditure in enormous proportions. They even were bound to have recourse to considerable loans under conditions most onerous and most unfavourable to the country. Instead of being reduced, the effectives of the Canadian militia were increased, even doubled; administrative commissions are created in all the departments; a course which doubles and trebles the cost of administration. The nationalization of the railways, the creation of a merchant fleet, when the country is already on the brink of bankruptcy, I hold to be national suicide. And that is why the Government had to face in its loans rates of interest higher than that which would be paid even by the unfortunate farmer forced to borrow a thousand dollars from his neighbour.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not by borrowing money, nor by increasing the duties, nor by imposing taxes that we shall remove the unrest that prevails at present throughout the country. That is not the means of restoring the confidence and well-being which our people need, neither of reducing the high cost of living that is bearing so heavily on them.

I was surprised but delighted to hear, in the opening days of this session, that the navy was about to disappear; but, knowing the inclinations of this Government as I do, I am afraid it will come back stronger than ever after the Imperial Conference.

[Mr. Desaulniers.]

If we wish to restore peace, harmony, confidence and prosperity and to balance our finances, Mr. Speaker, we must put off this onerous scheme of a navy to fifty years hence; we must reduce the permanent forces of the Militia to the strength that is strictly necessary for maintaining order in the country; we must abolish all commissions that are more or less useful, such as the Board of Commerce which the people talk so nicely about and which threatens to become famous, the Railway Commission, the only one which might be of some little use, the Civil Service Commission, so much criticized even by the most faithful supporters of the Government, the Purchasing Commission, who have the power to buy more than the Government can afford to pay, the Tariff Commission, still in the embryonic stage, the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Board, which, judging by the many amendments brought at every session, has been badly conceived, and all other commissions the names of which I do not remember now but that are still less necessary and more useless. The population of our country has barely increased in the course of the last fifteen years; however, the number of civil servants was more than doubled, on account of these commissions, so that we have never enough buildings to accommodate them all.

To explain their policy of deficits, the Government stated that large works had been undertaken sooner than they wished, with a view to procuring work for the labourmen and the returned soldiers. We cannot accept that argument, Mr. Speaker, when we know that labour is scarce in the country and that in many places the soil is not producing what it should, because the farmers cannot secure the help they require; also when we know that the manufacturers, particularly the lumber men, have very much difficulty in getting the men they want for their factories and mills, notwithstanding the continuous and alarming increase of wages which are not yet sufficient to meet the high cost of living.

For all the reasons I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I wish to appeal to the good sense of former Liberals sitting on your right, Mr. Speaker, and I am asking them to endeavour to impress upon their Conservative friends who are in power, the necessity of dissolving Parliament immediately after this session, in order that the people may select their representatives, not for their purposes, but with the only object of assisting in the economic and social reconstruction of our country. Thus shall

be sent back home those pretended patriots who, since their coming into power, confined themselves in tearing up our statutes to replace them by ever famous Orders in Council, that iniquitous legislation which sanctioned the utmost arbitrary and most autocratic measures.

Thus, the people would be able to elect representatives who, while in Parliament, would strive to create a real "entente cordiale" between the different nationalities in Canada and to eliminate racial disputes so often raised by hon. members opposite.

Thrift is a vain word on the lips of hon. members from the opposite side of this House and of hon. members of this Unionist Government. Why should they talk about economy, when they advocate measures entailing such heavy expenditure at a time when the country is on the verge of bankruptcy? Why should they speak of saving, when the present Government are encouraging the profiteers whom they let accumulate millions of pounds of foodstuffs, while the people groan under the burden of taxes and the exorbitant cost of essential commodities? Why should they advocate thrift, when the Government are making the ridiculous promise to lend 125 millions to foreign countries, while our finances are in such a bad condition; but that is another way of further enriching the Canadian manufacturers who made millions out of the war.

Now, if we look at Canada from a social standpoint, we regret to find that the country is seething with unrest and discontent; that this epidemic of strikes is reaching an acute state; that the troubles between capital and labour have brought hardships to the working people and even to the farming community who are no longer able to provide for their wants, owing to the high cost of living. What is the Government doing? What is the Minister of Labour doing? I think I am within the mark when I say that such a state of affairs was brought about, to a large extent, through the supineness of the Minister of Labour. In these times of stress, when all our energies should be bent towards securing that economic and social reconstruction I was referring to a moment ago, which is the first requirement for the prosperity of Canada, it is absolutely necessary that the electors of this country be called upon to choose representatives, having at heart its interests, men who are able to put our affairs on a sound financial basis, and to cause Canada to successfully hold its place among other countries, so that the dictum of Sir Wilfrid Laurier may prove true, when he said that the 20th century would be Canada's century.

On motion of Mr. McCoig the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

Friday, May 21, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

LETTER FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to communicate a letter from His Excellency the Governor General signed by his own hand and which is as follows:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have received with great pleasure the Address that you have voted in reply to my speech at the opening of Parliament and thank you for it sincerely.

Devonshire.

Government House, Ottawa,
May 17, 1920.

JOINT PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. CURRIE moved:

That the recommendations in the first report of the Joint Committee on Printing be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion will require unanimous consent in the absence of notice.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Return of the number of persons employed in the Department of Indian Affairs; copy of a letter signed by 21 members and senators; return in regard to the publishers of the Montreal Gazette and of the amounts paid to them; return showing the number of persons employed in the Department of Labour.—Hon. Mr. Sifton.

Return showing the number of persons employed in the Department of Marine at Ottawa; copy of Order in Council No. 1061, dated 15th May, 1920, with regard to the payment of gratuities.—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

EMPIRE DAY ADJOURNMENT.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I beg to move the motion of which I gave notice yesterday:

That when this House adjourns on Friday, the 21st instant, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, the 25th instant.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out, as I did yesterday, that this motion requires two days' notice and only one day's notice has been given. It can therefore only be entertained by unanimous consent.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know whether it is applicable or not, but my attention has been directed to the language of rule 40 which says that the rule requiring notice shall not apply to the times of meeting or adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the interpretation which has been given to the section under that rule is that it refers to the hour for meeting because in the French edition "heure" is used. That being so, as at present advised, I am still of the opinion that two days' notice would be required to be given.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I do not want to be the only dissenting voice in this House to the motion moved by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). We have no hope or expectation of an increase in the indemnity this session although the high cost of living is just as bad for members of Parliament as for anybody else.

An hon. MEMBER: Worse.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman—

Mr. GAUVREAU: I shall not make a speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him to point out that if this motion is to be entertained by unanimous consent there can be no debate. I assume that the hon. gentleman, in the few remarks which he has already addressed to the House, intends to withdraw the objection that he made yesterday.

Mr. GAUVREAU: No, but I want to give the reason why I took objection to it. It is in deference to those who joined hands with this side of the House to make Ascension day a holiday. I hope that the Prime Minister will see his way clear to starting Saturday and morning sittings as soon as possible, and the sooner the better, because every member wants to get home to attend to his private affairs—if we want to live up to our obligations and make a decent living.

Motion agreed to.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

COPIES OF BUDGET SPEECH FOR DISTRIBUTION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I would like to ask the Government if it will be possible to print 25,000 copies of the speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) for distribution among members. We have many requests from different parts of the country and it is impossible to get copies from the distribution office. I think that a copy of this speech should be in the hands of every person, or at least of every family, in Canada, and we ought to have at least a reasonable number for distribution.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would not have any objection provided that the answer by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) is also published and distributed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will take into consideration the suggestions which have been made. I think that arrangements are already under way to print a large number of copies of the resolutions.

THE BUDGET.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON THE ANNUAL STATEMENT PRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

The House resumed from Thursday, May 20, the debate on the motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means and the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (Kent, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, representing in this House, as I have the privilege of doing, one of the largest urban and rural ridings, if not the largest, in the Dominion of Canada, I wish to give to the House a few reasons why I purpose supporting the amendment of my hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) to the Budget which was presented to the House a few days ago by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). I wish as well to offer a few objections to some of the arguments which were advanced by hon. gentlemen who addressed the House from the Government side and to give a few reasons why I take exception to the views which they presented. Mr. Speaker, with your long parliamentary experience and knowledge of the different members

of this House personally you would have been amused as you sat in your place and listened to the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) who spoke with a brief for the great Massey-Harris corporation, advocating their case and telling us why we should not allow agricultural implements to come into Canada in opposition to theirs.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have very great doubt as to whether the hon. gentleman is in order in imputing to another hon. gentleman the circumstance that he holds a brief for a manufacturing corporation. I have very grave doubt indeed as to whether the hon. gentleman would be in order in making an assertion of that kind unless he were to do so in a constitutional manner.

Mr. ROBB: That expression, as I understand, is only used as a figure of speech.

Mr. McCOIG: If it would be more in order that the word "brief" should be withdrawn I will withdraw it and say that he was advocating their case. With all due respect to that hon. gentleman, when he undertakes to interfere with any policy that may be advocated by any hon. gentleman in this House, which has for its object the admission of agricultural implements into this country in order to give us greater food supply, those who have the real cause of the plain people of this land at heart should object to the statement the hon. gentleman made, and should do their utmost to put an end to the great contribution that some manufacturers are securing from the people of Canada at the present time. In justification of this statement let me draw the attention of the House to a despatch in the Globe from the city of Washington which states that this year the wheat crop in the United States will be 483,000,000 bushels as against a crop of 731,000,000 bushels last year. This shows that we are going to be confronted with a great shortage of wheat on the part of the United States. We have an Associated Press despatch from old England which states that the British people will receive from the North American continent 4,000,000 tons less wheat than they received last year. I also want to draw the attention of Parliament and the country to the fact that we are face to face with scarcity, it may not be too much to say that we are possibly on the threshold of a wheat famine. This Parliament should do everything possible to assist the producers of this land in getting every bushel of grain so that they may reap as large a harvest as possible to assist the other nations of the world with what we do not need for home consumption.

Let me go further, Sir. We have the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) standing up and advocating protection to-day because he represents in this House one of the large cities in the province of Ontario. But it was only a few years ago, in 1911, that the same hon. gentleman was running in a rural riding on the reciprocity platform and advocating the very thing which he seems to be opposing to-day. May we not therefore say: "Oh, consistency thou art a jewel"? At a late hour last night we heard the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Stacey). How he tickled the ears of the high protectionists, and the representatives of the corporations, or rather the stockholders of the corporations—I should rather put it in that form. How they applauded and pounded their desks when the hon. member complimented the Government because they had placed a duty of ninety cents a barrel on apples—a food, Sir, which the people require so badly and which in the old days so many families in humble circumstances could enjoy. The effect of this duty on apples was brought home to me in a convincing form last night when in company with another gentleman I took a walk down Sparks street. Then I understood the reason for the applause with which the remarks of the hon. member for Fraser Valley were greeted. My friend and I dropped into a fruit store and what did we see there? A sign that apples were selling at the rate of three for 25 cents. Fancy, Sir, three apples for a quarter, and hon. gentlemen opposite were pounding their desks because of the fact that the apple growers were getting a protection of ninety cents a barrel! Fancy people in humble circumstances being forced to pay such a price for fruit which they so greatly need, instead of being able to obtain it at a reasonable figure. I am interested in fruit-growing to a limited extent. I set out some fruit trees in my orchard last year, and propose to do the same again this year; but I say, Sir, that if the customs duty compels the plain people of Canada to pay so much for fruit let that duty be removed in order that fruit—which after all is a food—may be available to them at the very lowest possible cost.

We had also yesterday a lengthy address from the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). We listened to him for an hour before dinner and then for another hour when the House resumed after recess. The hon. member attacked the United Farm-

ers, and what did he say? He said to them: "You people have stores in the West. You supply agricultural implements to purchasers out there and demand the cash." Then the hon. member grew eloquent and he addressed compliments to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), whose face lighted up at the compliments that were paid to him. The hon. member for Brantford was held up as a public benefactor who supplied the farmer of the West with his wares and granted him six months, two years, and sometimes three years, to pay for them. Is it not a grand thing that we should have in this House a manufacturer who is so generous that he is willing to sell the machinery which he produces on lengthy payments? But did the hon. member for Vancouver Centre state that the hon. member for Brantford's firm—the International Harvester Company—and also the Massey-Harris Company, when they sell machinery to the farmers in the West or in other parts of the country, expect those farmers to pay at the rate of from eight to twelve per cent per annum for every day they give them on the goods which they supply. Furthermore, Sir, on some occasions, on some of the implements these firms supply, when the customer wants time, they advance the price from $50 to $75, and add interest to the price besides. Is it not significant that these gentlemen are united together and are all agreed upon the one great question of extracting from the people of this country every possible dollar they can, and likewise charging them for the time allowed in paying for the goods?

The hon. member for Vancouver Centre brought forward one question which is of vital importance to the people, and on which I agree with him to a very large extent, and that is the question of the Wheat Board. That board, I wish to assure the Government, does not meet with the approval of the farmers in that section of Ontario which I have the privilege of representing, and for reasons which I will furnish later. In the meantime let me say that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre certainly did pay his compliments to the United Farmers in this regard. He almost charged them with responsibility for the creation of the Wheat Board, but he omitted to state that it was the Government, and not the United Farmers that created the Wheat Board. Some time ago, in reply to a question, the Minister of Trade and Commerce stated that the participation certificates would likely yield the wheat growers about forty cents a bushel. The Wheat Board in the first place exacted on every bushel of wheat that is sold in this country fifteen cents, in the second place twenty-five cents, and in the third instance forty cents, making a total of eighty cents. Thus, if the eighty cents a bushel is received on the wheat, and the participation certificates only amount to forty cents in the way of return to the producer, it is going to cost the Canadian farmer forty cents for every bushel of wheat that has been handled and sold by the Wheat Board in Canada. If this is true, then figuring on the basis of five bushels of wheat to every barrel of flour, if the consumers of Canada had got their wheat at what the farmers sold it for they would have been able to purchase their flour at $2 a barrel less than they have had to pay for it. This, Sir, I believe, is one of the reasons the people of Canada are opposed to the Wheat Board, and why they are to a very large extent agreed that it should be wiped out of existence at the earliest possible moment.

Let me go a step further in this matter. As far as regards the province of Ontario, the Wheat Board have been taking the wheat from that province and not allowing the millers to grind it, which has resulted in driving many of the stock raisers of Ontario out of the stock-raising business. Those stock raisers would have been able to obtain the offal from the wheat had the millers of Ontario only been allowed to operate and been permitted to sell the flour they could have made instead of shipping away the wheat to be ground in other countries. What does that mean? It means, Sir, that in the province of Ontario for months at a time, the wheels of the flour mills including many of the largest, have not been turning; in the different localities many men have been deprived of employment; and the stock raisers have been driven out of business to an extent that will be illustrated by some figures which I shall now quote.

These figures are taken from the stockyards report as set forth in the Toronto Globe, and they relate to stock that was placed in the Toronto stockyards for the first three months of the present year, and the corresponding months of last year. Of cattle there were 72,766 head in 1920. In the corresponding three months of last year there were 90,183 head, making a difference of nearly 18,000 less cattle sold in those stockyards this year than was the case in 1919. Of swine there were 95,285 for the first three months of the present

year, and 139,969 for the corresponding period of last year, a difference of nearly 45,000 hogs. I ask you, what will that mean to the consumers of this country? Of sheep there were 14,083 this year, and 26,764 last year, a difference of 12,000 less sheep in the first three months of the present year. What does that mean, Sir? It means that on account of the wheat being shipped from this country instead of being ground here, stock raisers have been deprived of the offal to enable them to finish their stock and place it on the markets of Canada.

Now let me give figures to further show the extent to which these men are going out of the stock-raising business. Taking calves, there were 2,500 more calves sold in Toronto for the first three months this year than were sold for the corresponding period last year; whereas if the farmers of Ontario had the offal and had the feed which they should have been able to obtain they would have been able to finish a large proportion of these calves, and in placing them on the market been able to contribute materially to the available food supply of the country. I therefore feel on safe ground in advising the Government to hesitate before they permit the Wheat Board to remain any longer in charge of the supplies which are being produced by the farmers of Canada. Objection to the Wheat Board has been directed, so far as supporters of the Government are concerned, not only by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), who has looked thoroughly into the question. We see that the representative of the Government to England and also to Washington, in the person of Mr. Lloyd Harris, is also attacking the board. At a dinner given in Hamilton the other day that gentleman is reported as follows:

> Mr. Harris alluded to the Board of Commerce being appointed to check profiteering, and stated that while it was at this duty, the Wheat Board was profiteering to "beat the band." If he were allowed to control the entire steel output of Canada he could make all kinds of money, and the situation regarding wheat was like this. The board made wheat prices that were a crime.

Now, Sir, if the trade representative of the Government to England says that the Wheat Board is profiteering to beat the band and that the prices they made for wheat are a crime, then am I not justified in appealing to the Government to give the matter a great deal more serious consideration than they have evidenced up to the present time? The statement is also made that the Board of Commerce is at present investigating the operations of the profiteers of the country. In this connection I would recall to the House the day the Board of Commerce was created. You will remember, Sir, that hon. members on this side of the House protested against the creation of the Board of Commerce, advancing the argument that we had too many commissions at the expense of the people of Canada. We protested against the Board of Commerce on the ground that we ought to have a public prosecutor in the country whose duty it would be to investigate all cases of profiteering and to bring before the county judges all persons against whom charges could be made. We contended that profiteers could be prosecuted in that manner with less expense to the people of Canada. That was our stand then, so far as I am concerned, I can say that it is my attitude yet in regard to this subject. The Department of Finance now have offenders in connection with the Income Tax or the Business Profits Tax brought before the county courts through the medium of their officers, thus obviating a great deal of unnecessary expenditure, and there is no reason why a similar procedure should not be followed in the case of profiteers. The Board of Commerce, Mr. Speaker, has issued a new circular which it would take too long a time for me to read. This circular is issued to every grocer of the country, and in warm weather like this I am afraid it will prove too laborious a task for the already hard-worked man behind the counter to read what is contained in it. There is a long list of requirements as to what these people shall and shall not do, what they pay for their goods, what they sell them for, what profits they receive, and all information as to whether they are profiteering or not. It is quite a voluminous document. Could you imagine a more ridculous letter sent out to the trade, Sir? Here is a list of articles, eighty in number, which has to be made out every month. Why, Sir, are the Government going to let this board run wild? Are they going to allow the board to inconvenience beyond all reason people who are transacting business honestly, requiring them to have special clerks to keep track of every article taken in and sold and every cent of profit which is made? If so, the expense of additional clerks which will have to be borne by the consumer will greatly enhance the price of goods. This body has been in existence for nearly a year investigating profiteering, but it has not yet succeeded in putting one profiteer in jail;

it has not extracted one dollar of unjust profit from any one in Canada. Yet the commissioners are going on upsetting the business and trade of the country and interfering to an undue extent with men who are trying to conduct a straight and honourable business. In this regard may I repeat a little story that was told me by a gentleman the other day by way of comparison with the Board of Commerce. Knowing that the board has been doing all sorts of investigating during the past year, being considerably in the limelight and being much written about in the press week in and week out, this gentleman told a story about a burglary that was committed in the city of Detroit. The Chief of Police was called up and was informed of the affair. Immediately he called up the police station and deputed a policeman to hurry as fast as he could up Spadina avenue where, he told the officer, an extensive burglary had been committed. The policeman went down and after the lapse of an hour the chief called him up on the telephone to ascertain what he had done in the matter. He asked the policeman: "Are you there?" The policeman replied that he was. "What are you doing?" asked the chief; "I am working hard," said the policeman. "Are you on the job?" says the chief. The policeman replied that he was; then the chief asked him what he had accomplished. Slowly the chief got the information that his assistant had discovered that a lot of jewellery and clothing had been stolen. "Well, hurry up and try to accomplish something definite" says the chief. To his satisfaction the policeman replied; "I have accomplished something." The chief asked him "What have you done?" and the policeman replied that he had got one of them. "Which one?" the chief wanted to know; and the policeman replied quite innocently: "I have the fellow who was robbed." Now, Sir, that is precisely the position in regard to the Board of Commerce. They have been investigating for a year, giving people all kinds of trouble and annoyance, and all they have discovered is the poor man who has been robbed, who has had all sorts of high prices extorted from him. Are the Government going to continue this extravagance? Are they going to continue the board, whose first act was one of profiteering so far as they themselves were concerned? They were appointed at first to receive salaries of $7,000 each, with $8,000 for the chairman, but before they would act they had to have these salaries increased to $8,000 apiece with $10,000 for the chairman. This is the only real profiteering that they have discovered up to the present time. Now, if we are going to keep commissions like the Board of Commerce, who raised their salaries not by ten cents on the dollar but by $2,000 at a jump, I want to say that the minister's proposals for taxing the plain people for the necessaries of life will be absolutely rejected when the people have an opportunity of expressing themselves. I want to protest on behalf of the people who have to buy shoes for large families. The minister is going to make it impossible for poor people to get shoes. You know, Sir, that you cannot buy a pair of shoes for $9. Any hon. gentleman who has bought a pair of shoes within the past month will agree with me that a very ordinary pair of footwear will cost at least $12 or $14. Are you going to make the man who can least afford it, pay ten cents on every dollar he pays for shoes? Are you going to tax the man who has to pay $45 for his suit? Who, Sir, will be most affected by this tax? I see my hon. friends opposite smiling; but the Minister of Finance and his colleagues are compelling the boys who went overseas, who saved this country to us and have made it possible for us to enjoy the privileges which we enjoy at the present time, to pay a large portion of this taxation. The soldiers who are returning to civil life will be the ones most affected. Their wardrobes were wiped out of existence when they went overseas; they now find it necessary, upon their return, to buy suits and other necessary articles of clothing, and they will be the first to dig down into their pockets and pay these taxes as a result of the sins and extravagances of the Government of the day. I appeal to the Minister of Finance to exempt thes soldiers of this country who have obtained their honourable discharge from payment of these ridiculous and unfair taxes that he is levying on the people. I make this appeal in all sincerity, and I believe that it will be backed up by members of Parliament and by every citizen of Canada.

Let me also appeal to the minister on behalf of the women, particularly the young women who have only themselves to depend upon for their support, and many of whom are to-day trying to save a little money for the purpose of buying a coat to keep them warm during next winter. Sir, you cannot buy a coat that is respectable for less than $50; not a member of this House can buy a coat for his wife at less than that amount. Why, then, should the Government compel those who are in

humbler circumstances to appear on the streets clothed differently from those who are fortunate enough to have greater privileges, greater earning capacity? Let me say a word also on behalf of those women who are working in the shops, in the different department stores, possibly some in the kitchens, who have their troubles in getting along in this life. Is it not ridiculous that the Minister of Finance should extract from them a tax of ten per cent on a $50 garment while at the same time the profiteers are escaping any extraction from them of amounts that should go into the public treasury? If a returned man is married, he has to pay a greater bulk of these taxes, because he will have to buy clothes for his wife as well as to buy clothes befitting his own position. There are other ways of raising revenue to carry on the affairs of this country than this method which the minister has adopted. I saw in the press the other day an intimation to the effect that the minister intends to visit within a short time the old historic city of Kingston, which did him the honour of electing him by acclamation. In all likelihood, the minister will go there on the first of July, after Parliament prorogues, when all kinds of sports will be going on; when the school boys will be competing with one another in friendly games on the ball diamond. The minister will go around in his limousine or expensive motor car. He will drive up to the ball park, and how will he feel, Sir, when the boys look at him and say: "That fellow charged us ten per cent on the baseball that just went over the plate." Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that he will feel proud when the boys say that the broken bat could not be replaced; it had cost two dollars and, having no gate receipts or funds on hand, the boys could not get the $2.20 which, with the tax, a new bat would cost? Will it not be rather humiliating to the minister when he is faced with this condition in connection with legitimate sports throughout the country? Teams that are made up in the schools and in the factories for the purpose of engaging in innocent amusement, the members of which have no treasury to draw upon, no gate receipts with which to purchase supplies, will find this tax bear heavily upon them; the boys will have to go down into their little pants' pockets and pay out every cent they get in the purchase of balls and bats and gloves and the little uniforms that they require. I say, Sir, that it is small potatoes on the part of the Government, on the part of the Parliament of Canada, to extract from these children these small amounts, when legitimate sports are so badly needed and should be encouraged by every good citizen.

Let me read a brief quotation from a newspaper editorial before I resume my seat. I know that my hon. friends will not question any editorial appearing in the Toronto Globe, because no journal in this country fought behind them more strongly, more faithfully or more honourably at the time of the election which placed them in power. The Globe says, under the caption, "Bad News for Profiteers," referring to a despatch from England concerning a proposed special levy on war-created fortunes:

> A real shell exploded last week with the announcement that the committee—
>
> A committee of the British House of Commons
>
> —not only thinks the proposal practicable, but has devised a plan whereby $2,750,000,000 can be collected from 75,000 war profiteers.
>
> A nice tidy sum, that, for the Chancellor of the Exchequer. There will be no tears of compassion in his eyes at the thought of adding it to the credit side of his Budget. He is more likely to be smiling at the prospect.

What a splendid position our Minister of Finance would have been in had he had the courage to stand up in this Parliament and, instead of extracting from people in humble circumstances a ten and twenty per cent tax, provide for a levy on the war profiteers of Canada! Estimating the population of Canada as one-quarter of that of Great Britain, a tax of this kind would result in placing $500,000,000 in the treasury. That would put you on Easy street, and only a few would feel sore. Those affected might not contribute to the support of members of the House of Commons at an election, but those members would have the support of the masses of the people for all time to come.

Mr. HOCKEN: Has that policy been adopted in Britain?

Mr. McCOIG: Has the hon. member any reason to say that it has not?

Mr. HOCKEN: Yes, I have.

Mr. McCOIG: I would like to have your proof.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hocken) would not be in order in speaking at this stage.

Mr. McCOIG: I do not know why the hon. member should dispute it. The state-

ment appears in the editorial column of one of the most reputable newspapers of Canada, published in the city from which my hon. friend (Mr. Hocken) comes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Read it again.

Mr. McCOIG: I will send the clipping over to my hon. friend.

Mr. HOCKEN: The British Governmnet has not acted.

Mr. McCOIG: I will read it again, in case the hon. member wants to copy it in the Orange Sentinel next week:

A real shell exploded last week with the announcement that the committee not only thinks—

An hon. MEMBER: "The Committee?"

Mr. McCOIG: A committee of the House of Commons appointed to investigate this matter.

Mr. CURRIE: No, a committee of the Treasury officials.

Mr. McCOIG: Does the hon. member (Mr. Hocken) wish me to read the article?

Mr. HOCKEN: Surely.

Mr. McCOIG: It continues:

—not only thinks the proposal practicable, but has devised a plan whereby $2,750,000,000 can be collected from 75,000 war profiteers.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HOCKEN: Has that been adopted by the British Government?

Mr. McCOIG: Well, the hon. member will realize that I have not all the details, but it is quite evident that it has, because reputable newspapers all over the country have referred to it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. McCOIG: Then I put this question to the hon. member: Is he opposed to extracting from the war profiteers some of the profits that they made?

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule is very clear that an hon. member who is speaking may, if he gives his consent thereto, be interrupted by another hon. member who wishes to put a question to him. But in no case can an hon. member who is speaking interrogate other hon. members who are in their seats.

Mr. CURRIE: I think the hon. member knows he is wrong now.

Mr. McCOIG: If the hon. member for Toronto West (Mr. Hocken) is satisfied with saying—and I saw him shake his head—that he is not in favour of collecting from the war-time profiteers—

Mr. HOCKEN: I did not say that.

Mr. McCOIG: Well, if he is in favour of collecting from the war-time profiteers, let him join with us on this side of the House in demanding that the Government impose a tax on these war-time profiteers and thus increase the revenues of this country.

These are, to a very large extent, the reasons why I am on this occasion assuring the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) that I will support his amendment and any other amendment brought in by any hon. member for the purpose of assisting in reducing the tariff on the necessaries of life, so as to give us every opportunity of producing as much as possible with a view to making the cost of living in this country as cheap as possible to the Canadian consumers.

Mr. JOHN A. MAHARG (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, before entering into a discussion of the Budget, I should like to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) on his frankness in laying before Parliament and the people of Canada the exact situation in which we find ourselves from a financial point of view. I should also like to congratulate him on what appears to me to be a brave attempt in some respects to secure additional revenue. I cannot go so far as to congratulate him on all of the methods he proposes in order to secure this revenue; I only wish I could. No doubt, he is making an honest attempt to curtail extravagant expenditure; but as the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) has said, the relief he hopes to give to some and his belief that those more able to pay will be called upon to do so, will, I am afraid fall far short of the mark. His estimates of values of goods when they become luxuries or not real necessities, might apply to warmer climates; but they are, in the main, rather too low for a country with the temperatures we have. They may, however, be, in his opinion, the right values to put on these goods, and we shall leave the matter at that. He might have gone just a little further, and while he purposes making those pay who are able to do so, he might have made it a little easier for those to whom he wishes to afford relief to get along. His Budget makes no provision for lowering the daily or monthly cost of living of the average workingman, the average individual, be he a labourer

in town or a labourer on the farms. This Budget will not make any reduction in the monthly bills of such a man; on the contrary, I believe it will increase them to a certain extent, and I do not think that is what the minister purposed doing. He might have gone a little further and substantially reduced, if not entirely wiped out the tariff on the necessaries of life, particularly as regards foodstuffs. We, as producers of food, which is practically our entire production, are quite prepared to give the consumer the entire world for his market in which to buy his necessaries of life so far as food is concerned. The Minister of Finance might also have gone a little further and made some reductions in the tariff on other necessaries of life. Taking into consideration the climatic conditions he might have made it easier for a man to keep his family warm during the long winter months we have in this country. I will not dwell on this matter any further than to draw attention to the fact that the Budget of the Minister of Finance is not going to accomplish what I think he intends it should do.

Another point that I wish to touch on, apart from the Budget entirely, is this, namely, that the discussion that has taken place and the sources that it has come from in this House must surely furnish food for thought for the average individual in Canada. We have heard the statement made that political expediency has largely governed the actions of Government as well as of individuals in this country; and when we see men who in former years were ardent supporters of tariff reductions taking, as the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) has just stated, a complete somersault and now advocating protection, there must be something worthy of consideration at the bottom of the matter. We have often heard it stated that a certain number of Liberals remain within the Liberal party in order that they may control that party. I am not going to say whether that is true or not. The year 1911 brough a number of that type of Liberals to the front and their position became clear, and I hope 1920 will bring the balance, if there are any, to the front, so that the people of Canada may know exactly where they stand. Such disclosures are being made from time to time, and the position of a number of such Liberals has been disclosed. There may be obvious reasons for this. We hear of large mergers taking place these days and of certain concerns represented by certain hon. gentlemen being interested in those mergers, and there may be something in that. We shall, however, leave the matter at that, and no doubt time will disclose just to what extent that condition of affairs exists.

I desire to touch briefly on the remarks of one or two hon. members who have taken part in this debate. In the first place, I want to deal briefly with a few of the remarks made by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) who, I am glad, is in his seat, although I can assure him I am not going to say anything that will be annoying to him. While addressing the House my hon. friend gave us a large number of comparisons of conditions, his remarks and his comparisons being almost entirely as regards the Mother Country, Germany and the United States. He held Germany and the United States up as models, England on the other hand being in every case at the bottom. He gave us figures and percentages without end, but his figures and percentages amount to absolutely nothing unless the full conditions are understood. He first dealt with the wheat production and importation of Great Britain in an endeavour to show that Great Britain did not compare with other European countries, of which he mentioned several, in the matter of production of wheat. He stated, if I understood him aright, that during the year previous to the war Great Britain imported 215,000,000 bushels of wheat and produced 57,000,000 bushels, making a total of 272,000,000 bushels. The House will readily see that Great Britain did not import all that wheat for her own consumption; otherwise, she would have been consuming per capita almost double as much wheat as any other country in the world. Canada is considered one of the largest consumers of wheat, and our consumption is in the neighbourhood of five bushels per capita. What did Great Britain do with that wheat? I want to tell the hon. gentleman that he has no doubt eaten some of that wheat that was imported into the Old Country, ground into flour, made into biscuits, and sold to him in his own city at a price equal to, if not less than, the Canadian-made article. That is one of Great Britain's ways of doing business. She thrives on this importation and exportation, and it is that which has made her what she is. I just give that illustration to show that unless you have all the figures and understand fully the conditions, such a huge array of percentages and figures as the hon. member gave count for nothing.

I might go a little further. The hon. gentleman—and I am very sorry he made this comparison—endeavoured to hold Great

Britain up as a land almost of paupers. He mentioned the thousands and thousands of paupers there were in that country, and in his comparison he took the year 1914 for England and the year 1910 for the United States. Now we all recollect very well what hardships there were in our own country in 1914, and how in 1910 this country was flourishing as it had not done before for years. But in 1912 and 1913, which is about the period the hon. gentleman took for England, we find that in our own country municipalities and provinces were furnishing funds to give employment. I know of hundreds of thousands of tons of rock being crushed, even though it could not be used at the time, but was merely piled up, in order to give employment to our people. I think the hon. gentleman should have taken these conditions into consideration in making his comparison.

Mr. MANION: I explained when I gave those figures that the reason I took 1910 for the United States was that I could get no figures for 1914 for that country.

Mr. MAHARG: But the hon. gentleman said that it did not make any difference anyway, comparing 1910 in the United States with 1914 in Great Britain.

Mr. MANION: I do not think it would make very much difference.

Mr. MAHARG: There are paupers and paupers, and some countries do not worry very much about them until the paupers are amongst them, in the curb or some other similar place, when institutions have to be provided for them. Other countries let people shift for themselves and keep no records of their paupers. This should be borne in mind when studying the hon. gentleman's comparison.

The hon. gentleman also compared the railways of England with those of other countries, and here again, unless the actual conditions are understood, figures and percentages count for nothing. He instanced the capitalization per mile of railroads in England. Probably the hon. gentleman has travelled more miles in England than I have, and he must have observed that there is absolutely no comparison between the roadbed and facilities along the railroads in England, which he tried to show up in their worst light, and those in the United States or Canada. The roadbed of the railroads in England and the speed at which the trains go is absolutely different from the conditions that prevail in this country. Were the light trains that are used on the roads in England hurled across our roads at the speed at which they go there, they would be in the ditch before they had got up speed. He must also remember that it is service that counts. To give only one illustration, the roads running into the city of London bring in almost as many people to work each day as there are in the city itself. Millions of people are brought in to the city in the morning to work, and are taken out in the evening. The roads there are built for service and they give service, and where you get service, rates are a secondary consideration. The hon. gentleman also gave the cost per ton mile. Here again his comparison was entirely misleading, unless you are familiar with the conditions. Let me give just one illustration: Previous to the war it cost more to take a bushel or a carload of wheat across the province of Saskatchewan by short haul, similar to what they have in England, than it took to transport it from the province of Saskatchewan to the port of Liverpool. That shows that it is the length of haul that counts, and not the circumstances as the hon. gentleman gave them.

Mr. CURRIE: Is not the high cost of hauling a bushel or a carload of wheat across the Prairie Provinces due to the arrangement made by the Government with some of the provinces for a fixed price between Fort William and Winnipeg?

Mr. MAHARG: I presume the hon gentleman refers to the deal that the province of Manitoba made with one of the American lines. He will remember that that applied only to a portion of Manitoba, and also that this Parliament abrogated the agreement some two sessions ago. That agreement is not now in existence, if I understand the legislation that was passed, so it has no effect whatever on the rate for the short haul within the provinces, or on the long haul from any point in Saskatchewan either to Fort William or to Liverpool.

I think it would have been only fair if the hon. gentleman had made a few comparisons with what England had done after the war started. His comparisons related to the period previous to the war for the most part, and he made no comparisons with what England did after the war started, when the great morale which the hon. gentleman has spoken of in these protected countries was put to a very severe test. What do we find Great Britain did after the war started? The very first thing she did was to send over to the continent her "Contemptible Little Army"—as described by a German officer—of 300,000 men, which held back the Germans for days and

weeks and months. It was only
4 p.m. a short time afterwards, that free-trade Britain was financing these high-tariff countries which the hon. gentleman referred to the other day. Great Britain kept on financing them out of her own resources, and loaned money to them to a far greater amount than her borrowings from the United States. Great Britain did more than that. She broke the back of Germany while that other country which the hon. gentleman used in his comparison stood looking on, almost to the finish. It reminds me of a little incident I happened to witness once in a home. A mouse had made its appearance in the kitchen, where a little girl of tender years and her father happened to be at the time. While the father undertook to catch the mouse the little girl safely perched herself on a chair, and after he had succeeded in catching and killing the mouse, the little girl at once called to her mother upstairs "we have got the mouse." That was very much the position that country which he was comparing to England was in at the close of the war. What is England doing to-day? England today is paying the freight on the food that the United States has been good enough to sell to the people in Europe to keep them from starving. I do not think we need to go much farther—

Mr MICHAEL CLARK: The loyal party.

Mr. MAHARG: We could give comparison after comparison with the little free trade country that was held up and which came out of the bottom of the list but which holds a very prominent position no matter in what respect you may wish to compare it. The hon. gentleman made comparisons as to the advancement of agriculture in Great Britain. What has Great Britain had to do since she adopted the free trade policy? She has had to break down and she has broken down to a certain extent, the greatest land monopoly that any country ever had to contend with. First of all she had to break down the system and get possession of the land. What did she do in connection with Ireland? She spends hundreds of millions of pounds for the purchase of land on behalf of the agriculturists of Ireland. England had to break down this system before she could start building up again. Great Britain is not recognized as a producer of cereals. She is a land of pasturage; it does not pay her to produce cereals and she only turned to the production of cereals owing to the necessities of war, and no country, not even Canada or the United States, has increased its production of food stuffs to a greater extent than did Great Britain during the years of the war. I do not think we need go any farther. It was not because she could not do it but because there were better lines of business for her to follow.

I do not wish to take up too much of the time of the House but there were one or two remarks of some other hon. gentlemen that I wish to refer to. The hon. gentleman who has just preceded me (Mr. McCoig) has relieved me of considerable trouble in this respect, but he did not go quite far enough in some lines. The hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) yesterday gave us very largely a repetition of what we got at our last regular session in regard to the farmers' movement. That was answered pretty fully, I think, at that time, and I am not going to detain the House with a repetition of what was said then. Once is surely enough. But he made further some statements that are not correct and which I intend to deal with. The hon. gentleman who has preceded me touched on one of these and that is the Wheat Board. We did not ask for the Wheat Board. The inference, if not the statement is to the effect that the farmers asked for the Wheat Board. One hon. member described it as the pooling of our wheat. While the hon. member from Kent (Mr. McCoig) stated that the Government appointed the Wheat Board I want to go further and say that the Government did it against the strong opposition of the farmers of this country. The farmers did not want it and they did not ask for it. But if the Government stepped in, took possession and broke down the lines which had been built up financially and otherwise, and if there is pooling in the buying of wheat overseas, we have no hesitation in saying that we consider it the proper course for our Government to carry out pooling in the selling of wheat, just so long at least as there was pooling in buying from us. We know where this comes from, we know whom the hon. gentleman from Vancouver Centre is speaking for. He is speaking for those who want to get back to the old speculative methods of dealing in wheat. We know who they are and to what lengths the ramifications of their influence extend. They have secured possession of a portion of the press of Western Canada, they have got their tentacles into almost every branch of western business. Behind this movement is a most powerful company, and what has been said by this hon. gentleman

is only an echo of the editorials appearing in the press controlled by them, and it is about time the people of this country knew why this campaign was being carried on and why the hon. gentleman is knocking the farmers' movement. It is simply to make it possible for the speculators to get back into action and to mulct the consumers as well as the producers in connection with the marketing of grain. The present system is in the interest not only of the producer but of the consumer. Just so long as the pooling arrangement exists on the other side where our wheat is marketed, we must have a similar arrangement here; if governments are going to buy the governments will have to sell.

There was one other remark that was made yesterday to which I wish to refer. An hon. gentleman undertook to castigate the farmers rather severely and to say that they were dealing in American implements only. He is right to a certain extent. There is no doubt that they are dealing in American implements very largely, but there is a reason for it. Twelve or fourteen years ago we organized a company—not the company that was spoken of here yesterday but a local company—to handle necessaries in connection with our farms such as implements and so on, but not necessarily retail shelf goods. We organized and incorporated that company, but what did we find? We found that there was not a Canadian manufacturer who would sell us one agricultural implement of any kind. You could not even buy a hand cultivator. We had to go to the United States. We had to go as far south as Tennessee to buy a plough. And what did we find? We found that we could buy a three-furrow plough, pay freight and duty into our country and sell that plough at less than we had been paying for a two-furrow plough. That is the exact situation. If any gentleman wants to blame us for that, well and good; we are quite prepared to justify our action in doing what we did. We were the victims of circumstances, we had to do it and we did it. The manufacturers say that we must have a tariff to raise revenue. If that is a fact, how are you going to get your revenue if you do not go outside and buy a few of the articles that you require? It is absolutely inconsistent, because if you have to get a revenue in that way you have to import. However, that was not the reason in this case; we went out of the country simply because the manufacturers in this country absolutely refused to sell to us.

[Mr. Maharg.]

I cannot agree with the Budget now before the House in many respects. In some respects I believe it is along the right line but it does not go far enough to meet the conditions of the country at the present time. I hope the minister may see fit during the consideration of the resolutions in committee to make some changes. I have spoken to him about some changes that he agrees with me would be only fair and when the resolutions come into committee we will look into these matters. I am not going to touch upon them at this particular time as I have the assurance of the minister that if there is any unfairness it will be dealt with, and I am quite prepared to take the minister at his word.

As to the feeling in the country towards the Budget I have been travelling a little recently; I have been in some of the Ontario centres within the last day or two; and have been talking to a lot of people. They were not farmers, they were business and professional men, following different professions, some were labour men. I asked them for no information whatever; it was all volunteered to me. Both the professional man and the labouring man informed me that this Budget afforded no relief to them, not even to the labouring man, but that it was going to make it harder for them. I hope the minister will take into consideration the values that he has placed on some of these articles when we are in committee. I think that the minister's valuation is too low on some things. I do not care how hard he hits some articles that are really luxuries, and that are not indispensable to the community; but with respect to wearing apparel, boots and shoes, and similar articles, I am convinced that it is not economical buying at the present time to purchase below the figures which the minister has named.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Mr. Speaker, there appears to be no response from hon. gentleman opposite, therefore we on this side will continue the debate, as the last word on this question has not yet been uttered. I listened with much interest on Tuesday last to the speech of the Minister of Finance dealing with the condition of the country and the financial proposals of the Government. In commencing my remarks I wish to congratulate the minister on his decision to stop borrowing and in future to pay his way. The financial methods in vogue in this country during the last four

or five years, by which the public debt has been rolling up like a snowball, were a matter of grave concern to every man who cared about the future of the country. The task of my hon. friend at this period of our history is not an easy one. In addition to providing for the war debt, it falls to his lot to teach the rudiments of economy to an Administration that has always been accustomed to "dash away and spend the money." This habit of extravagance they contracted before my hon. friend became a member of the ministry. We on this side sympathize with the minister in the position in which he is placed, and would like to help him if we could. It must be a very uncomfortable experience to be seated on an empty chest by the side of bottomless deficits fishing for a Budget. The Government professes to stand for economy in theory, why not also stand for economy in practice? In the remarks that I am about to make regarding the expenditures of the Government it may appear as though I were attacking the Administration. This is not my purpose. My main object is to give my humble contribution in the direction of checking the prevailing extravagance and preventing waste. The real friends of the Government are the men who tell them the truth; the worst enemies they have are the people who flatter them. I see no good reason why this Government should be immune from criticisms. It is far from perfect. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell)—who comes nearer to being a saint than any of the rest of the ministers—does not claim perfection.

Mr. McMASTER: Pretty nearly, though.

Mr. SINCLAIR: He would be the first to admit that the Government is only human. They were human, and subject to the frailties of human nature before that distinguished group of Conservative-Liberals who are now supporting the Administration joined them and you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that no archangels have been added to the Cabinet since that date.

Now we are told that we have maintained a record of industrial and commercial prosperity in Canada during the year; but it is difficult to conceive of a country being really prosperous that is going in debt at the rate of one million dollars a day.

The Minister of Finance told us on Tuesday that the addition to the debt during the year was $395,000,000, which is more than a million dollars a day. I wish to tell my hon. friend that this kind of prosperity will soon come to an end. The prodigal son appeared to be very prosperous at the start. He left home with good clothes on his back, with good shoes on his feet, and his pockets full of money. He had not earned the money himself and he did not know its value. Like my hon. friends on the treasury benches opposite he spent his money in riotous living, it was soon exhausted, and he was forced to adjust his expenditure to his income as hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches are now also compelled to do. I presume the Finance Minister is familiar with the philosophy of Mr. Micawber:

> Income, £50. Expenditure, £49 19s. 6d. Result, happiness.
>
> Income, £50. Expenditure, £50 0s. 6d. Result, misery.

Permit me to call a witness on this question of expenditure. I am not now referring to war expenditure but to the ordinary expenditure of the Government apart from war. I presume there is no newspaper in Canada which is more friendly to this Government than the Montreal Gazette. That newspaper, however, is a candid friend, and when the Government turns aside on the broad road the Gazette does not hesitate to draw attention to the fact. The Montreal Gazette of January 15, in an editorial on the financial record of the Administration, after pointing out that the revenue for the year shows an increase, goes on to say:

> The record of the expenditure is less satisfactory. There are increases noted in every item of the ordinary outlays from consolidated fund, which include the cost of the administrative services and maintenance of ordinary public works and buildings, etc. Outside of war, it will be seen, the outlays in the nine months of 1919 were almost double those of the like period of 1918.

At a later date, on February 9, we find the following editorial pronouncement in the Gazette. Referring to the Union party the Gazette says:

> The Conservative party we know, and the Liberal party, and the Farmers' party, but who art thou, may be asked of the Union party. It is a party that has outlived its usefulness, a party that having accomplished its purpose is reverting electorally into its original elements. It is said of some species of beings, that the head being severed, the body still retains animation; in the case of the Union Government it may be that the head survives the body. The Government is about to meet Parliament and endeavour to prolong its life by adopting the line of least resistance, avoiding large controversial questions, and postponing to a more propitious season concurrence in a policy, and preparation for a campaign. The art of government is most difficult, under the best of auspices, but a leaderless ministry, destitute of policy, must be the despair of its friends. The public memory is short, and public gratitude an

unknown quantity. The electorate requires a guide, a policy, an association with those who invite its confidence; and the Government offers neither guidance nor principles, nor familiarity with the people. The situation is not suddenly precipitated. It began with the conclusion of the war, since when futile efforts at permanent coalition have more than once been made, and minister after minister has dropped out with no successor to his place, until the situation has become difficult for the Government and despondent to its supporters.

Now, Sir, we have here a picture of a chicken with its head off, gasping and winking its eye to make believe it is still alive. That is an extraordinary picture to come from a friendly newspaper which had a great deal to do with bringing this Union Government into existence. The Gazette tells us that this is a leaderless ministry destitute of policy and the despair of its friends. That is strong language, but no one in Canada is in a better position to know the facts than the Montreal Gazette. Other newspapers have been even more emphatic than the Gazette, but the Government pay no attention. I have in my desk a very interesting little book which I found in the library. The title is, "Recreations of an Historian." It was written by George M. Trevellyan. He describes an after dinner discussion in London many years ago participated in by a number of eminent literary men, of whom Thomas Carlyle was one. The question was whether protests in the press and in books have any effect on public conduct. These philosophers decided among themselves that these public protests and criticisms had no effect whatever. They simply read them and then threw them into some thirty-two-dollar waste-paper basket and forget all about them. Carlyle who had been silent up to that moment, took his pipe out of his mouth and made the following remark:

> There was a man once named Rousseau who wrote a book on political questions. The nobles of that country laughed, but the next edition was bound in their skins.

It occurred to me that something like that, in a figurative sense might happen to the present Government. Now, Sir, the people have been asked to produce and save and many of them are honestly trying to do so. But what about the Government? War expenditure is inevitable, but what excuse can there be for increasing the ordinary expenditures of the Government by over $100,000,000 during the past year? Can there be any excuse for that enormous addition to our public expenditure? Now here are the figures. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance at page 2561 of Hansard the other day told us that the expenditure on ordinary account for the year ending March 31, 1920, was $336,741,110. Not one dollar of this is for war. When we turn to Public Accounts, page 9, for last year's expenditures, that is, for the year ending 31st March, 1919, we find the expenditure on ordinary account to be $232,731,282. Subtract the one from the other and you have an addition to our expenditure for the past year over the former year of $104,009,828. When the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) last year told us that any further cash advance to the soldiers would bankrupt the country, every one expected that the knife would be applied. But, Mr. Speaker, economy seems to be a despised and forgotten thing so far as this Administration is concerned. I have read to you a quotation from the Gazette. Now I want to call another friendly witness. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy) in his New Year's message to the people of Nova Scotia used the following language:

> Whether rightly or wrongly, there exists a widespread opinion that due care is not exercised in Government expenditure. The feeling is daily growing stronger that the Government expenditure should be cut down and that the public estimates should be scrutinized and revised with a firmness never before exercised.

I submit that the hon. member for Colchester is right; expenditures must be cut down if we are to remain solvent, and in many cases they should be cut not with a blue pencil but with an axe. I submit, Sir, that up to this date there has been no sincere attempt on the part of the Government to carry out the views of my hon. friend the member for Colchester. You will find proof of this if you refer to the Estimates of the present year. Let me cite you one or two examples. The Government are proposing to vote for the Canadian Press, Limited, the sum of $50,000, and for the Canadian Associated Press $20,000, in all $70,000. I am opposed, Sir, to subsidizing the newspapers; I regard it as a vicious policy. The moment you begin to subsidize newspapers you strike a blow at their independence. There is the same objection to subsidizing the press as there is to subsidizing the church; both should be absolutely free. We are told that a similar amount will be contributed by the British Government. If that is so, Mr. Speaker, let me say distinctly that it is humiliating not only to the press of Canada but to the people as well to have the British taxpayers called upon to contribute money to the Canadian newspapers. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that Canada is a nation. Well, if so, let us act with becoming

dignity, and let the Canadian press deal with this matter as a business venture. What does my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) expect to get for this $70,000 of the people's money? I have no doubt that he expects to get $70,000 worth of propaganda. His plan is to teach the toddling public in Canada what they are to think about Imperial matters. Now, Sir, what is propaganda? I am not sure that I can give you a definition, but to speak frankly, my idea is that in a general way propaganda is tainted news, and the less we have of it the better. Sir, one grain of truth is worth a ton of propaganda. If, on the other hand, the object of the President of the Council is to strengthen the tie that binds us to the Old Country, then I say it is unnecessary. Those ties are already strong and they had better be left alone, we do not make them any stronger by talking about them. This constant chatter about loyalty to the Old Land and the old flag becomes tiresome and reminds me of Mark Twain's domestic hero, who boasted that he never jumped on his mother. Then we have such items in the Estimates as the following: Trent Valley Canal, $400,000; Toronto Harbour and Toronto Breakwater, $1,900,000; Canadian representation at Washington, $80,000; and scores of others. Now, these expenditures may be popular in the localities interested, and with an overflowing revenue there might be some justification for them; but no Canadian business would suffer if they were delayed for some time to come. Then again, we are asked to vote $150,000 for salaries and expenses of the Board of Commerce. I put it to you, Sir: Is this a useful expenditure? Is this Board of Commerce worth $150,000 of the Canadian people's money? If it is not worth the money then let us dismiss the board and save that sum. Interest on war debt must be paid; our obligations to our soldiers and the dependents of the soldiers must be discharged; but who will say that the Trent Valley Canal must now be built or that a playground must immediately be provided for the good people of Toronto? The taxpayers of the country are always willing to back up any productive enterprise, but they are not anxious to go to the poorhouse in order to serve sectional interests. The people do not realize how their money is being spent. A gentleman talking to me the other day about this very point, said that if the Canadian taxpayer could come to Ottawa and see for himself how his money was being spent he would take an apoplectic fit. Now, Sir, I want to give a few more striking items. Here are one or two: Classification of the Civil Service, $108,173 57; New York News Agency, $30,000; one-half expense of Royal Commission relating to Indian Lands in British Columbia $317,797.68.

Mr. CAHILL: And no settlement.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend is quite correct. The whole proceedings were practically useless. Expense of Canadian Trade Mission to England—this was nothing more or less than a free gift to the Manufacturers' Association — $123,410.36. And if you turn to page 646 of Hansard you will find an item of $24,194,639.78 for Canada's Merchant Marine. This amount was spent between April 1, 1919, and March 1, 1920, eight or nine months after the war ended. No tenders were called for; contracts were given out to friends of the Government at a very high price,—straight Government patronage to friends and supporters. Or turn to page 1158, where reference is made to a payment of $60,775.38 to the Gazette newpaper company of Montreal, and $25,373.69 to La Patrie newspaper company, also of Montreal, at the very time when five hundred employees were doing nothing in the Printing Bureau at Ottawa,—employees who are now being dismissed because, I understand, there is nothing for them to do.

The Government are constantly devising new methods for spending money. My hon. friend, the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell), is an adept at this kind of invention. I believe that this is the first Government in the history of the world that has had the temerity to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money for the purpose of publishing flattering notices about themselves.

Mr. McMASTER: Shame.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The Department of Public Information was organized for political purposes and for no other purpose. The President of the Council gave it a high-sounding name, but that deceived nobody. The department proved to be very expensive, but when the facts were exposed at the last session of Parliament he himself became ashamed of it and promised that he would discontinue it. It lasted from the 9th day of November, 1917, until the 31st day of December, 1919. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, the significant date on which it started,—the 9th day of November, 1917. During that period this Department cost the country $200,986.54. Now, whatever value it may have had as a political agency

to assist the Union Government, he would be a bold man who would say that it was worth two hundred cents to the people of Canada. At the last session the President of the Council said that he would abolish it. Instead of abolishing it, as he said he would, he continued it under a new name. That fact is disclosed by the following questions and answers:

Is Mr. M. E. Nichols, formerly Director of Public Information, still in the employ of the Government?

Mr. Rowell: Yes.

If so, what is his position, what are his duties, and what salary is he being paid?

Mr. Rowell: Director of Information, Department of External Affairs. Salary, $5,000 per annum.

Last year he was "Director of Public Information"; this year he is "Director of Information." The man is the same; the master is the same; the salary is the same; the duties are the same; everything is the same, except the name; he is now "Director of Information."

But that is not all. The President of the Council not only kept the Department of Information alive under a new name; he started a new one in New York under Colonel John A. Cooper. A few weeks ago I asked for information about this new method of spending money and the minister in his reply referred me to an Order in Council dated July 17, 1919. I secured a copy of that Order in Council and it was disclosed, to my astonishment, that the money to pay the salary of this gentleman and his staff was improperly taken out of the money voted by Parliament for war purposes. Let me read the Order in Council:

P.C. 1480.

One thousand four hundred and eighty; I suppose that indicates the number of Orders in Council passed during the year up to that date.

Certified copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 17th July, 1919.

The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, advise that pursuant to paragraph 4 of the Order in Council of the 24th February, 1919, P.C. 265—Lieutenant-Colonel John A. Cooper, Toronto, Ontario, of the 198th Overseas Battalion, be appointed Director of Canadian News Service at New York, at a salary of five thousand ($5,000) dollars per annum.

The committee on the same recommendation further advise that the Director of Canadian News Service at New York shall be under the supervision of the Canadian War Mission at Washington or of such representative of the Canadian Government at Washington as shall hereafter be appointed.

The committee on the same recommendation also advise that the salaries and expenses—

[Mr. J. H. Sinclair.]

This is the point.

—of the office to be established for the purposes set forth in the said Order in Council of the 24th February, 1918, be paid out of the demobilization appropriation through the Department of External Affairs.

Rodolphe Boudreau,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

Mr. McMASTER: What is the date of that?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: July 17, 1919. This money was voted for the defence and security of Canada and for the demobilization of our forces. Parliament was not told that any part of this vote would be used for the purpose of finding soft jobs for political favourites. This is a violation of a well-established principle, a principle that has prevailed in Great Britain since the days of Edward III, that money must be spent by the executive for the purpose for which that money was voted by Parliament and for no other. When I placed the question on the Order Paper I asked who this gentleman, Colonel John A. Cooper, was. I have since discovered that he is one of those vermiculating patriots who figured in the election of 1917. He was returning officer at Witley Camp, and when the ballot box over which he presided was opened it was discovered that it was stuffed with parcels of ballots that could not have possibly gone through the aperture. Over sixty per cent of the ballots in that box were illegally marked for constituencies in which the voters had no right to vote. You see, therefore, that it was necessary that something should be done to reward Colonel John A. Cooper. His job is to tell the American newspapers what smart men we have here in the Union Government. Here is a sample which appeared in a New York paper. I have no proof that this is from the pen of Colonel Cooper, but I suspect very strongly that it is. Anyway, this is how it reads:

That distinguished Canadian statesman, the Hon. N. W. Rowell, who is frequently mentioned as a probable successor to Sir Robert Borden, has arrived in the city en route to Washington, where he will represent Canada at the Labour Congress.

Now, this News Bureau is estimated to cost $30,000 per year, but as you can see, Mr. Speaker, a few items like that would show that the money was very well spent. These are merely sample bricks.

In regard to a large part of the public expenditure, hon. members can form no definite opinion, because they are denied reasonable information. When the Minister of Railways did not wish to tell his supporter from South Cape Breton (Mr. Doug-

las) what he was paying for coal for his ships in Halifax, he told the hon. member that the business was being carried on by a joint stock company and that the Department of Railways and Canals did not know anything about it. And even when information is given it is often of an uncertain and haphazard character; not only is it haphazard, but it sometimes looks extremely suspicious. Public money is spent without any account being given. Everybody remembers the case of DeWitt Foster, the man who got $72,000 to buy war horses in Nova Scotia. He is said to have purchased some old decrepit, spavined and blind horses in Nova Scotia, but the Government never got any account of the transactions. The point I want to make is that $72,000 was handed out to Mr. Foster and up to this date the Government do not know what he did with the money. After the investigation took place and that scandal was exposed, we had reason to hope that that system would be corrected, but that loose method of doing business seems to be still in vogue in the Militia Department. If proof is required of this, I would refer you to the fourth volume of the Auditor General's report which we were fortunate enough to get two or three days ago, at page ZZ-300. It would seem to be a common thing to peddle out money without asking the person who gets it what he is going to do with it. On page ZZ-300, these items are to be found:

Adams, H. A., Ste. Agathe: Advance unaccounted for	$ 50
Allen, James, Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	75

Then turning to page ZZ-301, the following items are to be found:

Boate, G. A., Ottawa: Advances to be accounted for in 1919-20	200
Campbell, Major R. G., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	150
Casey, J. F., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	50
Church, Lieut. G. W. F., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	200
Conrad, Lieut. F. B., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	$100
Donaldson, J. L., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	100
Dore, Ben, Ottawa: Advances unaccounted for	125

Then on page ZZ-302, these items are to be found:

Edwards, Lieut. T. F. R., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	150
Gilling, E. F., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	250
Haines, F. P., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	150
Harper, W. S., Ottawa: Advances unaccounted for	200

Then, turning to page ZZ-303:

Labbe, M. H., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	97
Lamrock, J. S., Hamilton: Advance unaccounted for	100
Layton, B. M., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	100
Lowe, Lieut. L., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	150
Mansbridge, A. S., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	100
Mesurier, A. L., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for in 1919-1920	200
Morris, Lieut. W. O., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	100
Munsey, W. S., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	100
McGinley, W. G., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	100
McNaughton, E. M., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	100

Turning to page ZZ-304:

Patterson, W. J., Ottawa: Advance unaccounted for	200

We have here no less than twenty-four cases on five pages of Volume IV of the Auditor General's report of men who received money nearly two years ago without its being accounted for.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Are there any expenses that are accounted for?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Certain expenses are accounted for, but these are items not accounted for. Although most of these men reside in Ottawa, nobody seems to have taken the trouble to call on them to find out what they did with this money, it would almost look as if any one could walk into the office of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and help himself and snap his fingers at the Auditor General. But that is not the worst. Enormous sums of money seem to have been sent overseas that are not accounted for. The Auditor General's reports for both last year and this year show that large sums of money have disappeared in London, no report of them having been given to Ottawa. Let us first look at the Auditor General's report of the 31st March, 1918, that is the one we got a year ago. On page ZZ-218, you will find an item of $119,546,597.93 for which no vouchers have been received, although the expenditure was apparently made in 1917. This year a similar item appears in the fourth volume of the Auditor General's report, page ZZ-228. The item this year is $129,308,233.14, less refunded—it appears that some of this came back to the treasury —$7,668,216.52, leaving a balance unaccounted for of $121,640,016.12. The only difference between the statement of a year ago and that of this year is that there is

an increase of about $2,000,000. No one will contend that it requires three years to produce vouchers in the Militia Department. The Auditor General is not to blame. In 1917 the Auditor General appears to have discovered that large sums were expended of which no account was given, and the late Auditor General, John Fraser, urged the Militia Department to take action. The department in Ottawa appears to have done so, but the trouble was with the department overseas. This is the correspondence:

AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE.

September 15, 1917.

Sir,—With reference to vouchers for expenditures in England, I have received no vouchers for 1917-18. It is necessary that these vouchers should be forwarded regularly to enable this office to properly check the accounts. Kindly let me know when I may receive vouchers covering expenditure for as late a date as possible.

I am sir,

Your obedient servant,

J. FRASER, A.G.

Deputy Minister for
Militia and Defence.

DEPARTMENT OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE,

Ottawa, September 24, 1917.

Sir,—Replying to your letter of the 15th instant regarding vouchers for expenditures in England, this matter has been taken up repeatedly with the authorities overseas, by cable and letter, but without much success. A memorandum has lately been prepared for the information of the Honourable the Minister, with a view to his communicating with the Minister Overseas. I trust that this will have the desired effect.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

E. F. JARVIS,
Acting D.M.

The Auditor General.

The Auditor General demanded these vouchers in 1917; he demanded them in 1918; he demanded them in 1919; we are now living in 1920, and apparently he has not the vouchers yet.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the amount?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The amount that has disappeared without any account having been given is, roughly speaking, $121,000,000. And the question now is—what has become of this $121,000,000? The minister does not know; the deputy does not know; the department does not know; the Auditor General does not know; and Parliament does not know. There is apparently not a scrap of paper in the possession of the Government to show what has become of that $121,000,000.

If, Sir, you desire further evidence of the brand of economy that is practised by this Government, look at the record of appointments to the Civil Service. Certain hon. gentlemen about the opening of the present session were boasting about the number of Government jobs that had been given out, and I took advantage of my privilege to ask this question:

How many appointments have been made by the Board of Civil Service Commissioners since the date of the Armistice?

The answer I got was:

Permanent	4,176
Temporary	22,954
	27,130

That is to say, commencing on the day of the Armistice up to the date that this question was asked, the board of the Civil Service Commissioners appointed more than fifty civil servants every day, including Sundays.

Mr. M. CLARK: And then the Government expect a reduction.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: But do they? It is incredible to me to think that 27 regiments of 1,000 each have been appointed to the Civil Service since the Armistice; but if you wish, Sir, to verify that statement, you can look at the answer given me by the Secretary of State as reported on page 324 of Hansard. In that answer I was informed that some of the 22,954 temporary appoints were for short periods, and in order to get all the facts correctly, I asked this second question:

How many of the 22,954 temporary appointees are still on the payroll of the Government?

I got no reply to that question. It was made into an order for a return, and I shall probably not get the answer until next year. The first question was answered within three or four days of the time I asked it. I do not want to be suspicious, but I am sure that it would have been much easier to answer that second question than the first one I asked. Not having received an answer to it, I shall have to make an estimate myself. The dismissals, I understand, were few. I think we can assume that 25,000 of the 27,130 are still on the pay-roll. If they are, and we estimate that they receive $1,000 each per year, that would add $25,000,000 to the expenditure on civil government for the year. But $1,000 is too little. I estimate that they will get on an average $2,000 apiece, and in that case the addition to our public expenditure

on that account for the year would be $50,000,000. Is it any wonder that the country is going into debt at the rate of a million dollars a day? And all this is in face of the fact that every department of the Government was overcrowded at the time that these appointments were being made.

With reference to the proposed tariff changes, all I have to say is that they are very meagre. The concessions to the consumer are very slight. There is not much in this Budget for the common man. His bread, his boots, his clothing, will not be any cheaper. The implements of production are still required to bear a very heavy burden. In camp-meeting parlance, which my hon. friend from Fraser Valley (Mr. Stacey) will understand, the concessions outlined in this Budget would be called "small mercies." I question very much if the farmer can be caught with that kind of chaff. Mr. Speaker, you have been brought up in town and are not as familiar with country life as I am, but no doubt you have been in the country sometimes on your holidays and you must have seen a farmer out in the pasture trying to catch a spirited horse with a handful of oats in his hat or in a tin basin. When he has caught the horse you must have seen him rub the horse's nose while he was getting the bit into his mouth and the throat strap securely buckled, and then pat him gently on the back preparatory to mounting him. I was just wondering if the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) could catch a low-tariff colt like my hon. friend from Strathcona (Mr. Douglas) or my hon. friend from Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan) with such a shabby dishful of oats as this. Take instead the Liberal tariff platform. Here it is:

That the best interests of Canada demand that substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance; First: diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; Second, reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country.

That, to these ends, wheat, wheat flour and all products of wheat; the principal articles of food; farm implements and machinery; farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and repair parts thereof; rough and partly dressed lumber; gasoline, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils; nets, net-twines and fishermen's equipments; cements and fertilizers, should be free from customs duties, as well as the raw material entering into the same.

That a revision downwards of the tariff should be made whereby substantial reductions should be effected in the duties on wearing apparel and footwear, and on other articles of general consumption (other than luxuries), as well as on the raw material entering into the manufacture of the same.

That the British preference be increased to 50 per cent of the general tariff.

And the Liberal party hereby pledges itself to implement by legislation the provision of this resolution when returned to power.

That, Sir, is the platform on which I stand, and the platform which I shall submit to my electors if I am a candidate at the next election. I regret that this platform does not meet the views of my hon. friend from Fraser Valley, although I understand he is a free trader in principle. The appeal he made last night on behalf of the British Columbia apple growers touched the hearts of hon. gentlemen opposite and he received a great deal of applause. I have been told that my hon. friend is a free trader in everything else excepting apples, but, as with our common ancestor while free trade is sound in principle, the temptation of the apple was too much for him. We fully recognize that the adoption of this tariff platform will result in a loss of revenue, but revenue must be secured and will be secured from some other source. This tariff platform is a great forward step and by taking this step at a time when revenue is so important the Liberal party have shown the courage of their convictions, and they have become to this extent the underwriters of progress and commercial freedom in this country.

But there is an even more important question than tariff reform, and that is the restoration of Parliamentary government in Canada. The election of 1917 was, to say the least, a very artificial affair. I do not believe the people of Canada had any idea at that time as to the kind of chicken they were hatching, and I believe they are now ready and anxious to rectify their mistake. Besides, Parliament, such as it is, is ignored, and the business of the country is carried on in secret conclave behind closed doors. The conclave itself has ceased to be a representative conclave. Our large French-speaking population is without representation in the Government, there being not a single cabinet minister, with the exception of the Prime Minister, from east of Montreal. It cannot be denied that this Government is hanging on to office without any mandate from the people. Unrest and distrust prevail to a greater degree than ever before. I submit that the remedy is a general election. Let the people decide. If the people are dis-

satisfied with this Government, as I think they are, let them have an opportunity to turn the Government out bag and baggage and replace them with a Government in which they will have confidence. Confidence always counts for more than police forces and criminal penalties. Would not every sane man in Canada welcome a return to the conditions that existed during that golden period in our country's history from 1896 to 1911—a period when the land was first reserved for the settler, instead of being granted to great railroad companies; a period in which were carved out and started on their splendid career the western provinces; a period when the stranger within our gates was made welcome and treated like a free man in a free country; a period of overflowing surpluses, instead of bottomless deficits; a period when we built railways out of revenue and tax-exempt bonds were unknown; a period when letters were carried for two cents and the Post Office Department showed a handsome surplus; a period when profiteering was rare and the workingman could eat bacon and eggs for breakfast and give his children butter instead of oleomargarine; a period when penal laws were few and the farmer's bee could stray into the sugar bowl without the farmer going to gaol for thirty days; a period when a man could blow his nose in his own way without asking the Secretary of State or the President of the Privy Council anything about it; a period when Parliament was consulted and Orders in Council were only resorted to in matters of routine; a period in which Canada first became known to the world as "daughter in her mother's house and mistress in her own." It was in short a period of fifteen years of good, clean, honest and progressive government. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that it is known as the golden period of Canada's history? Let us therefore ask the Canadian people whether they wish to perpetuate this present combination of decayed Conservatism and un-united Unionism, or whether they would prefer to place a new pilot in charge of the ship. Let the people decide, and we on this side of the House will cheerfully accept the verdict of the people, whatever that verdict may be.

5 p.m.

Mr. W. C. KENNEDY (North Essex): Mr. Speaker, like the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, I desire to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) upon his presentation of the financial affairs of this country. I think he should be congratulated also on the courage he displayed in accepting the post of Finance Minister because it did take great courage to take over the handling of the financial affairs of this Dominion at a time when the outstanding liabilities were in excess of $2,000,000,000 and there was a grave question as to whether the revenue would meet the growing expenditure. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has announced that he does not propose to emulate the example of his distinguished predecessor and go the public for a loan. Whatever he may think about it I have my doubts whether the public are in a mood to regard favourably such a proposition. As a matter of fact, I am of the opinion that the hon. gentleman would find the number of lenders in the country few and far between.

However, the hon. gentleman has two other fields of finance open to him; one is the proper imposition of taxation and the other is the collection of taxes so imposed, and I think the minister might with advantage give his attention to these two subjects. May I say in all fairness to my hon. friend that in so far as we on this side of the House are concerned, while the war was on, and indeed until such time as our soldiers returned, whether we approved of the expenditure of the Government or not, whether we believed that their expenditure was wise or judicious or whether we believed it was not, we felt it was our duty, until such time as our men came home, to support the Government in every way we could.

Now that the Government has declared its purpose to carry on, I feel that we on this side of the House would be inconsistent, to say the least, to oppose expenditures in this House as we have done in the past and then go to the country and ask the people to loan the Government money. Even if the men who loaned the Government money last fall, and who to-day would receive only $95 for the $100 which they invested in a bond, were disposed to invest in similar securities, I question if they would do it as I do not believe the Government has the confidence of the people. I think the evidence of that is in the recent by-elections. If it is necessary for the Government to obtain money, and they do not want to pay the high rates obtaining on the other side, there is only one source from which they can reasonably expect to obtain it and that is the bankers.

The Government have been pretty fair friends to the bankers in years past. In

a return which has been brought down I find that, during the period of the war and up to the 31st March last, no less a sum than $4,994,619.57 was paid by the Government as commissions to banks in this country. In addition to that the Government permitted the bankers to retain without interest any balances they might have on hand to the credit of the Government from payments made on account of Victory loans. There is another privilege which the banks possess, and which I think hon. gentlemen are all familiar with, and that is that notwithstanding the fact that this Government, the Provincial Governments and the municipalities are paying more for money, the banks are paying the same rate of interest on deposits as formerly, namely, three per cent. I believe the time has come when there should be an increase in so far as public deposits are concerned. The banks have been piling up profits faster than they have ever done before. This year many of the banks, in addition to their regular annual dividends, have paid dividends as bonuses, and in addition to that, within the last two months, no less than three of our principal banking institutions have been offering stock to their shareholders at a price that will net them a bonus of 40 to 50 points on the present market value of the stock. In view of these facts the people feel that the time has about arrived when the Government should control the banks and not the banks the Government. The Government should immediately insist that the rate of interest on deposits be increased.

I said, Sir, that it might be a question whether men who had invested in Victory bonds a few short months ago, paid $100 for them and would have to take $95 for them to-day, would make a further investment in that class of security. There is just one thing in connection with this Victory bond business that should be aired in this House, and that is the attitude of the committee on management appointed to handle the buying and selling of these bonds. I do not know if the public are thoroughly aware of the situation. There has been very little information given out on the subject. As a matter of fact, the Government invited people to loan their money and they did loan it. The Government then appointed a managing committee, and if you desire to purchase bonds this managing committee fixes the price you have to pay; if you desire to sell, fixes the price they shall be sold for; but gives no information as to how the prices are arrived at, and do not inform us why we have to accept $95 for bonds we paid $100 for a few months ago, why we should not take $90 for them, or why they should not be worth $100. A number of Toronto and Montreal brokers were appointed by the Government and given the complete handling of these transactions. It is not a question of whether they are handling them with a profit to the country or not; the point is that the people should be entitled to know what their bonds are worth on the open market.

Hon. gentlemen opposite spoke the other night of the stabilizing committee. That is what they called it. I do not know how much of the people's money is being used to stabilize the bond market to-day. There is no information as to what use is being made of this money or how much money is being used. There is no information as to how much money was used to stabilize the market last fall when an appeal was made to the people to buy bonds, and when all Dominion securities bearing a rate of 5½ per cent were quoted at a premium on the stock exchanges. When the Finance Minister went through the country asking the people to buy Government bonds, and pointing with pride to where these bonds stood on the public market, there was nothing said about the stabilizing committee, as far as I remember. The only public information I have seen in connection with this matter is a statement made by the former Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) before the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Committee last year. He told that committee that during the year $60,000,000 had been used for the purpose of stabilizing Government bonds. How that money was used is information that the public ought to have. They ought to know daily what bonds are offered for sale, how many are sold and how many are on hand. It is only in this way they can obtain an idea of the value of their securities.

This is the only country as far as I know that is handling securities in this manner. In Great Britain a weekly statement is published by the British Government showing the amount of Treasury Bills sold, the amount of Treasury Bills retired, and the amount of Treasury Bills outstanding.

In the United States the gold reserve of the federal banks is published whether it falls below the legal limit or not. But apparently in Canada investors are such infants that all information must be withheld from them and a few hand-picked brokers are permitted to do as they will with the securities of the people. It is simply an-

other evidence of the desire of hon. gentlemen opposite to give us in this country a paternal form of government, which is as exasperating as it is absurd.

I said, Sir, there was a field open to the Government in the collection of taxation and I congratulate the Finance Minister that he has at last consented to adopt the American system. Two years ago when speaking during the Budget debate I urged the adoption of this system but apparently there was no desire to make collections promptly and to-day we find it is only applied, if I followed the minister correctly, to the income tax. The business profits tax will be collected, in the same old way. I appreciate these profits may be very difficult to arrive at, but there should be clearly defined rulings governing depreciation, etc., printed and circulated, and whenever a ruling is made by the department publicity should be given to it through the press. The firm or corporation need not necessarily be named, but there should be uniformity, and then we would not have, as we have to-day, a feeling in the country that some firms are more generously treated than others. If this is done it will not be difficult for corporations to send in their cheques for 25 per cent of what they think they owe, and surely the account may be adjusted just as readily under these conditions as if no money accompanies the return.

Let me mention this year's experience in the First Michigan District—The Collector of Customs at Detroit is in charge of income tax returns for this district, and the deputy collector informed me that by the 15th March this year they had filed with them 130,000 returns, covering incomes up to $5,000 per annum and 25,000 returns covering corporation taxes and amounts in excess of $5,000, and he further informed me that of 130,000 returns of sums less than $5,000, 95 per cent of the tax payers paid the full yearly payment. Hon. gentlemen will appreciate what this means—the large amount of money that is immediately available to the Government of the country and the great saving effected in interest on money borrowed by the Government in order to carry on. In this country it did not matter that the man had the money to pay, he had to wait until he received his tax return. In the meantime his money was lying at the local bank perhaps without interest, and if interest were allowed, at most 3 per cent and the Government were paying the banks an increased rate for the money actually theirs but not available owing to the method of collection.

If the Minister of Finance is sincere and his department are actually trying to collect Business Profits and Income Taxes I would strongly urge a change in the proposed system to include business profits tax. As far as a reduction in the business profits tax is concerned I think it is a move in the right way. I believe the business profits tax contributes in no small degree to the high cost of living. It encourages extravagance upon the part of the manufacturer and adds unnessarily to the cost of output. Tax the income derived from manufacturing as high as you like. In the way I have suggested you will obtain revenue without interfering with the necessary growth and expansion of business.

In addition to imposing and collecting taxation it is equally the duty of the Government to carefully guard revenues and, wherever possible to eliminate unnecessary expense. What excuse is there for carrying on, say, the Board of Commerce? Here is a commission floating round the country at the public expense and, as far as the results go, practically useless. It was absolutely absurd to appoint that board with a view of controlling prices. They could not hope to do that. Prices cannot be regulated artificially with any degree of success. The only way prices can be lowered is by production, and by the people recognizing that extravagance is a large factor in keeping them high. The Government should set the example. They should practice the greatest economy and cut out all unnecessary expense. No Board of Commerce can arbitrarily affect the situation, and I believe that board should be discharged at once. They are absolutely of no more use than a fifth wheel to a coach.

Take the Wheat Board, nobody knows what that has cost the country. It is true that hon. gentleman opposite say the Government are not paying the expense, but the people have to pay it in the long run and it makes no difference who issues the pay cheques. I do not know what is the attitude of our western friends with reference to this board, but I can say as far as the producers in our section are concerned they want none of it. We had rather a sad experience with the board in my constituency. Let me relate the circumstances: This year, after the United States Government lifted its embargo against Canadian wheat, I made an application on behalf of some of our farmers for permission to export about 3,000 bushels of wheat to the United States. After waiting approximately a month and getting two or three

answers that were rather contradictory, the reply finally came: No, we cannot permit you to export wheat. Now what were the conditions? There is no mill on the Canadian side within fifty miles of where these men live, and the Commercial Milling Company of Detroit were willing to buy. They had a paved road from their farms less than eight miles from Detroit—the price being paid by the Wheat Board was $1.90 and a participation certificate. The American mill offered to pay them from $2.35 to $2.59, which, with the exchange as it then stood, was as good as $2.90 per bushel, but the Wheat Board would not issue a permit. They took this attitude notwithstanding that our money was at a discount in the United States and we should have been glad of the opportunity of getting all the good American money we could. The Wheat Board insisted that the wheat would have to be shipped by rail and then exported in all probability to Greece or Roumania to be paid for in the sweet by and by.

Is it any wonder the people of this country are dissatisfied and discontented? To-day the price of Ontario wheat is, say, $1.95 with participation certificate. The Americans are paying $3 at Detroit with exchange, making the price $3.33.

Let me read you a letter on this subject which I received from one of our prominent farmers. It is as follows:

TECUMSEH, May 11, 1920.

Dear Sir,—You will no doubt remember the efforts I have made to the Wheat Board to sell my wheat in Detroit and have so far been turned down.

It is not necessary for me here to give my opinion of the unjust treatment of the Wheat Board, especially this western part of Ontario, knowing that you are fully conversant with the conditions here and what we are up against. I am told on good authority that a large number of farmers have sold their Government wheat certificates to speculators for 10 cents per bushel, and this only nets them $2 per bushel. I noticed in our paper some time ago that the Board would pay around 40 cents per bushel for the wheat certificates. Even at that it would give us $2.30 per bushel for any wheat, which would be by far the cheapest hog feed we could get, with corn selling at $2 per bushel and oats at $1.20.

I am still holding up my wheat in hopes I may be able to sell at a market price. Wheat last Saturday was worth in Detroit $3 per bushel, with 11 cents exchange, which would make our wheat worth to us $3.33.

We farmers are asked to produce in order to even up the balance of trade. If speculators, Wheat Boards, etc., are going to take the profits of our production they will soon have to do the producing too.

Not wishing to take up your valuable time, I will state the object of this note to you, and that is the following questions:

Can you tell if the Wheat Board releases their control of wheat in Ontario on the 1st of July next, and if not, can the balance unsold in farmers' hands of the 1919 wheat be sold with this year's crop and prices?

If I do not get an open market or a market price for my wheat I shall feed it to my stock.

If you can give me any information on the above questions I would be greatly obliged.

That is the way the Wheat Board stands in the estimation of the farmers in our district, and the Government would be well advised if they resolved to discontinue its operation. There is another board to which reference was made this afternoon by my good friend from Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), and that is the publicity board that now exists in the city of New York. I understand from the Order in Council that it costs approximately $30,000 a year, and I could suggest to the Minister of Finance a better way of spending that money, by which he would obtain far better results than keeping a bureau in the United States merely for the purpose of telling the people there what a great people we are. As I understand it, the duties of that board or commission consist in attending social gatherings and business meetings and telling people what the possibilities commercially and industrially of Canada are. Well, I can say, living close to the American border as I do, that generally speaking the American people, especially the business men, know pretty well what things are like in Canada, and particularly there is nothing that affects our credit which they do not know. With that in view I am going to suggest to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that he take that $30,000 and buy New York exchange with it and make good the promise of this country in so far as outstanding bonds are concerned. I am taking this matter up at the request of the bondholders of Detroit and also of bond salesmen of Windsor, who feel that something should be done. I would suggest to the minister that this is not a matter in connection with which one can adopt any ostrich-like policy. What the bankers of Detroit know to-day the bankers of New York know to-morrow, and what the bankers of New York know the investors of the United States know the day following. If we are going to hold up our credit in the United States and throughout the world, then the Government must handle this matter boldly, courageously and in a proper manner. Last fall we placed a loan of $300,000,000 and I have here a prospectus stating definitely and clearly that both principal and interest will be paid in gold. At the urgent solicitation of the Cen-

tral Selling Committee, we in the city of Windsor went across to Detroit and sold over $1,000,000 worth of bonds. We represented the bonds as they were represented to us, as gold bonds; we said that the interest and principal would be payable in gold. Instalments of interest have come due and we find that when the coupons are presented for payment the holders of them are told that by reason of an Order in Council which existed no gold can be exported. These men were depending on the word of this Government; they were relying upon the good faith of this Dominion; and in all fairness, they say that if there was an Order in Council providing that payments should not be made in gold it should have appeared on the face of the bond. They ask: "Why did you not tell us what we were purchasing?" I have a letter from one of our bond salesmen, a prominent citizen in Windsor, and this is what he says:

WINDSOR, May 14th, 1920.

W. C. KENNEDY, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Mr. Kennedy:

This Canadian Government of ours seems determined to keep me in hot water. You may recall that last Fall I wrote you relative to some unpleasantness that had arisen as a result of the sale of Canadian War Bonds to the President of one of the Savings Banks of Detroit.

When I approached this gentleman on the matter of purchasing these bonds he said, in effect: "Why, I don't want to buy bonds payable in depreciated currency." But, I countered glibly, "these bonds are payable in gold, both interest and principal. See, it says so right on the bonds, and my Government never violates or repudiates its pledges. The interest is payable in gold in any branch of any chartered bank in Canada, so all you'll have to do is to send your coupons to Windsor to be cashed." I made the sale, several thousand dollars.

When the interest fell due last November the Imperial Bank in Windsor promptly refused payment in gold, but after some delay and correspondence with the Finance Department in Ottawa payment was finally made. And now, on the next interest date, the bank again refuses payment and here's what the Banker said to me; "So your Government never repudiates its pledges, eh! Well, we in the United States thought we entered the War to help hammer the Hun into a realization that the solemn undertakings of the Governments were not scraps of paper. We hadn't any idea that Canada was in this class, but the very first time I have business with your Government, instead of meeting its obligations without evasion, equivocation or question, I am forced to chase it around and dun it, much as we bankers have to do in the case of the maker of a bad note. If your Government can't pay or wont pay, let it say so and I'll charge it off to profit and loss, but the next time you peddle any of your so-called securities please choose some other victim."

Now, you know with my six feet and 185 pounds I easily qualify for the heavyweight class and could make almost any Yankee eat those words, but I haven't the heart to tackle the job in this case because I believe he is right. Perhaps, though, you or the Minister of Finance or Mackenzie King, or Lloyd George, or somebody, can suggest a less heroic method of keeping our honour untarnished. Will you try, please? In the meantime as a bond salesman for the Canadian Government (without commission) I'm through. I seem to have misrepresented the goods. In my innocence I thought that when the Government said it would pay in gold it meant exactly what it said. From now on I'll fight shy of governments and do more business with institutions and individuals who don't welch when the time comes to pay.

Now, I would again call the attention of the minister to the fact that if he values as I do, and as I believe every man here does, the credit of the Dominion, the first thing he must do is to take charge of this affair boldly and with courage and pay those people as they should be paid. There is no better way of retaining our credit. I have protest after protest, in this matter, and I hope the hon. minister will find some way of redeeming the promise which his Government made.

There is another matter to which I should like to direct the attention of the House for a moment, one that is engaging some public attention to-day—the question of subsidies. Most of us in Canada who knew something of the financial condition of the country and who knew that this country was being loaded with bankrupt railroads felt that at least so far as subsidies were concerned we should not hear any more about them for some time. But they seem to have broken out in a new place; we hear a good deal now of subsidies to shipbuilding companies. There seems to be an organized plan to raid the public treasury. Now, Canada has done pretty well for the shipbuilding industry, at all events so far as helping them to get started is concerned. I have here a prospectus issued by a bond house dealing with the St. John Drydock and Shipbuilding Company Limited, showing that the Government of Canada have agreed under certain conditions to assist this company to the extent of $247,500 per annum for a period of thirty-five years. I have no doubt the Government have been equally generous to other shipbuilding concerns. In addition to that we have given contracts to the shipbuilding companies aggregating $75,000,000, certainly at fairly good prices, because they are all back for more. On top of that we are asked to provide a subsidy or bonus for tonnage. I am very much surprised that this request has come so soon—I see, by the number of

deputations arriving, that it is on its way. So far as deputations are concerned we all know how these are arranged for; we know a good deal about what has resulted in the past. Many deputations came here in days gone by for subsidies for railroads —these very railroads we own to-day—and shortly after the subsidy was granted it turned out the greater portion of it went into the pockets of the gentlemen who promoted the enterprise and who at that particular time were being featured as Empire builders. I noticed in the Ottawa Citizen the other day this very illuminating despatch:

> Sydney, N.S. May 13th.—A resolution calling upon the Dominion Government to subsidize a shipbuilding industry in Eastern Canada was passed at a meeting of the Board of Trade held to-day at the request of the Canada Steamship Lines, one of the companies entering the steel shipping merger.

I am very much surprised at that, because I understood from the announcements that were made in the public press that this new merger did not propose to ask Canada for any financial aid. We were told that there were three great fundamentals which entered into the building up of commerce; natural resources which we had, capital, and the benefit of the experience of the Old Land,—all three would bind together the Empire in the golden chains of commerce. Well, Sir, that was most appealing, but if the people of this country are going to be asked by way of subsidy to supply the gold for the chains, then I am very much opposed to it. The sooner the gentlemen who are promoting these subsidies understand just where we stand on that question; the sooner they realize that the people are in no mood to create a new group of millionaires, even if they be in the shipbuilding business, and that the financial position of this country is not such as to warrant the granting of the aid they are seeking, the better it will be for all concerned.

So far as the tariff is concerned, I regret, as the resolution of the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) stated, that the Government did not, as they promised last year, have an investigation into tariff conditions and bring about a revision of the tariff. I represent a manufacturing constituency, but I have no hesitation in saying that the time has come when the tariff should be revised, and as far as I know there is only one way that the tariff can be revised with satisfaction to the people of this country, and that is downwards. If there are manufacturers in this country who are taking advantage of the tariff to extract the last five-cent piece from the consumer, then the Government should act and act quickly. This is one way to restore the public confidence so essential at the present time to carry on successfully the Government of this country.

I would also suggest that hon. gentlemen opposite take seriously into consideration the desirability of cutting down the expenditure in connection with these boards and commissions that we have been talking about this afternoon. Until we remove restrictions on trade and allow the business of this country to take its natural course and follow the usual channel of supply and demand, there will be no relief from the abnormal conditions that prevail.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. ONESIPHORE TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, in rising to express my views on the Budget which is now before the House I wish at the outset to tender my sincere congratulations to the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) upon the honest and lucid statement he has given to the House of the country's financial condition at the present time and of the taxation which the people will have to bear this year. He has given us statements which have not been given in previous Budget speeches. In this matter he has shown that honesty of purpose which always characterized the more judicial statements which he made while chairman of the Railway Commission. While acting in that capacity he made a reputation for himself for honesty and clear judgment, and these same qualities were displayed in the speech he made when introducing the Budget. With the facts and figures he gave, some of which must be amazing to the people of Canada, he mingled patriotic expressions, and in noble language he expressed his gratitude to the returned soldiers, whom we must never forget now nor in the years to come. It was their courage and virtue which gave to Canada the fame she now enjoys among the nations of the world, and which contributed more than anything else to the great status apparently accorded this country by all the great nations. We owe our soldiers all possible gratitude. We shall never forget their energy, their valour, their heroism. We shall never for-

get Langemarck, where in the early days of the war the Canadian soldiers were left without reinforcements, but using the bodies of their comrades as a rampart withstood the attacks of the enemy until reinforcements came, and saved the day for Canada and the Empire. There are many other deeds of theirs which we might recall, but this is the battle we should never forget, because but for the Canadian soldiers on that occasion the war would have been lost, not only to Canada and the Empire, but to Belgium and France, and to humanity. I was pleased, therefore, that te Minister of Finance did not forget to give expression to the sentiments of gratitude which we entertain towards our returned soldiers as well as towards the women of Canada who worked marvellously in every possible direction for their sons, brothers and husbands at the front with a spirit not only of loyalty and generosity but of Christianity, to help preserve the liberty and freedom we enjoy to-day.

There is one statement of the Minister of Finance to which I wish to call particular attention, and which I give him credit for having made, and that is his explanation of the discrepancy that exists between our net debt and our gross debt. That discrepancy amounts to $1,078,537,461.27, and the thinking people of Canada have been asking themselves for some time how it came to be so large, and whether it was really a fact or only imaginary. The Finance Minister has given the House to understand that a great portion of this discrepancy between our net and our gross debt is made up of investments which may not be realizable for many years to come, and some of them perhaps never, as he expressed it himself. He has shown that the net debt was $2,273,305,435, and the gross debt $3,014,483,774.12, the discrepancy being made up of loans and investments, a great many of which cannot be relied on as realizable.

I now turn to some of the details of the Budget, more particularly the taxes which the people of Canada will have to bear this year. No doubt the Minister of Finance has exercised his best efforts and best judgment to endeavour to relieve, if possible, the situation existing in the mind of the people of Canada. Of course, he has not been able to do all he would have wished to do. That would be impossible for any man in Canada in bringing down a Budget under the present conditions due to the terrible war. I had, however, expected more generous treatment from the Minister of Finance for those who are less able to carry the burden of taxation. No doubt he has done the best he could, but I am afraid that just before passing the threshold of the Council chamber when he was going in with his proposals he was told "Abandon hope," and consequently he has not been able to accomplish all he would like to do. He has given us, I think, the best perfected Tory Budget we have had in this country yet,—for this is a Tory Budget, more particularly as regards the taxes it imposes on the common people. We know that of the people of Canada, ninety-five per cent have to struggle for their living as against the five per cent who have in plenty the goods of this world.

There is one new tax which the minister has imposed to help to pay the debt of the country and the annual interest upon it, which struck me more particularly, and that is the sales tax. That tax hits, apparently, the manufacturer, the wholesaler and the dealer. One per cent has been added to the manufacturer's price. But the manufacturer and the wholesale dealer will add that tax of one per cent to the retailer's price, and the retailer will add that one per cent again to his price and he will take his profit on it. This will clean up everything and in the end it will be the consumer who will have to pay the tax of one per cent. Nobody else but the consumer will pay, whether the article be worth $1 or $10 or $100. The consumer has to pay the tax on everything that he buys. The soldier has had to pay the extra prices caused by profiteering in the textile and woollen business particularly since the war by being charged excessive prices for the suits of clothes that he has had to buy since he came back from the field of battle. The minister has imposed a new tax on goods supposed to be needed by the common people, or by the people who are not endowed with the goods of this world, commencing with boots and shoes above $9. We know that $9 is a terrible price to pay for a pair of ordinary boots and shoes. It was a terribe price some years ago, but to-day we are confronted with the position that a pair of boots at $9 is only equivalent to a pair of boots that was selling at $3, $4 or $5 a few years ago. If the workingman wants to buy a pair of boots that will save his feet from the wet, the dust and the stones for a month or two, he will not do that by buying a pair of boots at $9. We know that a woman who wants to buy a pair of boots to wear while she is doing her work in the house, or while she is travelling on the streets or the roads in the country will have to pay more than $9. Therefore, the shoes which she will have to buy, being

above $9, will be subject to the tax; if she buys a pair at $4 or $5 they will only last a week or two because they are made of paper instead of leather. She is obliged to buy a pair of boots at $9 or over in order to economize as much as possible. Therefore, this is a new tax that will fall more particularly on the mass of the people. The same may be said in regard to the tax on clothing. No suit of clothes that, from the point of view of economy, is worth buying or wearing, is sold to-day under $45. This condition also applies to many other articles of clothing. This new tax which my hon. friend has imposed falls more particularly upon those who have the least means to pay it.

The tax on luxuries is certainly one which commends itself to my judgment. I have advocated it myself. The only doubtful thing about it is that we may make it so high that people will not purchase or import luxuries. I beg to congratulate my hon. friend upon his decision in this matter and to say that I approve of the tax on luxuries. The tax on imported liquors, wines and spirits may bring in a revenue for a year or so, but if Canada realizes our hope, as I trust it will, of becoming a temperance country, this tax will not bring in any great amount of revenue in the years to come.

Before proceeding to a general consideration of the Budget and of the fiscal question as it affects Canada to-day and will affect her in the future, I wish to say that I was amazed this afternoon at the statements given by my hon. friend from Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). The facts and figures which he gave constituted an indictment against the Government, and it was certainly amazing that no one on the other side of the House, not one of the ministers, not one of their supporters, rose to contradict, if a contradiction were possible at all, the indictment that will be carried by the wires throughout this country and outside of it. Certainly when these facts were so amazing I would have thought that some of the ministers would have got up and shown at least some resentment at their having been placed before the House. Although the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Sifton) was present, he listened to the indictment apparently with complacency notwithstanding that many of these statements were directed at his own department in connection with its management of the Printing Bureau. However, I am not familiar enough with the charges and figures brought forward by my hon. friend to discuss them at length and I only wish to express my disappointment at having heard no contradiction of the statements which he placed before the House.

Coming to the great question which occupies the minds of the people of Canada, the question as to the future, I wish to ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I express a view that I have already expressed in this House and which I hold as firmly to-day as ever I did. I know it will not meet with the approval of my hon. friends on the other side of the House, and especially my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) if we are to judge him by the Budget which he has brought down. Meanwhile I wish to repeat on this occasion that, notwithstanding the adverse reports which strike our ears to-day, I am as much a free trader as ever I was. I am a free trader in principle, a free trader in theory and in practice. When I speak of free trade, permit me to say that I do not give expression to a mere opinion nor to a cherished idea; I speak the convictions which have grown firmer and firmer in my mind as a result of prolonged study of the question of protection and free trade as it has been developed from time to time in the different countries of the world. I have arrived at my convictions as the result of a study of Adam Smith, Cobden, and Gladstone, and I am fortified in them by the views so strongly and courageously expressed by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) whom I am pleased to see just now in his seat. That hon. gentleman has always been consistent, notwithstanding the conditions under which he at times has had to speak, in his advocacy of a free trade policy for Canada. In order to dispel any suspicions that might exist as to my adherence to that party let me say that it was my lot, whether for good or ill, to have lived for some seven or eight years in the city of New York in the eighties and the early nineties, at a time when Henry George, that great exponent of free trade, was exciting the admiration and the interest of the people of the United States, and particularly those of the great city to which I have referred. It was my lot at that time to be able to follow his principle as personally expounded by him and to study them closely. I had the good fortune to hear Henry George address great audiences in the Cooper Institute. I have always borne in mind the expressions which I heard him utter at that time, and though his doctrines were slow in making their

way in the minds of the American people yet to-day they seem to be achieving the effect which was hoped for many years ago, and we now see a re-action in the public mind in the United States in favour of free trade. Sometimes doctrines may be enunciated ahead of their time, as one might say, and only with the passage of years do we see those ideas come to fruition. Henry George, as well as Cobden and Gladstone, in their respective periods, may have advocated principles that were then looked upon as too advanced; but free trade came to be accepted in England, and I hope that before long the same doctrine will conquer both in the United States and in Canada. It may be said that as yet free trade has not made much progress in Canada, not even in the ranks of the Liberal party. I admit that progress has been slow but a tree is of slow growth, even where the conditions are favourable, and the same may be said of free trade in this country. And then there is this also to be said. In the world of nature tornadoes and storms occur which often uproot trees from the soil. We had such a disturbance in the political life of this country in 1911, when an explosion of prejudice, for which the Conservative party were responsible, defeated the reciprocity agreement with the United States which the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier arranged after years of consideration and with the expectation of contributing greatly to the prosperity of the Canadian people. The defeat of the Reciprocity Act was a setback for the free trade idea. Reciprocity was worsted, with the result that ever since the people of Canada have been lamenting the fact. In the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta the sentiment in favour of reciprocity was very pronounced, and this policy, which embodied the principle of free trade, would undoubtedly have been a great boon to them, as well as to the rest of Canada had it gone into effect. In the West a period of stagnation followed. In the city of Edmonton, when I was there in 1914, arrangements were put into effect to give employment to those who were in need. Works such as paving streets and constructing sidewalks in the outskirts of the city were undertaken in advance of the time when they would actually be required in order to give employment to workingmen who would otherwise have been objects of charity. Then take the matter of exchange between the United States and Canada. The adoption of the reciprocity pact would have given our farmers, more particularly those in the West, a market for their wheat and other cereals, as well as for their live stock, and when any additions to that live stock were needed they could have been obtained from the other side without any difficulty. The trade that would have resulted between the two nations as a result of the reciprocity agreement would have been such as to have afforded an equilibrium in the matter of exchange, and we should not have suffered the loss in that regard which has taken place during the last year.

It has been said that the Liberal party have done very little to promote the adoption of free trade. I do not say that the Liberal Government, under the guidance of Sir Wilfrid Laurier promised when they came to office in 1896 to establish free trade as it is in England immediately, but their aim was in that direction. Almost at the very first session of Parliament after their return to office their steps were turned in that direction, and as my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) so lucidly explained yesterday, a great measure of relief was put into operation in 1897 which effected a saving to the people of $100,000,000 every year, and which to-day, bearing in mind the growth of population which has since taken place, would have represented something like $200,000,000 of relief from taxes yearly, a relief that would have been experienced more particularly by the labouring classes and the farming community. During all the intervening years, prosperity, contentment and happiness prevailed in Canada. The late Sir Wilfrid Laurier was all the time contemplating measures having for their object to relieve the people of further burdens. Finally he conceived that the best possible thing would be the inauguration of reciprocity with United States, and the then Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) my esteemed friend from Shelburne and Queen's spent an entire year in discussions with the American authorities and ultimately effected an agreement which commanded the admiration of everybody who has had the opportunity of studying it and who was conversant with the natural conditions as between Canada and the United States.

Let me now for a moment or two consider some statements which have been published in the press of Canada, more particularly the Government press. The effort is being made to make all possible capital out of exaggerated reports of a so-called cleavage in policy between two sections of the Liberal party. Under scare heads some of the newspapers hold up to the public eye the so-called spectacle of a party divided into moderate protectionists and moderate free

traders. These journals allege that the speeches made in Parliament and out of it indicate that there has been a departure from the tariff plank as laid down in the Liberal platform, and that the ideal of free trade is being forsaken. The truth may seem funny to lips that have been tasting gall and wormwood, but these journals greatly deceive themselves. We still keep the ideal in our mind, but, as I have already explained, conditions are not always favourable for carrying an ideal into effect. So it is with the Liberal party. Actual circumstances make concessions imperative, and events are gradually leading up to a demonstration of the fact that in the last analysis free trade must solve the problems that confront us. It is my intention to support the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), and I shall do so with pleasure. I see in it a sincere expression of a desire to alleviate the burdens which bear so heavily upon the shoulders of the poor consumers of this country. The amendment of the hon. gentleman proposes a step in the right direction and I shall therefore willingly support it. I need not read to this House the resolutions which were passed by the Liberal party at its convention in August last, but I think I can safely say that the amendment moved by the hon. member is in harmony with the proposals contained in those resolutions. I have no doubt whatever that the public will view the amendment as a wise one, and I know that when the Liberal party comes into power, whether it be in three months' or three years' time, one of their first considerations will be the affording of some real relief for the poor people of this country.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that our friends in the Farmers' party cannot find any considerable difference between their platform and ours, for if I read their programme aright, it is contained in the policy of the Liberal party. But, whatever differences there may be between us, we are at any rate, in accord in this, that we have a common desire to free the masses of the people of Canada from the burden which has been imposed upon them for so long by the protectionist policy that has been in vogue in this country; and I think it is also, our common desire that that relief shall soon be given to the people.

With regard to our home industries, I may say just a word or two. Some years ago when the National Policy was being launched by Sir John A. Macdonald, that statesman said that we should look after native industry in its infancy. Well, the native industries of Canada are now forty-five years old. I think that the Conservative leader, Sir John A. Macdonald, intended that they should be propped up only so long as they were incapable of taking care of themselves, and I think that if he could return to earth now and see what progress Canada has made since he departed this life, if he could see some of our so-called infant industries, he would tell his friends on the other side that if these industries still need to be propped up, then they had better remove such cripples from the highway and let the chariots of prosperity and liberty pass on their way. The Conservatives or the Protectionists, Mr. Speaker, have changed the description which they have all along applied to their protégé; it is now "home" industry, not "native" industry; they think that home industry appeals more to the imagination of the people. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is a poor country that restricts its efforts in any direction, industrially, commercially or agriculturally, and looks only to the home market. I say that the manufacturers and all others engaged in business should not be satisfied with the home market alone; they must look to foreign markets which are now open to them but which they may lose to the more vigilant American producer or the more alert German trader who is now preparing to take full advantage of all the markets which the world can offer. These highly efficient business men are invading the field while Canada is marking time and, if I may say so, execrating the term "free trade." I think, Sir, that the conditions which are prevailing at the present time are conducive to free trade. I may be in error, but I think that the people of this country, and indeed of all countries, have never been in a better position to adopt a free trade policy in the exchange of products than they are to-day. What are we called upon to do at the present moment? We hear on every hand that the increased production of foodstuffs is imperative for the safety of the world. As most of you probably know, Dr. J. W. Robertson has travelled extensively in Europe since the conclusion of the war. He appeals to the people of Canada to produce and to export in order to afford some relief to the present distressing conditions under which the people of many European countries are living. When I think of the lack of food, the lack of proper clothing, the lack of many of the essentials of life which the

people of these European countries are suffering, I feel that I should ask our farmers, in the West and elsewhere, to produce, to stay on the farm, to keep their sons and their daughters on the farm. I would have them free from taxes, municipal, provincial, federal, in order that we may be able to do our part in bringing about the salvation of suffering European countries. The condition there is almost as sad as it was when the world was in the midst of war, because millions of children are dying from the effects of starvation, an indirect result of the war. Therefore I say to every farmer and to every man of industry: take away all tariff from these implements of industry; take away all tariff or encumbrance upon what the farmer needs in his work of production. I do not ask that in the interests of the farmer alone; I want him to be able to produce, and the cheaper you make his production the more he will produce and the more of our products will go across the ocean.

It was with sadness that I listened the other night to my genial friend from St. John City (Mr. Elkin) in his reference to what the farmers had done and what cause they had for complaint. The farmer who gave his son whom he could spare from the farm and who kept another son at home in order that he might be able to assist in production of the necessities of life to maintain our soldier companions in the field did more than my hon. friend, with all the thousands of dollars which he may have given and which I am sure he did give—his sacrifice was not as great as that of the farmer who gave his son and himself remained on the farm to engage in the great work of production.

My hon. friend talked also of protection. He was a free trader, he said; now he is a protectionist. Of course, I do not know his motives, but his conversion has been very rapid. Three years ago he was elected to this House as a Liberal joining the Liberal-Unionists as a sacrifice for the time being, as a matter of conscience. With his attitude on that occasion I do not quarrel. But he says he is a protectionist because Canada is not in a position to adopt free trade. He tells the farmers of his province to be satisfied with the conditions that he and the industrial people of his city or of other cities impose upon them. He would give them no say in the making of the future of Canada; he would have them come very modestly into the streets and market squares of St. John with their products and be satisfied with what the industrial people give them. They should listen only to my hon. friend and his fellow protectionists; hand over their products; and wait for the future. But, Sir, the farmers have been as generous as any other class of people, according to their means. To-day, I say, is the time more than ever when the industries of Canada can go in the direction of free trade, because their products are sought, as are the products of Canadian farms, in every part of the world. Every financier who looks into the matter dispassionately encourages the industries of Canada to produce and to take advantage of the market that offers for their products, just as it offers for the products of the farm. Last April the directors of the Bank of Montreal announced an issue of $2,000,000 new capital stock to be offered to their shareholders of record as at the close of business on May 20, 1920, at 150 per share in the ratio of one in ten in order that the manufacturers of Canada might be able to take advantage of the trade that offers to them in the West Indies, British Guiana and West Africa. This bank with other important banks has announced the policy of forming close connection with permanent institutions firmly established rather than that of opening branches in foreign countries with all the resulting expense and difficulty. The banks are prepared to offer to the manufacturer further credit in order that they may take advantage of these markets which are offering to them.

A few days ago a lady who was the guest of the Ottawa Kiwanis Club at the Chateau Laurier, Miss Jill Crossley-Batt, told her hearers that Australia is in need of the products of Canada and is desirous of establishing trade communications in order to receive those products. She said also that Australia has products to offer to us which we greatly need, such as wool, leather, and raw materials in connection therewith, through the lack of which the people of Canada have had to pay excessive prices for clothing and shoes. It is urged by some that because we are a small country; because our population is only eight millions, we are not in a position to attend to the demands of the foreign market. But if there is a country that is suited to the adoption of free trade at the present time it is Canada. We have immense resources. We can produce more pulp and paper than any other country in the world. We have vast water-powers awaiting only the hand of the engineer in order to produce every day millions of dollars' worth of articles which the Old World needs. We have many other kinds

9 p.m.

of resources. We have to the south of us the wealthiest nation in the world, the United States, able alone to absorb all the products of Canada for years to come. Our seacoasts, east and west, virtually face the markets of the Orient and the Occident; the markets of Europe and of England.

We have our deep open harbours of Halifax, St. John and Quebec on the Atlantic coast, and Vancouver, Prince Rupert and Victoria on the Pacific coast, and dozens of others on either coast are waiting patiently for the developments which the people of Canada may make of them. Canada is more conveniently situated as regards Australia than Great Britain or the countries of continental Europe are; we have convenient access to Japan and China, which is bound to develop amazingly during the next few years; we are more conveniently situated as regards South America than any European nation. And yet we are told that we are not in a position to have free trade and to expand our commerce under that policy! We want to produce and export, but we want also to import, and I was amazed the other night to hear one of the hon. members for St. John, who lives in one of the great maritime ports of Canada saying: We do not want free trade. Strong appeals are being made every day for the development of the port of St. John, and I am one of those who appeal for that, not as a citizen of St. John, but as a Canadian, knowing the facilities which that port commands for the transportation of grain and other products of the West as well as for the products of the East. That port seems to have been placed there by Providence for the benefit of the people, not merely of St. John, but of Canada as a whole. The hon. member seems to be satisfied with the markets of Canada; or if he wants goods to be exported through the port of St. John, does he think that a seaport can develop merely by exportation without importation, and that the vessels which carry away cargoes from St. John or Halifax or Quebec will have no cargoes to bring back to those ports? In order to be able to carry cargoes both ways a vessel will have to go to the United States instead of returning to one of those Canadian ports. Free trade means the free commerce of the ocean. You cannot expect to export if you are not willing to import; you must keep the channels open, coming just as much as going, and it is only by free trade that that can be effected.

While I am on that topic, I might perhaps refer to what was said this afternoon by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy), who spoke about the bonus for shipbuilding. If we develop the resources of Canada, as we are urging that they be developed and as everyone wants them to be developed, and if they are developed by the free trade policy which I advocate, thus creating trade, not only going, but more particularly, coming, the shipbuilding industry of Canada will require no bonus. During the last year the Government of Canada has given the shipbuilding industry of this country as much bonus as is required for building ships. All I regret is that before and during the war they procrastinated in regard to this policy as they did in regard to other policies. Every session during the war I seconded the efforts of the then member for St. John, who advocated a policy of shipbuilding. We were all told to wait. My hon. friends opposite wanted to win the war. But they did not seem to understand that ships were the best instruments by means of which to win the war. This has been proved, because without the British navy and mercantile marine the war would not have been won. But the Government procrastinated until the war was over. However, better late than never. They have now given to that industry a sufficient impetus, and the steel industry of Canada, at Sydney or at any other Canadian centre where it is established, is in a splendid condition of prosperity and can supply the steel required better than any other country. This is more particularly the case with Sydney, because it has the iron ore of Newfoundland within a few miles of its shores and it has coal right at the door of the industry. Under those conditions, those industries being so prosperous, we might say, under the bonus given some years ago, now that they are established, now that they have been making millions of dollars, they certainly do not require any further bonus. Truly those interested in such bonus profiteering are using every possible means at their disposal to draw the attention of the people of Canada and the Government to the matter. They gather around them some soldiers whom they have, as a matter of course, working in their institutions, and they tell them: We will give you work providing that the Canadian people will give us a bonus. I say to the people of Canada and to the Government to-day, as I would say to my own children: If Canada is to give a bonus at all, let it be given directly to the soldier and not to the shipbuilder. Under present conditions the only interest in Canada for which a bonus is justified would be the soldier, and we are told every day by the Gov-

ernment that they cannot grant the soldier a bonus. Therefore, let us speak no more of bonusing an industry which can prosper so well by the exercise of free trade in Canada, keeping its ships loaded coming as well as going.

Certain Canadian manufacturers might consider I was out of my place if I were to offer them advice in regard to taking advantage of opportunities which I see ahead for them. No doubt the only excuse given in years gone by for the establishment of the protectionist policy by Sir John A. Macdonald, of offering every possible bonus or protection by way of tariff to the manufacturers, was that the manufacturers would come one after another to him, as they came later to Sir Leonard Tilley, to the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) when he was Minister of Finance, and also, no doubt, to the present Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), and say: My industry is in such a position that I cannot continue manufacturing unless I get so much protection. The Minister of Finance asks, "How much do you want?" "Oh," they reply "Thirty-five"—or it may be forty or forty-two—"per cent." "You shall have it," says the Minister of Finance;—go on manufacturing." To-day the manufacturers are coming again to those in authority, saying: "We cannot do without the tariff; if we are not protected, the United States manufacturers will dump their products into Canada." I say that if our manufacturers would be satisfied with one profit, if they could sell at prices charged for similar goods from the United States the people of this country would buy their products. We must not forget that the Canadian manufacturer has the advantage of not having to pay the transportation charges which the American manufacturer has to pay on his goods coming to this country. It is the fault of the manufacturers themselves, if they do not expand their industries and introduce all possible improvements. If the Canadian manufacturer will take advantage of all the improvements the American manufacturer takes advantage of and will introduce into his business all the mechanical and business developments which the Americans have done, he would be in a position to compete with the manufacturers of the United States not only in this market but in theirs.

Notwithstanding all this, we do not speak against the Canadian manufacturer. If he is deficient our patriotism goes to him as our charity goes to the sinner, but we ask him to take a new stand and make every effort to compete with manufacturers outside this country. When the war came on, our Canadian manufacturers knew nothing about producing munitions; they hardly knew what shells meant; and they had no plants adapted for turning them out. But under the inspiration of true patriotism, and with big profits in prospect, in the course of a few months plants were erected all over this country, and our manufacturers were able to turn out as good a product as the munition makers in other countries who had been practically brought up in the manufacture of munitions. In many lines of munitions our manufacturers took the lead and supplied their product not only to our own army but to the armies of the Allies. I say to them to-day: Put the same patriotism and the same vim into your work as you did when turning out munitions! Improve your plants and make them as productive as those of the United States; then you will be able to command the markets of the world and need no longer be afraid of the products of the United States, because you will be able to compete successfully against them.

It might be objected that if radical changes are made in the tariff, we would not be able to raise sufficient revenue. I only want the taxes removed from the classes who have to work for their living, from the farmers and the working men who are producing. I am not asking the people of Canada to go into free trade blindfold. I want to see the debt of this country paid and not left to posterity to discharge. I say it belongs to us, it is our duty, not only to pay the interest charges on the war debt, but to decrease that debt itself and wipe it out in as few years as we possibly can, and it is only by production that we can do so. Let not the manufacturer be uneasy. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) may be satisfied with the home market. He may make more profit on one plough in the home market than the American manufacturer, but if he sold two ploughs in an outside market his profits would be greater, and the bigger his sales the more prosperous he would be at the end of the year. There are other sources of revenue to which we can turn to relieve the burden on the workingman and the farmer and the clerk. The increase of wages that workingmen are getting is of no benefit to them, because you increase their wages one day and the next day the prices of commodities go up, and so they are no better off. We must devise some permanent means for raising revenue from those best able to

pay, instead of taxing those who are engaged from morning till night in production. What I have in mind, in order to hasten the adoption of free trade in Canada, is a tax on land values. I hear some one rapping on the other side. Let me tell him, whoever he be, that thousands and thousands of people in this country who have studied the taxation of land values will admit that I am right. In the East as well as in the West thousands and thousands of people are looking forward to the introduction of a tax on land values in order to relieve from the heavy burden of taxation the workingman in industry and those who toil on land or on the sea.

What would be the effect of the introduction of the taxation of land values? The first effect would be to make the holders of of Canadian lands who are now living in the United States, or France, or England, or were living in Germany before the war, sell their land to the people who would produce on it, or else they would have to pay the taxes. We have millions of acres of land in this country, more particularly in the western provinces, held in that way, and in our towns and cities and suburbs we have vacant lots that are being held for a bigger price than they are worth. A tax of one per cent on unused land which is being held up for a bigger price would make the owner sell it, or build on it, or cultivate it to make his land profitable and escape further taxtion. My hon. friend (Mr. Crerar) the leader of what is called—and I say this with all due respect—the Progressive party in this House, stated that such a tax in Canada would easily bring in a revenue of $75,000,000. Now $75,000,000 would largely do away with the need for the tariff which rests so heavily on the working classes and consumers of Canada. Another hon. member spoke from this side of the House in 1917, the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Cruise). Speaking in this House on May 15, 1917, a few days after I had made some similar assertions, he made a statement in reference to the raising of revenue by taxation of land values. He is reported in Hansard of that date as saying:

> Again, certain calculations have shown that a tax of one per cent on land values in Canada would yield large revenues. Mr. Henry Timmis, of Montreal, in a speech reported in the Montreal Herald and Daily Telegraph of March 28, 1917, estimated that the land values of Canada total $8,000,000,000—five billions in the towns and cities and three billions in the rural districts. A tax of one per cent on this valuation would bring revenue to the amount of $80,000,000 per annum.

I am sorry that my hon. friend is not in the House at the present time. I hope that he stands by the same convictions as those which he expressed when he spoke two or three years ago. If we take $80,000,000 as being the estimated revenue which might be raised by a one per cent tax on land values we might be able to wipe out the tariff which weighs so heavily upon the people of Canada. What has the Minister of Finance done in his Budget? What relief has he given to the people? He has given relief to the people by abolishing the so-called war tariff tax of 7½ per cent on all importations and 5 per cent on all importations from Great Britain. Last year they relieved the people only of a part of this impost and this year they have decided to relieve them of the rest of this tax which was inaugurated at the beginning of the war. Imagine at the beginning of the war levying a 5 per cent tax on the products of the Mother Country! And they did it in the name of loyalty and of patriotism! I remember my hon. friend from Red Deer, eloquent as he always is, made an appeal against such an impost. I seconded him in my feeble way and all on this side of the House made a protest against it. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Loggie). whom I see sitting opposite to me now, made one of the strongest appeals against that impost. But, he has been satisfied for the last three years to see his neighbour burdened with that tax. Now that tax is gone and that is all the Government have done in the way of relieving the burdens of the people since the war has been over. Not an additional dollar of relief has been given to the taxpayer or consumer in Canada.

We might raise more than one per cent from a land tax for a few years in order to reduce the capital of the war debt which we must reduce during our lifetime. Under this system of taxation it would be impossible or unprofitable for any one to hold land without putting it to use and the temptation to speculate in natural opportunities would be gone. This is a perfect tax. It does not tax capital. It does not tax improvements, it does not interfere with production, exchange or exportation, and it does not fall upon the consumer. It affects the possession of property but it does not affect the table of a man with a large family any more than the table of the rich man. Every time you tax production you raise the selling price and increase the cost of living. This sales tax of one per cent will

have to be paid by the consumer; it has to be paid, as I have already said, by ninety-five per cent of the population of the country who are least able to support it. I repeat, every time you tax production you raise the selling price and increase the cost of living. It is not so with a tax on land. We therefore change a burden into a benefit to the people. By taxing land values the owner finds his land unused and he will sell it cheaper than under the present system. Under the present system those who use land in a productive manner are taxed more heavily and their improvements are taxed. The more they improve their property and extend their field of production the more they are taxed. But we are asking to tax land on the value given it by the community. The community would judge that a farm, or a piece of land on the outskirts of a city, was worth so much to-day. The tax would be imposed on that value, and whatever improvements were made would be free. It would encourage the owner to improve his property or, if he does not improve his property, to sell. That system would bring immigration, it would bring settlers to those immense tracts of vacant land which we have in the West and to many abandoned farms in the East, and to areas in the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, which have been left uncultivated. Under this system these farms would immediately become productive. It would bring in capital and create a demand for labour both of which are now debarred because of the excessive prices asked by speculators. Our farmers in the country and our homesteaders in the West have everything to gain by this tax on land values.

During the war the very thing which should have been taxed was not taxed and everything which was taxed should not have been taxed. To-day we have a heavier debt to pay and more annual interest. The income tax has also been delayed. I cannot hold my hon. friend the Minister of Finance responsible for that because he was not in the House or a member of the Government. But I remember an eloquent appeal made in favour of the income tax at a special session of the House, which only lasted about five days after the declaration of war, when the hon. member for Red Deer rose and called upon the Government of Canada immediately to impose an income tax upon the people in order to form an asset against the expenditure on account of the war. We, on this side of the House, all joined him, but for two or three long sessions the then Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) smiled away our efforts for the taxation of incomes. At last, late in the session of 1917, after having said at the beginning of the session the collection of the tax would not pay the expenses of collecting it, the income tax was adopted. I demonstrated at the time that even amongst his colleagues in the Cabinet there were a sufficient number of millionaires to be able to guarantee the expense of the collection of the tax throughout Canada, and therefore he need not be uneasy as to the cost of making that collection. At last, in 1917, the Government acceded to our request. But it took us a long time to obtain the concession.

The Government may also set up the claim that they have adopted other measures calculated to promote the welfare of the country. They may say that in 1917 they gave free wheat also. But an election was anticipated shortly and such was the feeling that had been aroused among the people who were bemoaning and lamenting the defeat of the reciprocity pact, that some western ministers who had been paying a visit to the West got alarmed, and returned to Ottawa and said, "We must have free wheat." But free wheat, as well as the concession in regard to income tax of which I have spoken, are measures which were really due to the exertions of the Liberal party.

I wish again to urge the adoption of a policy of taxing land values. The inauguration of this system may take some time—perhaps that is to be expected in the case of every new system of taxation—but it is only a few days since we were informed by Mr. Breadner, the Commissioner of Taxation that even after three years the methods of collecting the income tax were not perfect, and that two or more years might yet elapse before the system was adjusted to a nicety, so that collections might be promptly made and at a great lessening of expense. The same perhaps would be true if a system of taxing land values were adopted. But, notwithstanding any difficulties which might have to be overcome at its inception, we would within a very few years derive a revenue from it of $100,000,000, and even $200,000,000, which would wipe out a considerable portion of the war debt, and compel future generations to admit that we had lifted from their shoulders some of the burdens imposed. May I not appeal to my generous friend, the new Minister of Finance, and ask him in the most amiable manner that I can, to take into consideration this question of taxing land

values, and see if he cannot give effect to it before this vote is taken, or at a later stage when we go into committee. It is doubtless unnecessary to inform the Minister of Finance—who follows these matters perhaps more closely than I do—as to what happened in England with respect to this policy. In the British Parliament, owing to a snap verdict the movement for the taxation of land values received a temporary set back, but this fact did not discourage Mr. Asquith. That right hon. gentleman expressed no despair over what had happened. It was, he said, not an occasion to write the epitaph "Requiescat," but rather "Resurgam"—"I shall rise again." And when that takes place a better day will dawn for the mass of workers in Great Britain. The temporary defeat of this policy is no doubt attributable to the peers of England who are great land owners and have taken the opportunity to rid themselves of this taxation and have the burden placed on the industries of Great Britain.

Last year a tariff inquiry was promised by the Minister of Finance, but no inquiry has yet taken place. To-day we again have the promise of such an inquiry. I have all belief in the sincerity of the present Minister of Finance and I hope his anticipation will be realized. But he will need to be on his guard against the manufacturers and the other protectionists who will come to him with a demand not for additional duties perhaps, but for "moderate protection" the idea of which was so eloquently set forth by my genial and good-hearted friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne). The same idea of a "moderate" tariff was expounded in the West sometime ago by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen). "A moderate tariff," what a vague expression it is! You might erect a Chinese wall around the confines of Canada and yet the protectionist would tell you it was "moderate" protection. The promise of "moderate protection" is not satisfactory, we want something more definite. People will tell you, "What we want is a scientific tariff," and this term is freely used in the public journals of Canada. We are not given any figures to show what a "scientific" tariff means; it is capable of almost any interpretation. I hope therefore that when the Minister of Finance comes to sit down at the table and deal with the so-called "scientific tariff" he will display the same courage that animated him in presenting his Budget which could not have been in conformity with his hopes or expectations. As a matter of fact science is opposed to a tariff. Science in its operation works for the good of humanity and contributes to the welfare and comfort of the community. In this instance the community consists of ninety-five per cent of the community who toil for a living. They are the persons in whose behalf science should be invoked and the protectionist should be told plainly, "We will took after the mass of the people first." The tariff, Mr. Speaker, is only a creation of the convenience of the privileged classes, and I must protest against any further impositions on the people.

Now, I feel that I have taken up too much time and have encroached on your patience, Mr. Speaker, and the patience of the House. But I could not let this occasion pass without expressing my view of conditions as they are to-day. We are living under abnormal conditions; abnormal conditions prevail throughout the world; and it is for that very reason that we must courageously face the situation and adopt the best possible means at our disposal for restoring the happiness and prosperity of this country and helping, as far as lies within our power, to restore the happiness and prosperity of those countries in Europe which are appealing to Canada and to the United States for sustenance. Now, exclusive attention to home markets cannot possibly meet those conditions. We must have an expansion of trade if we are not only to develop our own resources but help those countries that are suffering as a result of the war.

I have spoken at great length, Mr. Speaker, but what I have said has come from the heart. I have given utterance to what I hold to be truths and not mere pet ideas. I trust therefore that what I have said will have some weight with the Minister of Finance, and that that hon. gentleman will not regard my remarks as mere idle talk to keep this House occupied for the time being. I have expressed my convictions and I feel that I am right. I believe, Sir, that the truths I have stated will appeal not only to my own constituency but to all the people who do not believe in privilege.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): I am not going to speak at any great length. Perhaps I have not as much to say as my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Turgeon), and at all events I will try to express my views in very much shorter time. I should like to add my congratulations to those that have been already expressed to the Minister of Finance for the

very able Budget he has presented and the clear manner in which he has presented it. I do this, Sir, with a great deal of pleasure, because I can look back thirty years to a time when the present Finance Minister and myself were associated in another form of public service. I think it was his first position in the public service as a young man just entering his profession. He made good in that position, Sir, and it has been my pleasure to see him advance from one post to another, each more important than the last, until to-day he occupies one of the highest places in the Dominion of Canada. My thirty years of friendship and acquaintance with the minister therefore makes that fact a very gratifying one to me. The minister displayed in his speech the characteristics he has always exhibited since I have known him—caution in preparing his case and courage in presenting it. Evidently he learned a good while ago that old maxim: Be sure you are right, then go ahead; and the result is that in this Budget he has shown, as I think, a more courageous course than any Minister of Finance that we have had in the Dominion of Canada. Of course, he and the Government face to-day the most difficult conditions that any Government or any Finance Minister ever had to face in the history of Canada. There have been times in the past when a large amount of money had to be raised; but never has there been a time when such a tremendous volume of revenue was demanded, never was there a time when circumstances called for such large expenditures; never were we compelled to impose such drastic taxation, taxation so new and to which the people are so unaccustomed.

Taxation that, in my judgment, it required a great deal of courage for the Government to impose. The minister has told us the truth and the whole truth about our national assets, and I think he is to be commended on that score. He has resisted the temptation to make our balance sheet appear better than it is, and that is not always done by public men when they are trying to put the best face possible upon the case they are presenting to the country. I believe that the frankness displayed by the minister in that respect will be received with admiration by the people of Canada. I think that the people like their public men to be frank and straightforward. They can see through any camouflage that is put on just as easily as those who are behind the scenes; and my short experience in public life leads me to believe that if a man has a case which he can defend the people are ready to listen to him. They are reasonable in meeting their obligations and will respond to courageous leadership. But to my mind, the confidence which the Minister of Finance displays in the Canadian people all through his speech is the best and truest note he has sounded, and I venture to predict that the nation will respond and be prepared for any necessary sacrifice. He has added burdens of taxation as undreamt of in the past as they are imperative for the present and for the immediate future, and he has called for united effort to meet the obligations of to-day and reduce the liabilities of to-morrow. This should, and I believe it will, inspire our citizens to give him the support he needs to begin the process of restoring the finances of this country to their pre-war solidity.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, the Budget shows high regard for the masses. It may bear somewhat heavily upon wealth, upon those large incomes, but in my judgment that is the right kind of Budget to bring down in any country, particularly in these times of stress. What I was particularly interested in was his declaration that the Government will adhere to the principles of the National Policy. I am confident that that will appeal to the judgment of the great mass of the people of Canada. I desire especially to emphasize his pledge that the tariff shall not be used to exploit the consumer. I will not take the time, Mr. Speaker, to read all that he said on this subject; I shall simply quote a few words from page 2569 of unrevised Hansard. The Finance Minister said:

> Apart from the question of revenue, the tariff should have regard to the maintenance, stability and prosperity of Canadian enterprise in the development of all our natural resources in lands, forests, mines, fisheries, as well as our agricultural and manufacturing industries.

That, as I understand, is the principle of the National Policy. He goes on to say:

> Consideration must also be given to the importance of creating and maintaining conditions that will afford to Canadian industrial workers opportunities for steady and remunerative employment. It is undoubtedly in the true interests of Canada as a whole that Canadian workers should not be forced to seek in foreign countries employment and opportunity denied them at home by reason of the export of the natural resources, primary products, and raw materials with which the Dominion is amply endowed.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that seventy-five per cent of the people of Canada are in favour of the protection of our industries. An intensive propaganda has been carried on for years to convince them that the

manufacturers systematically exploit them to accumulate huge fortunes. In a few instances huge fortunes may have been piled up as the result of taking advantage of the tariff. But I venture to say that that has happened only in isolated cases; that the men who work in factories as well as those who manage these enterprises have equally been beneficiaries of the protection that has been given to our industries.

Mr. Speaker I am a protectionist by conviction. I am not like some men in public life; I did not inherit my politics. My father was an intimate personal friend of and sympathizer with the grandfather of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), the late William Lyon Mackenzie.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Mr. HOCKEN: He was a Baldwin reformer, and he instructed me in the doctrines of Liberalism of that day and until I grew up to be a young man. He was not satisfied to call himself a reformer; he was a Clear Grit, a follower of Brown and Mackenzie. You will readily understand, Mr. Speaker, that growing up beside a man holding such political views, I was somewhat thoroughly instructed.

Mr. PROULX: And the son went astray.

Mr. HOCKEN: Well, I am just coming to that. I grew to manhood cherishing a very high regard for Brown, Mackenzie, Blake and Mowat. But about the time I was called upon to cast my first ballot in a Federal election the late Sir John A. Macdonald introduced the National Policy and affirmed the principle of the protection of our industries. I had grown up, Sir with conditions surrounding me that upset all my preconceived theories about the tariff. As a boy and a young man I saw my schoolmates, as they grew to manhood and learned their trade or profession, forced to go across to the United States to get employment. I saw the largest furniture factory in Canada at that time, located in Toronto, forced to close its doors and throw two thousand men out of employment. I saw trade sales of American-made furniture put on every week in Toronto the effect of which was to drive out the furniture factories we had in that city and close down one of our great industries. There were more Canadians in Chicago then than there were in Toronto or in Montreal. The very best blood of Canada, our young enterprising men, unable to find opportunities in our own country, were obliged to go across the border in order to earn their livelihood. I sav. Mr. Speaker, that any young man of observant mind growing up in those days could not help being impressed with such a spectacle as that which I am trying to describe. So, when I was called upon to cast my first vote in a federal election I decided that nothing could be worse than what we had and that I was willing to give the new policy a trial. I voted for the National Policy, and I have voted for the party that supported the National Policy and protection ever since because my subsequent observation and experience confirmed me in the belief that protection of our industries is absolutely necessary for the further development of Canada. I suppose I am like one of those whom the member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig) spoke of this afternoon. He complained that the member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) had a short time ago advocated free trade and reciprocity. Well, I never was quite guilty of that, but I was wondering while the member for West Kent was referring to the member for Parkdale why he did not couple the name of that hon. gentleman with that of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), who has changed his views in regard to the tariff quite as much and in quite as striking a way as has the member for Parkdale.

Now, the tariff is necessary for our urban communities;—I think many free traders will acknowledge that—and it is equally necessary for rural communities, for the farmers and their sons and daughters. If this country is ever to be great it can only be by the establishment of diversified industries. If a farmer in Ontario has six sons, only one will stay on the farm; the others will want to go elsewhere, to be doctors, lawyers, mechanics or business men. If we have not large urban communities such as are developed and maintained by large industries, there are no opportunities for men who want to leave the farm and engage in other professions; and that is one of the primary reasons why the farmers of Ontario are protectionists. They have always voted for a protectionist policy, and my judgment is that they are as soundly convinced as they ever have been that that is the best policy for Canada. It has brought hundreds of millions of dollars of American capital into this country; it has kept hundreds of thousands of Canadians at home. We need our young men, Mr. Speaker, to develop our national life. We want our young men and our young women to build up their homes in this country and to give their work and their service to the building up of the nation.

There are some things which have not been done in Canada in which, I think, we might have made greater advances. In passing, I should like to say that we are not proceeding fast enough with the development of our fuel resources. The time is coming, and indeed is not far distant, when the question will be, not how much we have to pay for coal, but whether we can get coal at all, and the primary duty of the Government is to develop not only our coal resources but our peat resources and any other fuel resources we have, and to establish such means of transportation as will make it possible for us to bring coal from the extremes of the country into the central provinces. I might talk at length upon that subject, but I want to keep my promise to you, Sir, that I would not be long, and I have something else to say.

I appreciate very much, as I think the people of Canada will, the desire of the Government to economize in every possible way. I have not yet seen many signs of economy. One action has been taken which effects a considerable saving, and my suggestion is that it should be carried out to a much larger degree than it has been already. I listened with great interest to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), when he spoke of the Civil Service of this country. He said that it was necessary that the expenditure on that service should be lessened. He told us that there were forty or fifty thousand men and women in the service; that it was a great organization through which the Government carried out its enterprises and its administration, and that millions of dollars could be wasted and spent uselessly through an inefficient Civil Service throughout the country, which millions could equally well be saved through efficient organization and thorough co-operation amongst the members of the Civil Service. I am not sure that that declaration by the Minister of Trade and Commerce received the attention that it deserves, and I am going to propose to him, to the Prime Minister, and to the Government, a way by which they can effect a saving of $20,000,000 a year.

My first suggestion would be that the Government declare a holiday of one year in the making of new appointments to the public service of this Dominion. If there are positions to fill, let the Government promote some of the superfluous members of the service in the various departments and place them where it is supposed that new officials are required. In that way, I believe (with the exception of the few experts that might be required) the Dominion service could run for a year without one additional appointment. This is what has been done in one department. At long last, as some hon. member said, we got a Secretary of State who had the courage to go into the Printing Bureau, the condition of which branch of the service had been a disgrace for years. There was not a printer in Canada who did not know how grossly that department was overloaded; that hundreds of thousands of dollars were being wasted every year. And yet it seemed to be impossible to find a man who would assume the position of minister of that department and clean it up as it ought to be cleaned up. This House knows that it has been decided to cut off three or four hundred men, and three hundred men have already been cut off from the Printing Bureau. At the present rate of wages in the allied printing trades, I would estimate that that would mean a saving of between $500,000 and $600,000 a year. With three hundred men cut off and $500,000 saved a year, as much work is being got out of that department to-day as was got out of it when there were thre hundred more men on the staff. And the same thing can be done in practically every other department of the Government of Canada. But courage is required for measures of that kind, and I am going to credit every minister of the Government with having courage to do this, and say to him: You can save $20,000,000 if you will collectively go through every department of Government in Canada as the former Secretary of State went through the Printing Bureau, and I believe that by transferring unnecessary officials in one department to necessary positions in another department, we can get along for a year without making any new appointments, except such technical and expert officials as may be required. That is the way to get efficiency. Make it possible for industrious men and women to work for promotion. Why is it that in the Printing Bureau a staff of men and women, three hundred less than it was a month or so ago, is turning out as much work as before? It is because those who remain know that they must work in order to hold their jobs. Let that idea go all through the service of Canada, and two men would do the work that three men are doing now. But some person must take the matter in hand and do it with a spirit of courage that is not always manifested in the administration of departments. It is not necessary that I should state to the House that the service of Canada is over-

loaded. There is not a member of Parliament, nor a person working in the Civil Service, nor a minister of the Crown, who does not know that. I say: Take the overload and distribute it around; instead of making new appointments, promote those who are now in the service, and if they are not fully qualified, give them an opportunity to qualify so that they can go up from one position to another. Form a board of deputy ministers for the promotion of efficiency in the Civil Service, and let them collaborate in regard to every position that falls vacant or every appointment that is to be made, instead of, as at present, if an official is superannuated or dies, putting a new man in his place although there may be in the department a dozen or fifty persons more than are necessary to carry on the work. A good deal more would have been accomplished if instead of the cumbersome system that has been adopted, some kind of instruction had been provided for those who are now in the service, so that a man or a woman could qualify for the position higher up, thus, having always ready those who could take their promotion for any positions that became vacant. If you could inspire the deputy ministers and the assistant deputy ministers with the idea that they were going to make the public service of Canada the most efficient public service in the world, there would be competition from the bottom to the top and from the top down to the bottom amongst those who are now in the service in order that they might render better service, earn a better reward and get a better position. What inducement is there now for a man or a woman who is in the service to show extraordinary ability or industry? There is no inducement whatever; too many of them simply put in their time, and many of them who do that could be turned into good officials if some incentive were put before them to inspire them to give better service.

There is another feature of this case that deserves attention. Why not readjust the hours of the officials of this Government? Why not require them to work eight instead of six and a half hours a day? Why not add 20 per cent to the working time and reduce the staff 20 per cent? Manifestly, if you increase the time that is put in by the employees in the public service in Ottawa by 20 per cent, you can do with 20 per cent fewer employees. There should be no objection to any person who works for this Government putting in eight hours a day. Why should not a clerk or a messenger work eight hours as well as a bricklayer, printer, moulder or any other man? That is one way in which practically 20 per cent more of service could be given to this country by these employees, and a saving of 20 per cent on about $75,000,000 or $80,000,000 would be an enormous sum left in the treasury of this country. It would mean both better officials for the service and a great many more million dollars to the country.

But this is a task that calls for the best brains you have in the administration. It calls for the best brains you have in the service, for men who have been long in the service, who understand its needs, and who would enter into the idea sympathetically and apply themselves to give their very best to working out this plan for the benefit of the people of Canada. I do not think it is a task for a group of glib-tongued young theorists who come into a country they have never lived in, of whose system of Government they are entirely ignorant, and who bring in some theories that may be applicable elsewhere and, in effect, put those theories over and above the experience of deputy ministers and chief officials who have been in the service of this country for thirty or forty years. If you had such a plan as that in operation, you would not have a spectacle such as that which was presented in the Senate a few days ago, when a debate took place on the appointment or dismissal of a translator who had been appointed by the present Commission and who was found after two and a half months to be absolutely unable to translate two or three pages of the debates in the Senate. He received higher marks in the written examination than anybody else, but when put down to do the job he could not translate two or three pages of Hansard properly in two and a half months. That is the kind of thing you are getting now, and it is not making for efficiency in the service. I think the present plan takes the heart out of responsible deputy ministers. My idea would be to inspire them to give their very best to this country, to go through their departments, and to go through them collectively and discuss with each other: Where is a man to fill this position and that position? It would also put heart in the officials in minor positions, who, I am sure, with the hope of promotion, would be willing not only to work eight hours a day, but to work harder and more efficiently while they are working. The Government is calling on the people of Canada to practice economy, "Produce and Save" is the watchword. Well, I submit that here is a plan that will effect econo-

my, and I submit it with all due deference. I am not submitting it with any complaint against the Government; I know the extraordinary labours the ministers have had to perform during the years of the war, and in fact up to the present time; they have been worked to death. I am not complaining, but I am afraid they have not thought of this plan, and I have thought of it; so I am just putting it before them for their consideration, and am wondering whether they will themselves do through the Government and through this House what they are calling on the people of Canada to do, namely, to practise the closest economy in our expenditures.

There is reason to congratulate the Government upon its Budget. It shows great courage to impose these new taxes. I think those taxes are going to bring in more than enough money to meet all the expenditures of this country during this fiscal year, and I think there will be a substantial sum besides to apply in reducing the debt. It is not an easy thing to impose new taxes, but I want the Government to go a little further now that they have imposed them. Let them get to work and, after the most careful thought, devise a plan somewhat on the lines I have suggested for reducing the service by 20 per cent and saving $20,000,000 additional to apply to the reduction of the public debt.

Mr. J. FRED JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to one remark which was made by the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Hocken), in respect to emigration from this country previous to the adoption by the Government of Canada of the National Policy. I was a boy some years, I expect, after the hon. gentleman was, and for many years after the old National Policy had been given what I would consider a fair trial in this country, and I would point out to him that there was great emigration from this country even in those days. Many of our young people were leaving the farms of Canada and going to the United States. Right at the present time people are leaving the farms in the province of Ontario in hundreds. You have fewer farmers on the land in Ontario to-day by many thousands than you had ten years ago. Now, if protection as we had it under the old National Policy was such a good thing for the farmers of this province, it seems to me that instead of having fewer farmers we would have more farmers on the land.

Mr. LALOR: May I ask a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON: The hon. gentleman may ask a question after I have finished. As a farmer in this House, Mr. Speaker, and speaking from the cross benches, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a resolution that was passed at a round table conference of Conservatives of this Dominion in the city of Toronto a few days ago. I do not know all that was considered at that conference, but there were men there representative of the Conservative party from one end of this Dominion to the other, and they passed this resolution:

> That agriculture in the broadest and best sense is Canada's greatest field for enterprise, and no handicap of any kind must be allowed to impede the progress of our farmers.

This resolution was passed by a body of men, if not representative of all classes, were certainly representative of all parts of this Dominion, and called together for the purpose of discussing party affairs. Whether or not we have confidence in these men or feel like entrusting them with the destinies of this country, I am sure we can give them credit for sincerity in expressing their opinion as to what should be done in the best interests of this country, and this is what they say with respect to agriculture,—"that no handicap of any kind must be allowed to impede the progress of our farmers." We have heard from every leader of public thought in this country during the past few months that if there was one thing needed more than another in Canada at the present time it is increased production.

I wish at this point to offer my sincere thanks and appreciation to the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), first of all for making an honest endeavour through the imposition of these new taxes—and by the way, in levying these taxes he has adopted the principle of direct taxation as proposed in the platform of the Council of Agriculture—to make our revenue equal our expenditure. Secondly, I wish to thank the minister for making the bonds that he floated last fall taxable. His predecessor had been asked by members of this House, and by representative people from all over this Dominion, to make the income from the bonds sold in 1918 taxable, but he did not see fit to do that. I am sure it must be a matter of great pride to the present Minister of Finance, after coming into office as he did late last year confronted with the responsibility of getting together the machinery for floating this new loan, that he

was able, even with a taxable bond, to get more money than his predecessor ever got. I am sure it was a matter of great satisfaction to the Canadian people to know that our people would, when necessity demanded, put up the money even if the interest accruing from those bonds was subject to taxation.

There are those in this country who think that the ex-Minister of Finance stepped from under when he saw the clouds gathering in Canada's financial sky. In connection with that I think it is only proper to say, in justice to the present minister, that the ex-Minister of Finance has left to him, and any who may follow him in the next few years, a great legacy of debt, a large part of which in my opinion could and should have been paid during the war period if the ex-Minister of Finance had been brave enough to impose taxes when money was plentiful in this country. When the people found themselves with more money than they had ever had in their lives, if the ex-Minister of Finance had been the genius he would have the country believe he is, and if he had had the best interests of Canada and of the great mass of the people at heart, he could have paid a large part of the war cost during the war period. But instead of that I charge, Mr. Speaker, that he pandered to the interest of his friends. If the ex-Minister of Finance had lived up to his opportunity, the present Minister of Finance would not have found it necessary to impose these new taxes at all. In addition to that, our interest charge would not have amounted to the colossal sum that it does.

I wish to thank the Minister of Finance for something else, and that is for investing the fund held in trust by this Government and known as the School Lands Trust Fund. He has invested it so that it will return to the province of Saskatchewan five per cent instead of three. I brought this matter to the attention of the House last year and pointed out at that time that while the ex-Minister of Finance had invested a part of this fund to return to the province five per cent instead of three, he had promised to invest the balance. This promise he never carried out. It would be well perhaps if I gave the exact words of the treasurer of the province of Saskatchewan as contained in his Budget speech of last year. This is what the provincial treasurer said in respect to the School Lands Trust Fund:

> It will be remembered by the House that two years ago when making our usual representation to the Dominion authorities in this matter we urged that even if the control of the lands and funds could not be vested in the province the Dominion should in any event pay a higher rate of interest than three per cent. Under the law three per cent is set as the rate. There was no question in the mind of any member of this House that when the Dominion Government was paying 5½ per cent for war loans that our money in their hands was certainly worth more than 3 per cent, and we made representations accordingly. Sir Thomas White, at that time, promised to invest the funds in Dominion Government stocks and bonds which the Act gave him authority to do with a view to a higher earning for the province than 3 per cent.
>
> Let us see how that promise was carried out. Of the $6,185,000 in the trust fund $3,891,000 have been invested. On that amount the province receives interest at the rate of five per cent at the present time, but the other $2,294,000 the Dominion still keeps for its own use at 3 per cent. Efforts have been made to secure the investment of a larger portion of the fund with no result to date.

This was the condition of this fund when the present Minister of Finance took office. When the matter was brought to his attention, he immediately invested the full amount of this fund so that it would return to the Provincial Government five per cent instead of three. I wish to take this opportunity of extending to the Minister of Finance the thanks of the people of Saskatchewan, not for having conferred a favour but for having done the right thing and for having done it at once when convinced of the justice of the request.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Does the hon. gentleman pretend to speak for the province of Saskatchewan?

An hon. MEMBER: Sure.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Very different was the action of the minister's predecessor who, though convinced of the justice of our claim, made promises which he did not live up to. If I have erred in taking upon myself something that I should not have done, I must say that I am only following in the footsteps of the hon. gentleman (Mr. H. A. Mackie) who undertakes to speak not only for the province of Alberta but for the whole Dominion of Canada when he gets a chance.

Now I wish to pay some attention to the speech of the hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Elkin). That hon. member came to this House as a Liberal and an avowed free trader. When, in the discussions around the corridors, the question came up as to who among the Liberals would stick to the Government forces, the hon. member for St. John city was one who was always counted out because, as I have said, he came to this House as an avowed free

trader. What then was the surprise of hon. members on this side—in fact I think of hon. members on both sides—when the hon. member rose in his place a few evenings ago and delivered one of the strongest protectionist speeches I have heard here.

Mr. LALOR: Honest conviction.

Mr. JOHNSTON: There is always a reason for such a quick conversion, and looking for the reason in the case of the hon. member for St. John one is reminded, Sir, that in private life he is a manufacturer and that his manufacturing business is one that is listed to be included in the great merger that is now in the process of consummation in this country. We have often heard, Sir, that the monied men of Canada—and, I think, of every other country—carry their politics in their pocket. Would it be that there was a money consideration in connection with this quick change of heart as exemplified by the hon. member for St. John? We have proof that men in the financial life of this country do change their politics in a hurry when they think there is a chance of their pocket being touched. I point you to the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) who with a number of other wealthy men of the city of Toronto—many of them reputed to be millionaires—repudiated their old party and its policy in 1911 because they, in their short-sightedness, feared to pit their ability against that of the Yankees in a fair, open, and above-board business transaction. No matter what the cause we have in the hon. member for St. John a living example of one who, in the twinkling of an eye, has been transformed from an avowed free trader into an ardent protectionist. One might understand how a moderate protectionist could extend, or stretch his moderate views so that he would get into the class that might be termed protectionist for protection's sake, or stand for the principle of protection, but how a man can go to bed at night an avowed free trader and wake up in the morning a real high protectionist is beyond my limited powers of comprehension.

An hon. MEMBER: You did it for fifteen years.

Mr. JOHNSTON: As I said the hon. member for St. John was an avowed free trader because he used these words in his address to the House the other evening:

> I believed in free trade once myself.

Those were the hon. gentleman's words. It would be interesting for the House to know just when the hon. member experienced his change of heart. He says he was once a free trader but does not enlighten the House as to when he was converted. Is it not a fact that the hon. member, as I have already said, has been engaged in manufacturing for a considerable time and that when so engaged he was a free trader? But now that his business is being absorbed in the gigantic merger to which I have alluded his fear of American competition is such that he has changed from a free trader to a protectionist. When the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) a few days ago moved the adjournment of the House so that we might consider this merger many felt that something should be done by way of investigating the reasons for that combination and its effect, if consummated, upon the commercial life of this country. I think there is something in connection with this matter that would stand a thorough investigation. You will notice that the hon. member said the western free trader does not exist to-day, but he drew attention in those words to the demands of the western grain growers:

> The western grain growers who want to make immediate and sweeping reductions in the tariff are fond of picturing Canadian manufacturers as a small group of selfish men, who support the tariff policy solely in their own interests. These grain growers ask: why should this privileged class be permitted to levy toll on all other classes in this country?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the grain growers do picture the supporters of high protection as a selfish class. It has been proved times without number that the Canadian manufacturer can and does compete in the foreign market, where he has no protection against the products from other countries. Why then are the Canadian people penalized when our manufacturers can compete outside of Canada without protection? Is it not a reasonable question to ask, and logical to claim that they can compete in Canada? The grain growers not only claim that the manufacturers are selfish in asking for protection that they do not need, but they also claim that the manufacturers are standing in the way of the advancement and development of the agricultural resources of this country. Again I would remind the House of the resolution adopted by the Conservatives at the Toronto meeting in which they said that no handicap of any kind should be allowed to impede the progress of our farmers. Is there an honourable member in this House who will argue that you are not retarding the progress and development of

agriculture in this country by imposing a tariff on the importation of agricultural machinery and thereby enabling the Canadian manufacturers to exact the amount of that duty from the farmers? Is this not a restriction on production? Any one who has given the matter of Canadian finances any serious thought must realize that the one big thing needed in Canada to-day is increased production so that the heavy taxes incurred through our war effort will not bear too heavily on the producer. If this Government would adopt the resolution as passed by the Conservatives at Toronto their first consideration should be to remove all duties on agricultural implements and machinery necessary to production. The honourable member for St. John then gives to the House his unsupported word that the protective tariff not only benefits the manufacturer but almost every other class in the country and then goes on to enumerate a long list. In this connection let me say that I am quite willing to leave this matter in the hands of the residents of the urban centres for them to decide upon at the next general election. Regarding taxes and the farmers the hon. member has this to say:

> It should be the aim of Parliament to remedy every legitimate grievance, giving attention first to those that are most pressing. If the case of the farmers is to be given priority, then let the farmers show some cause more convincing than the loudness of the howl they are putting up. What taxes do they pay to swell the federal revenues other than those levied by means of the tariff? When other people are paying taxes under the tariff, and income and profit taxes besides, how do the farmers justify their demand that they be relieved of taxes altogether? If their grievance is a real one, how do they account for the fact that there is such a brisk demand for western farm land, with advancing prices? If there were a movement away from the land there would be some colour to their argument.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first intimation that I have ever had that the farmers of this country were trying to evade paying their taxes. The farmer pays the general taxation of this country the same as every other person, and he pays the income when his income comes within the taxable amount. It is true that he has not been taxed for excessive profits because he never gets into that class. Regarding the other matter of a brisk demand for western farm lands, and a movement towards the land, I admit that there is a great cry of "Back to the land," but I fail to see any evidence of the urban dwellers of this country making any move towards the land. Any farm lands that are being taken up in Western Canada to-day are being taken principally by Americans from across the line, or by farmers in that country enlarging their holdings. In this connection I would like to say that in the province of Saskatchewan, from which I come, there are fewer actual farmers on the land to-day than there have been homesteads entered for.

As a fitting climax to the other mis-statements of the hon. member for St. John he winds up in this fashion: in respect to the representation in this Parliament:

> If the farmer persists in an attempt to get from under altogether, and leave the whole load to be carried by the townsman, it is not unlikely that the latter will arise in his might and sweep aside the pernicious principle whereby he has been deprived of his just representation and voting power.

The hon. gentlemen proceeds to give some comparative tables in respect to this matter, which tables I shall not quote. If the farmer dominates in this Parliament, Mr. Speaker, it is not by force of numbers. It is a well-known fact that according to the last census taken in this country 54.5 of our population were found to be rural, and the farmers in this Parliament represent much less than twenty per cent of the total membership. I think, therefore, that this statement of the hon. member for St. John is on a par with many other statements he has made. The hon. gentleman makes the threat that if the farmers continue to raise what he is pleased to term "a howl," the urban dwellers may rise in their might and demand that they be given representation in this Parliament in strict accordance with population. I do not think that any farmer in this Parliament has ever suggested that the farmers should be represented in this House other than by population. If some of the rural ridings do not contain as many electors as some of the urban constituencies, I believe that the reason is that in re-distributing the country some consideration was given to area. But if my hon. friend and those new-found friends of his see fit to make a re-distribution of the country and adhere strictly to population they will hear no complaints from the farmers.

Again, we as western farmers are charged with wishing to market our grain in Minneapolis and Chicago, and to buy our machinery from the United States. The only reason for this is that the western farmer wants to market his grain in Minneapolis and Chicago at times when it will bring him more money. There is no matter of sentiment in connection with the question at all. And the same applies to the purchasing of machinery. If any man needs a

piece of machinery and he can buy it for less money in the United States he naturally buys it there, and I think that a large portion of the machinery used in the factories of this country by people who support a protective tariff will be found to have been purchased in the United States. Yet no one would think of claiming that the owners of the factories are less Canadian because they use American machinery. There are those people in this country, Mr. Speaker, who consider that in buying American made machinery they are really doing a service to Canada, for the amount of the tariff levied on the machinery they get goes directly into the public treasury and not into the pockets of the manufacturers.

I come now to the last of the statements made by the hon. member for St. John, and this is in respect to our railways. He says:

> These railways were built with the money of the people of Canada in order that there might be opened up for settlement a territory whose population are now enjoying marked prosperity. Without the railways there would have been no West. Without the taxes cheerfully paid year after year by Canadians in the East there would have been no railways. Is the partnership arrangement that has proven so mutually profitable now to be terminated simply because of the unwillingness of the West to pay its share of the operating expenses?

Did you ever hear a more ridiculous statement made in this House, that the farmers, residents of this country, taxpayers in this country, with everything they own subject to the advancement and development of this country, were out to cripple the great transportation system that we as a people now own and are operating? No argument can be adduced to combat a statement of this kind for it is foundationless and absurd. In respect to this railway problem, let me say, the people of Western Canada are prepared to pay their full share of the deficit on these roads, but they are not willing that the whole deficit should be borne by those who use the roads, and they will not submit to an increase of freight rates for this purpose. I hold, Mr. Speaker, that this Parliament as representative of all parts of this Dominion and all the people of this Dominion, is responsible for the sad muddle in connection with our railways and we Western Canadians hold that it is not just or fair that those who happen to use these lines should be penalized for the mistakes of this Parliament as representative of all the people. I am forced to think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member could not have heard the hon.

[Mr. Johnston.]

Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) when he gave these words to the House last session. They will be found at page 69, Vol. 1:

> As a western representative, and particularly as a representative of the province of Saskatchewan, I feel I should say one word more. I refer to the conditions existing in Western Canada, where all the elements of disunion exists—A pretty big and serious problem. I am referring now to the tariff cleavage between East and West. You know, we might as well look that squarely in the face and recognize the situation as it exists; there is no use dodging it, that situation is there. What are the people of Canada going to do? Can it be settled in some way or another? Is there a possibility of a settlement? There is no doubt as to the feeling out West. There is no division among the people. All parties are practically united. What is to be done? You will have an opportunity later in the session to consider the question. In the meantime, I simply wish to point out to this House, and to the people of this country, that that is one of the other questions on the horizon that in many ways looks dangerous; at any rate it divides the people of this country and puts them in two hostile camps, fighting against each other all the time. If Canada is to be what we hope it shall be, then an honest and earnest attempt must be made to solve that problem which stares us squarely in the face.

These were serious words coming from one who should know conditions in Western Canada, and yet we have an hon. member going out of his way, I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, at the request of some western politician, to make statements in this House that can serve no good purpose but will have, if taken seriously, a disrupting effect. I have taken considerable time in dealing with the remarks of the hon. member for St. John, and I now wish to say to him and to the House that the people of Western Canada are just as loyal to Canada, her institutions and the grand Empire of which we form a part, as the hon. member from St. John, or any of those new friends whom he has so lately adopted.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, most of us who are now on these cross benches were called upon to make a decision in respect to the proposals of the Government in its Budget. The proposals did not suit some of us, and the promise of the ex-Minister of Finance for a revision of the tariff was not taken seriously. We had little hope, even with a commission appointed, that the tariff would be revised downward to such an extent that our views would be met. We voted against the Government on that occasion, and I think that in view of the result as we have it before the House to-day, our judgment was sound. My own reasoning was that there was no chance of the ex-Minister of Fin-

ance (Sir Thomas White) agreeing to a reduction that would suit me, and even if he did, I had little hope of its getting by a party caucus when the great majority of those present would be opposed. That was my opinion and in consequence, I have since been a cross-bencher in this House.

I would like to state my position in respect to the policy that we cross-benchers have adopted. It has been the aim of many hon. members of this House to make it appear that this movement is simply a class movement. Many of them have taken occasion to look over the policy as laid down by the Canadian Council of Agriculture and have tried to make the people believe that this policy is purely of a class nature. I may say that in 1916, shortly after this policy had been adopted by the Canadian Council of Agriculture, every candidate in the federal field in Saskatchewan was circularized by the secretary of the Grain Growers' Association there and asked whether if elected, he would be prepared to support the policy as laid down by the Canadian Council of Agriculture. My reply was in the affirmative, and prior to the consummation of Union Government in the fall of 1917 I issued a manifesto to the electors of Last Mountain in which I stated that I was a supporter of that policy in respect of tariff matters. I stated my position in this House in the Budget debate of last session. In view of these facts and the stand I had taken ever since I first became interested in public affairs, I could do nothing less than vote against the Government proposals as contained in last year's Budget. There are those who took a different view. It is for them to say whether the Government has fulfilled its pledges and whether the proposals of the Government as contained in this year's Budget are in the interests of Western Canada.

I am not going to make any appeals to the Government, Mr. Speaker; I believe it would avail me very little to do so. But I wish to point out to them that to have a solid, a lasting prosperity in this country, it must be founded upon the accomplishments and life of the agriculturist. Make prosperous the condition and happy the home life of the farmers in this country and all else will be well. There need be no worry about paying our national debt. Canada has the resources; her people have the conquering spirit. Change the fiscal policy so that no handicap shall be placed upon the real producers of wealth in this country. But to do that, Mr. Speaker, to bring about that change, we must, in my opinion, have a change of government.

There are many other matters to which reference might be made, but the hour is late and I do not wish to tire hon. gentlemen. I may say here that in respect to the matter of an early election I voted for the resolution of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) at the beginning of this session, and I did so believing that I was carrying out the wishes of my constituents. I believe that the great majority of the electors of this country have lost confidence in the Government. It matters not whether it is a good government or a bad government, the people who are rseponsible for the election of members to this House are dissatisfied, and I believe that they have every reason to be dissatisfied. This Government was elected for a specific purpose and for a definite period. The purpose was to win the war; the period was for the length of time that it would take to accomplish that purpose. That has all been accomplished, and the people are demanding that there should be an appeal to them. There are other reasons. This Government came into being as a Union Government. The promise was made to the people and to the Liberals who joined with the Conservatives under a Conservative leader that there should be a fifty-fifty split as respects the personnel of the Cabinet. That pledge or promise has never been fulfilled; and to-day we have a Government dominated by high protectionists. For this reason, I believe it is up to this Government to conclude the business of this session and then to appeal to the country for a new mandate.

On motion of Mr. M. Clark (Red Deer) the debate was adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 72, to incorporate The North-West Route, Limited.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 118 from the Senate, for the relief of James Lewis Price.—Mr. MacNutt.

Bill No. 119 from the Senate, for the relief of Frederick Tristram Clarke.—Mr. Burnham.

Bill No. 113 from the Senate, for the relief of Jessie Elizabeth Hudgin.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 115 from the Senate, for the relief of Caroline Ewing Gudewill.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 117 from the Senate, for the relief of Charles Lindsay Keys.—Mr. Casselman.

Bill No. 125 from the Senate, for the relief of Irene Martin Chapman.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 52, to incorporate The Western Canadian Union Corporation on Seventh-Day Adventists.—Mr. Mackie (Edmonton).

Bill No. 105 from the Senate, to incorporate United Canada Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Blake.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 128 from the Senate, for the relief of Francis Charles Dean.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 129 from the Senate, for the relief of John James Garrison.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 130 from the Senate, for the relief of Dora Lumsden MacLaurin.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 132 from the Senate, respecting The Army and Navy Veterans in Canada.—Mr. Blake.

Bill No. 133 from the Senate, for the relief of Edith Sarah Bell.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

On motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Tuesday, May 25, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

SALARIES OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. D. EULER (North Waterloo): I would like to bring to the attention of the Government a matter of great public importance There appears to be a state of unrest among certain of the postal employees with threats of a strike. I understand that the Government have introduced a Bill, which has been given its first reading, providing for increased remuneration to the postal employees dating back to April 1 of last year, but so much time has elapsed in bringing this legislation into effect that the men concerned are very much dissatisfied. I would therefore ask the Government what is being done in the matter, and whether they can make any pronouncement as to when the added pay, if any, will reach the men.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): As my hon. friend has stated, a Bill is now before the House which, when passed, will authorize the payment of the moneys which the Post Office employees desire to secure. That Bill would have been proceeded with before this had not so much time been taken up with the Franchise Bill which had the right of way. As soon as that measure is disposed of the Bill in question will be proceeded with The matter can then be dealt with.

[M. Johnston.]

THE BUDGET.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON THE ANNUAL STATEMENT PRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

The House resumed from Friday, May 21, the debate on the motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, in rising to detain the House for what I hope will be no very great length of time, considering that it is a Budget debate, I feel that it is my duty to voice what is a very general sentiment, and that is a sentiment of gratification that I once more speak in the presence of my right hon friend the Prime Minister of Canada. Sir, those of us who in an intimate degree shared the heavy load which the country placed upon his shoulders followed his search for health with the utmost sympathy, and in my own case I can say truly that my mind and heart were continually with him. I have had the honour of being his colleague in this House for twelve years. We have differed politically—we never differed otherwise,—we never differed except in opinion. His tenacity during the whole of the great struggle, and especially his statesmanlike patience in hanging on to the tough job of forming Union Government, have made it certain that when the heedless blast of time has swept away the passion and the prejudices of the present the name of Borden will occupy no lowly place on the list of those who, in the Great War, kept the standard floating in high places of the field. I feel sure the House joins with me in offering my right hon. friend the warmest congratulations that our hearts can conceive on his return to work and our best wishes for a long and useful public service in the future.

I turn to another matter when I compliment my old friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) on the personal aspects of his financial statement. I think every one I have heard speak of his speech has admitted that the preparation and presentation of his case was somewhat in the nature of a personal triumph. For the case itself, Sir, I perhaps cannot say quite so much—that will develop as I go along

Meantime I must remember that we are dealing with an Amendment as well as with a Budget Speech. There are considerable disadvantages attaching to the practice of moving amendments to a complicated Budget on the part of the chief critic in one's having to plan before having seen the Budget itself. I cannot help thinking that if my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) had heard the Budget Speech and studied it for a day or two he would have produced a rather different amendment than that which he presented to the House. I should have hoped it would have contained more milk and less water under those circumstances, and would have been less a shilly-shally, temporizing, and opportunist piece of print. Nevertheless it has one virtue—it calls for a downward revision of the tariff.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. M. CLARK: It calls for a considerable reduction of the tariff. Well that is at least one virtue. I do not know that I am unfortunate with the preambles of the amendments that come from my hon. friends of the Official Opposition. I do not quite sympathize with the preamble of this amendment. It is quite true that my right hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White) promised a revision of the tariff downward, after an examination last fall. But my right hon. friend is no longer a member of the Government. He unfortunately, and with the sympathy of all of us, felt that his health did not enable him further to carry on the business of that position,—the Government was not to blame for that. Then we had a fall session and I do not know that any one on this side of the House was much more opposed to a fall session than honourable members on the other side. Anyway we had to come here and do our duty, and I think, common fairness would lead the Opposition to recognize that these were almost insuperable obstacles in the way of a thorough examination all over the country in the fall of last year followed by a revision of the tariff. And we are further in this strange position, that the amendment calls for a revision from the Government which in its Budget Speech is promising this very thing. It is a most peculiar position from a parliamentary point of view. A revision is promised by the Government and a revision is asked for by the Official Opposition, and thus we of the Independent party have to make a choice between the two positions. However, as I have said, the amendment calls for a downward division of the tariff. The fact that both parties are pledged to revision is a strange comment upon the position which was taken by my right hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Finance, in a speech which he made, I think in reply to some remarks of mine, in the debate on the Address. I regret very much that my right hon. friend is not paying one of his somewhat infrequent visits to the House of Commons to-day. However, I am not going to say anything very savage about my right hon. friend; and I do not think any one will imagine I have treated him very badly.

My right hon. friend (Sir Thomas White) put up the argument that what the country needed at the present time was stability, and he seemed to argue that that stability was to be arrived at under a tariff. Well, that position would scarcely be supported by the faet that on both sides of the House at this moment it is recognized that the tariff is not stable, because we all want to revise it. I do not know whether we all want to revise it downward —I know that on this side we want to revise it downward. They have had a tariff in Germany for a great many years. Germany is not in a very stable condition to-day. Germany's tariff policy was entirely mixed up with her militarist policy; the two together produced a top heavy bureaucracy, and instead of stability we have absolute chaos, confusion, and the products of an unstable condition. If one looks at the United States they had in that country within my recollection, a Wilson tariff—not President Wilson but a former Minister of Finance—a McKinley tariff, a Dingley tariff, an Underwood tariff, and what the next one will be will depend upon the name of the next Secretary of the Treasury.

We have had in Canada, first the propagation of the National Policy; then the Fielding tariff; then the White tariff—now there is a double demand for a revision and the question comes to all of us what are we going to do with the blessed thing? Yet my right hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance brings that before us as the emblem of stability. The fact is that once you seed the bad of protection you sow a crop of vested interests; you may be lowering the tariff, you may be raising it, you are always tinkering and pottering with it, but it is never stable. Nothing is ever settled in this world unless it is settled right, and the only way you can settle the tariff right is to cut its head off just in front of its tail.

Now I have had this much to say in answer to my right hon. friend (Sir Thomas

White) on the question of the stable nature of the tariff. It would appear that the unstability of the creed communicates itself also to the apostle. I do not know that my right hon. friend's career on this tariff question has been an example of very great stability. For fifteen years he supported Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Government of that day in a policy which was always proclaimed—while they were in power anyhow —as a policy of tariff for revenue. But he went down to Toronto a few weeks ago and put himself at the head of the protectionist forces of this country as far as a proclamation could put him at the head. He said: "We must have a tariff not only for the production of revenue but we must have a tariff also for the building up of our industries. He proclaimed himself then and there a high protectionist. There has been a great evolution because last year in this House he was promising a revision of the tariff and, we understood, a revision downwards. He was at that time hobnobbing to a considerable extent with western members and promising a revision of the tariff which we understood was to be in a downward direction. He now proclaims that a tariff is needed not only for revenue but for protection, overlooking that he is making a tariff that should perform two completely hostile operations. If the tariff is to build up our industries it must keep goods out of the country. If it is to give us revenue it must bring goods in. There is a stable performance for you! It has to bring goods in and to keep them out, at the same time conducting two completely different operations.

My right hon. friend has given some other examples on instability in regard to the tariff. He and the Government of which he was a member came into power in 1911 pledged against free wheat. We were told that free wheat would ruin the country, break up the British Empire and turn the traffic on our railways north and south instead of east and west. They were pledged against free wheat. I remember his maiden speech in which he said that the great province of Ontario had spoken and was it not the part of wisdom to listen to it? But my right hon. and stable friend gave us free wheat which he said would ruin the Empire.

For three and a half years after the war began he told us that the Income Tax was the most impossible consideration for Canada that could enter the mind of any Finance Minister, and that it could not be thought of. He talked against the imposition of the Income Tax but he imposed it himself. It was imposed by my stable friend the ex-Minister of Finance. He was still the Minister of Finance at the time that tax was imposed. This criticism applies as much to the Government as to himself except that there was this difference: that some of them had not a past Liberal record as being in favour of a tariff for revenue only. I understood that an outstanding figure in that regard is to be seen in the person of the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen). No reed which ever shook its slender tip in the summer wind could compare with the ex-Minister of Finance as an emblem of instability.

I revert for a moment to the question of tariff revision, and I want to say, and say it with the utmost seriousness, that in my opinion the immediate future prosperity—yes, the immediate future financial solidarity, honesty and stability of this country, depend upon a revision of the tariff downward and that very speedily. At this point in my remarks I would say that the basis for that very strong and emphatic statement is the opinion—not my own opinion—but the opinion of everybody who is worth listening to in Canada upon this subject. We must increase the commerce of this country—export and import. We must increase the commerce of this country in the years immediately in front of us—export and import. What does Mr. Lloyd Harris who has had a remarkable chance of forming an opinion upon this subject, say? What do our great financial leaders say? What do Sir Vincent Meredith, Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor and Sir Edmund Walker say? Every one of these authorities says just what I have proclaimed though I admit they attach more importance than I do to an excess of exports over imports, although I will show you presently why we must have an excess of exports over imports. The commerce of the country must be increased and my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) put the matter in a way which cannot be disputed when he said the other night that ships do not sail loaded one way to come empty the other. The only way you can carry on foreign commerce is to import—to sell exports in exchange for your imports. I mention the same authorities, Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor and Sir Edmund Walker, as concurring substantially in the statement that in the years immediately before us we need to export $200,000,000 worth of produce, roughly, to pay the

foreign liabilities of our people—to pay the interest on money that Canadians in various capacities have borrowed from abroad we need to export every year $200,000,000 worth of produce, because that is the only form in which you can pay that interest. Mr. Speaker, that is a very serious liability for any country, but it is a tremendous liability for a young country like this, loaded, as we are, with our own internal troubles as well. Now, I want to proceed to another position: that for the payment of that liability; for the payment of that interest; for the procuring of that excessive export, you must depend largely upon your agricultural produce. Agriculture and kindred industries must carry the load. The immediate future of Canada depends to a demonstration—and I am trying to be as logical as I can—on the extent to which you promote the free production of your fields, the free production of your cattle ranches, the free production of your forest, the free production of your mines, because it is demonstrable to absolute proof that that is the way you must get the goods to pay your external liabilities.

I do not often burden the House with a large number of figures, but I want to give, in round numbers, some figures which, I think, will carry home pretty substantial proof of the position which I have just taken. I have here the figures of our total export and also the figures for the exports of our agricultural produce,—that is, the produce of the farm and the ranch—for the last five years. If the House will allow me I will cut out the thousands and the hundreds and give the figures in millions. In 1916 the total exports of Canada amounted to $741,000,000, and the exports of the farm and the ranch were $352,000,000. Even at that time, when we were in the middle of the war and our exports were inflated by munitions, note the tremendous proportion of our exports that consisted of the produce of our agriculture alone. In 1917, our total exports were $1,151,000,000, and our total exports of agricultural produce were $501,000,000. In 1918 our total exports were $1,540,000,000, and our total export of agricultural produce, $739,000,000. In 1919 our total exports were $1,216,000,000, of which $469,000,000 were produce of the farm and the ranch. But here is the most significant figure of all: for the first nine months of the fiscal year 1920, when munitions had gone out, the total exports amounted to $941,000,000 and the produce of the farm and ranch, $545,000,000,—much more than half our entire exports. Add to that the produce of the mine, the forest and the fisheries and have I not gone far, Sir, to prove my case when I state that you must depend upon the produce of your agriculture for the discharge of your foreign obligations?

We have to remember something further at this point: that the figures I have just given all apply to the war and the demobilization period, and, therefore, to a period during which there was enormous inflation of prices. There will be a decrease of prices, and we shall still have our $200,000,000 to pay in the shape of interest. What does that teach us? Surely that nothing will meet our case except an enormous increase in the volume of that very produce or otherwise we shall not be able to meet our financial liabilities as a nation. No other conclusion is derivable from the figures I have given,—and here I am talking no party politics; I am talking the best I know for the good of the nation to which we all belong and of which we are all proud. I hope that hon. gentlemen on all sides of the House will look into this matter carefully and receive my argument in the spirit in which it is given. It is an urgent national situation; yet we tax agricultural implements and place obstacles in the way of our foreign trade in the shape of a tariff wall, and a high tariff wall at that.

There is another matter to remember in this connection. The nations of Europe will get into their industrial stride, I think, faster than into their agricultural stride. In Germany and Austria you have very large industrial skill and manufacturing ability. The war has taught us that each nation needs the co-operation of all the other nations of the world; so these nations are looking all over the world for a market in which they can place their products. They are looking to the Argentine, where there is a nominal duty only on agricultural implements,—five per cent I think—with a view to selling their manufactured products there. With what results? That ships crossing the Atlantic from these countries which are rebuilding their business will sail to South America instead of to the northern portions of North America. That is the inevitable result if we keep the duty on implements as we have it and if we continue to keep up a high tariff war against international commerce.

While on this matter I recall that something has been said about key industries in the Old Country. There was for a time a belief in some quarters that the Old Country would desert her traditional free trade faith, and there was talk of some key industries,—I am not sure that my hon.

friend the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen) did not give an address to the Ottawa Board of Trade in which he mentioned that the Old Country was looking after her key industries. Well, it is amusing in that connection to recall that Lord Selborne's committee which sat for the purpose of finding out what was the best way of promoting the good of agriculture in the Old Country, advocated the production of all the food in Great Britain that the British people needed to eat. That was one of the findings of that agricultural committee,—and, Mr. Speaker, the Old Country could do it. If she devoted herself to agriculture of as intensive a kind as is followed in Denmark and Holland, she could produce far more food than her people require. But she has more sense. What is the use of her breaking her neck to produce wheat when she can buy far better stuff from us at a far cheaper rate, selling us in turn, her manufactured goods,—better than we can make—if we have the sense to let her? Our Canadian wheat cannot be beaten anywhere; we can sell it in exchange for the beautiful cotton goods of Lancashire, which equally cannot be beaten anywhere,—that is the way to expand your trade. But I should like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), if he is touching on key industries at all, what would happen to us in Western Canada if the suggestion of Lord Selborne's committee with regard to what it looked upon as the cardinal, key industry of Britain was carried out and Britain produced all the food that she required? What would the farmers of Portage la Prairie and Red Deer think of that state of affairs? It would be rather awkward; we should lose all our market. I mention this just as an illustration of what, after all, appears to be the silliness of protection.

I have very much pleasure in agreeing with many of the praises bestowed on my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). I think he did an extremely brave and wise thing, and the only defensible thing, when he put the actual condition of the finances of the country before the people and Parliament. The removal of the seven and a half per cent duty was good as far as it went. The cessation of borrowing is an absolute necessity for the good of the State. Economy, which he promises to practise—in that he will have difficulty with some of his colleagues —is all important. Just on that head I may observe that there are two ways of improving a bad financial position, whether it be on the part of the individual or on the part of the State. You can raise more income. That will improve your condition, but that is a much safer thing than in the case of an individual than in the case of a State. As regards some ministries, I do not think it is safe for them to have too big incomes, as they are custodians of the people's money—and that is true in the case of this Ministry. There are also some human beings who would be better off if they had less to spend. Still, I would, on the whole, rather trust an individual than the Government of any country with a big income. It is better for Governments if they have just sufficient income to carry on, except of course, when they have a large debt to take care of, as is the case in Canada at the present time, and I do not think we are at present in a position to form a sinking fund for the extinction of our debt. One way to reduce the debt of a State is to raise more income, but a far more salutory method is to spend less, and the latter operation is a vitally important step in what is all important as regards the finances of this country at the present moment. That is, a determined effort should be made to bring our daily expenditure within the limits of our daily income, and as far as I can see there is plenty of room for this Government to make large strides along the road of public economy, which Cobden describes as public virtue.

Like the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon), I listened very carefully to the most important and startling speech made the other day by the hon. member for Guysborough and Antigonish (Mr. J. H. Sinclair), in a small House, there being certainly not more than two ministers and very few members on the Government side present. I venture to take what is perhaps an unusual parliamentary course of procedure in quoting three of the statements that my hon. friend made in that speech. He stated on his authority—and he is a pretty careful man—that in a volume recently issued of the Auditor General's Report there was an item of $119,000,000 which was unaccounted for. The minister does not know where that money has gone; the deputy minister does not know where it has gone, and the Auditor General has it marked down "unaccounted for." That is a very startling statement. My hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) further stated that on four or five pages of the same volume of the Auditor General's Report there are twenty-four cases of individuals whose names are mentioned, going to some department or

subdepartment or another—we have so many of these things that you do not know where you end—and getting sums ranging from $100 to, I think, $220 right into their hands and those sums are marked down in this volume of the Auditor General's Report as "unaccounted for." The name of the individual getting the sum, $100, $150, $200, of public money is printed right in the report, and no account is given of what was done with this money. Some economies could surely be effected in that direction. I am not stating these opinions on my authority; I am quoting from the speech of my hon. friend, and I hope whoever replies to me will give some information as to where this money has gone.

My hon. friend further stated that, according to a return issued about the beginning of this session, the Civil Service Commission had appointed fifty civil servants every day from the date of the Armistice to the date of the issue of that return. I give these statements for what they are worth. They were apparently not worth very much to the Ministry, because not even a private member was put up to reply to my hon. friend, and the hon. member for Gloucester seemed astonished at that. The only explanation I can offer is that, when statements of that seriousness as regards the expenditure of public money are made in this House and no reply is forthcoming from the ministerial benches, I am bound to remind myself that the nearer an autocracy gets to its doom, the more autocratic it becomes.

Without going into the past, there is plenty of room for warning as regards economy in public expenditures. I have told the Government again and again of instances where they could save money and of things they went into that they should never have gone into, and I wish to issue a warning now. The other day in a copy of, I think, a Canadian illustrated magazine, courteously sent to me, I read very carefully an article entitled the "Case for Shipping Subsidies." I wanted to see what the case was because I had not been able to see it on my own account, neither did I find it in the article. What do you think, Mr. Speaker, the writer gave as an argument in favour of granting shipping subsidies? These are temptations that come to Governments, especially amateur members of Governments—I mean politically amateur—and they are supported by arguments of this kind. The writer of the article favouring shipping subsidies said that Great Britain could build ships 50 per cent more cheaply as regards labour than Canada could, and further, that she turns out 15 per cent more finished work in a given period of time. Mark that, Mr. Speaker. Nevertheless, we have in this country a Government that expect they can embark with success in a shipping industry. I am dumbfounded that they should ever think so. Who, in his private life, would want to embark to any great extent in a business in competition with another person who could employ labour half as cheaply and get 15 per cent more done by that more lowly paid labour in any given period of time? As regards shipping, I noticed the other day in a leading article in The Times, the statement made that there are on the seas to-day 4,000,000 tons of shipping more than there were just before the war. The amount of tonnage is increasing every day; the United States, for instance, are very busy constructing ships. I throw out these facts and arguments with, in addition, the confident statement that freight rates must in a very short period come down, against any temptations that are held out to the Government in the way of granting shipping subsidies.

I should now like to say something about the new taxes. I was wondering this forenoon what Bernard Shaw would say if he were to come to Ottawa. Without coming to Ottawa, he said the other day that it looked as if the other planets were, at the moment, using this planet for a lunatic asylum. I imagine him coming to Ottawa and emerging from the central station on to the plaza. The first thing he would see would be that on the railway buildings the time would be, say two o'clock and on the Government buildings, three o'clock—the time arranged on the one hand by the railways and on the other by the municipality, with the Government concurring in the action of the municipality. Last year, the Government took a hand in the matter and were eventually beaten out by the railway companies. I will not dwell on that further than to remark that this is a funny country. Mr. Bernard Shaw comes up to the Parliament Hill and he finds that we are seriously discussing a bad system of taxation which died out on the other side some two centuries ago, and I am sure he will be confirmed in his opinion that this planet is being used for the purpose which he has described. In the first place, these taxes should be rechristened. They are called "excise" duties, and I appeal to the min-

ister in this connection. By the way, very little that I say in the way of criticism applies to the minister personally. He has newly come into the Government; he has hardly found his feet amongst them, and I have no doubt he did not have anything like full responsibility for these taxes. If he did, if he has done all this off his own bat, he has preferred a tremendous indictment against the Government of which he is a member, because if these taxes are good, if they are defensible, and are going to raise us $100,000,000 a year, they should have been put on six years ago at the beginning of the war—$600,000,000 from this source would be a very tangible reduction of the national debt we are now labouring under. I should like the Government and Parliament and the people of this country to consider that; if these are good taxes, if they are defensible, they should have been put on six years ago. As I say, if my hon. friend is wholly responsible for these taxes he has got the Government into frightful hot water in regard to the operations they undertook before they had the benefit of his services.

I return to the point that these are not "excise" duties at all. I very much question if there ever were any such duties imposed in the world. I said that they were a bad imitation of what used to go under the name of excise duties on commodities in Great Britain. In 1643, nearly four hundred years ago,— just about a suitable period for a really Tory government to go back for its precedents — there were duties something like these on goods brought from Holland into England, but I doubt if they were placed direct on the consumer. I do not think they were. They were collected in bulk, just as excise duties are now in England. Real excise duties, such as those on spirits, for example, are not collected from the consumer. If a man wants a glass of whisky he is not asked to pull an extra cent out of his pocket. They would not undertake a ridiculous procedure of that kind—a man would not have time for it late at night. I is recorded of these duties in England, however they were collected that they were most unpopular, and I dare say that the Government individually and collectively have already had evidence that their taxes are not likely to be much more popular here. Their unpopularity was very well shown by Dr. Johnson, a good old English Tory, who described them as "a hateful tax levied upon commodiites and are judged not by the common judges of property but by wretches hired by those to whom excise is paid." I repeat that these duties are not excise duties as the word is understood. An excise duty has had a precise meaning for at least a century of time. I have fortified myself with authority on this question. Webster in his dictionary says that an excise duty is:

> An inland duty or impost laid on articles produced and consumed in a country.

That is an excise duty. It has always been placed on a home produced article, and it is not placed on the consumer. It is placed to save the consumer from being taxed more than he should be. It is placed so that the Government gets the excise duty in lieu of the tariff which is placed on the article coming in from abroad. The Encyclopedia Britannica defines an excise duty as:

> A duty charged on home goods, either in the process of their manufacture or before their sale to home consumers.

The tax is placed before the article is sold to the consumer, to protect the consumer. But there is no question of home goods in these taxes. If one goes to buy any of the goods in these almost wholesale lines which are in the schedule at the end of the Budget Speech, he will not be asked whether this article came from abroad or was produced in Canada. All he will be asked, under these proposals, when he buys a $50 suit of clothes is whether he has an extra $5, and if he does not have it I presume he cannot get the clothes. That is all he is asked. He is not told where the suit came from. He is simply taxed $5, and has that $5 taken from him. It is a case of catching a man buying in these many lines of goods and fining him for a legitimate operation between him and his neighbour. It is not an excise duty at all. It is an arbitrary proceeding. One should not in the main debate on this subject dwell on details and anomalies, because if the Budget carries on the second reading—and I suppose it will, because a government that is supported by a majority under certain conditions can get almost anything. In this House anyhow, we have had examples of that. We supported daylight saving by a huge majority one year and killed it the next year with just as big a majority, and nobody paid much attention to either of our operations—I suppose the Budget will be carried, but there are some terrible anomalies in the thing. The fact of the matter is that it is a totally arbitrary method of taxation, and there is no principle as to the incidence of the tax. If a man goes to buy a $20 suit of clothes he

is not taxed at all. If a returned soldier who, after all, has as much right as anybody else to wear a respectable suit on Sunday, goes to buy a $50 suit of clothes and he just has the extra $5 necessary to give to the Government, he pays his $55. The millionaire goes and gets his $150 suit, and I suppose he will pay $15 in taxes. If I were a millionaire I would pay the tax very cheerfully under those conditions, but I am not so sure about the returned soldier or the working man who just manages to scrape together $55. There is no equality or decency in the incidence of a tax of that kind. It is wholly indefensible, and I am not sure that anything like it has been done in history, until something like it was done in the United States, and the department sent some all-sufficient individual down there for five minutes to look at the thing and he said, "This is the pure cheese." This is another piece of imitation the Government are giving us, if this is an excise duty, but I think I have proved it is not.

What is it? In some respects you might say it is a levy on capital. That has been talked of on both sides of the water as a method of raising money to meet war obligations, but I do not think anybody with preciseness in his make up would want to define this as a levy on capital, and I am sure no supporter of the Government would because, if it is a levy on capital, it is in many cases not a levy on the capitalist. The levy on capital I want is the levy on the capitalist, the man who has some capital worth levying on. So I think we may dismiss that. Then what is it? We have to classify this thing. It is a new species in the fiscal zoological garden and we have to classify and describe it. If it is not an excise duty, and not a levy on capital, what is it? What does it bear most resemblance to? When a taxable article is brought into this country we place a Dominion officer at the port in buttons and blue coat and pay him a salary and he collects the money. That is a tariff against external goods, and, as I hold, against external trade. But in the case of the duties on all these lines of goods you do not have an officer to do your business. You do not pay him to give a license to the buyer even to do the collecting for you. But that does not alter the rule. This is an internal tariff and it will have, and it is having to-day—and it is a splendid object lesson from that point of view—exactly the effect which an external tariff has on the commerce and life of a nation.

That leads me to an enumeration of objections which I think are cardinal and insuperable to this form of taxation. As this is an internal tariff, and it cannot be defined in any other way, my first objection to this whole line of taxation is that it is practically an enormous increase of the tariff on whole lines of articles by a government that in the same breath is promising revision of the tariff, presumably downwards. That is my first real objection to this taxation. My first general objection, of course, I have already dealt with; that there is nothing like it in the heavens above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth. But my first real objection to this taxation is that it is a huge boost of the tariff in the case of long lists of articles in some cases by ten per cent, in others by twenty per cent, in others by thirty per cent, and in others by fifty per cent. It is a huge boost of the tariff. It is nothing else, and cannot be otherwise described, and the mischief of it is that in many cases the Government have boosted things thirty per cent which they should have boosted only ten, and in other cases have boosted only ten when they should have boosted thirty per cent. There is a tax of ten per cent on candies, for example. Well, I am told that young people who go to dance halls in large numbers in this and other cities throughout the country eat a lot of candy, and a young fellow never thinks he does properly by his girl unless he gives her a $2 box. If you wanted to tax luxuries, I would have put that young fellow in the thirty per cent class. Keep him at home more nights in the week; there would be less money spent on candies, and it would make more for the good of the community. But the Government encourage that kind of thing. Then they put a thirty per cent tax on Pain Killer. I have no brief for patent medicines, but Pain Killer has been used for so long as a workingman's medicine that I think there must be something useful in it, and I would put it in the ten per cent class. But these things we can thresh out in Committee, if we ever get there, and I have hopes.

My next objection to the tax is that it will be complex and difficult of collection. Another objection to the tax is that it will inevitably lessen business. That is too true, Sir. This tax will lessen business; it will diminish the prosperity, the trade and the accumulation of wealth in the country at a time when we never needed so much to accumulate wealth as we do

now. It must do that, and it is exactly what its twin brother at the sea coast does all the time. That is the value of this thing, and that is the value of our study of it in regard to the trade of the country. This internal tariff was not imposed three days till individuals all over Ottawa were going to the stores and cancelling orders. That is a fact that cannot be gainsaid. On the way to this House I met a gentleman in whose word I have implicit confidence, and he told me that one firm in a large line of articles, had lost $400 in trade that had been cancelled, and the reason is obvious. The cost of living is so high, that when a man who has made up his mind to buy a carpet for $150 finds $30 or $40 added to the price he determines to do without it and trade is lost to that extent. He wants a carpet, but he calculates that he cannot afford more than a certain amount, and when a large sum is added to the price which he contemplated paying for the article he prefers to do without it. I have met a great many individuals who have told me of their having cancelled orders. I may say that the same thing is true in regard to myself. I am a poor man and I have made up my mind to deny myself the extra suit which I had intended getting and to go this summer wearing overalls and duck shirts. The Government, I have no doubt, will take enough interest in me personally to congratulate me on that, because they say they are teachers of economy. But they reverse the rule. They have no right to teach me economy in my personal capacity. They have no right whatever to do that; indeed, there are far too many schoolmasters in the country. But I have every right in my capacity as a citizen to inculcate economy on the Government, because it is the money of the public which the Government are taking care of. Let me say, Sir, that there are limits to this practice of teaching individuals economy. Now, if it be a fact that you cancel orders in stores on articles of necessity, what is the effect? The store where orders are cancelled will be dismissing a hand before you know where you are; and to go further back, the factories will be employing fewer workers. What effect will that have on agricultural production? The people will not have money to buy agricultural produce, you will lessen trade, and you will hasten that stagnation which is bound to come before we are much older, according to all the men who know anything about trade conditions. I desire to revert for a moment to the question of economy on the part of individuals. When I spoke on the Address I said I doubted very much the soundness of the doctrine that individuals should be exhorted to economize in order to help the State at this time. What a man does with his own money, so long as he does not do anything that is not within the law, is no business of anybody's. It was my privilege at one period of my life to enjoy from time to time brief private conversations with one of the greatest men in the Empire to-day, Lord Morley, then John Morley, the member for Newcastle; and having a good deal of Scotch training in regard to the value of "thrupence." I remember saying to Mr. Morley: "There is a passage in one of your essays which I have been reading lately that rather puzzled me. You refer to the cant of having few wants." He said: "Well, I cannot at all recall having written such a passage, but it is just what I would have written; don't you think that it is the part of a high civilization for every one to have lots of private wants and to be able to supply them in a legitimate way?" I confess I could not reply to him; I thought he defended very well his criticism of that old doctrine of having few wants. But that same gentleman would have been the first to come in and preach, as I have often heard him preach on public platforms, that the duty of the Government is to economize because they are taking care of the money of the public. They are the nations' housekeepers, and as a matter of public uprightness and governmental righteousness it is incumbent upon them to take the best possible care of the peoples' money.

These taxes, therefore, I repeat, will be complex and difficult to collect. They will lessen business; they are lessening business at the present time. Furthermore, they will increase the cost of living in very many respects; there is no doubt about that. So far as the cost of any given article is concerned, they increase the cost of living at the point of the revolver. You go into a store and you are told that you have to produce $5 extra on a suit of clothes costing $50; otherwise you cannot do any business. That is increasing the cost of living with a vengeance, and yet we are all saying that it is our primary duty, in order to alleviate the unrest which exists in the country to-day, to decrease the cost of living as far as we possibly can. We all say that our object should be to lower the cost of living, but the intelligent rows of hon. gentlemen opposite me, who have been working their

brains to see how the cost of living is to be reduced, are going to vote for the principle of a Budget which, on the whole line of absolute necessaries, will increase the cost of living in the most crude and arbitrary manner. The use of that word "crude" in this connection reminds me of a quotation which I am tempted to make, confining its application, however, strictly to the Government. Adam Smith says somewhere that the methods of taxation employed by primitive peoples are generally crude. I will not insult the Canadian people by making them, through all their representatives, responsible for a taxation to which that statement can be applied. I restrict the quotation entirely to the Government. They are a primitive Government, in regard to their taxation at any rate.

The Budget, in the way I have pointed out, increases the cost of living at a time when large numbers of people, with every means of economy which they can devise, are unable to make ends meet. It burdens those who are already burdened to the point of back-breaking, and in that respect I want to say that I except the class to whom I belong. The farmer is not the worst hit by this thing; he can avoid it by wearing overalls and duck shirts. He raises his own food and lives on the land, and therefore I exempt the farmer class from those who are hardest hit. I have said here before, and I repeat, that one of the defects of the Finance Department of this Government during the term of the war has been that it did not get enough out of the farmers when they were making money. We are always being asked "Where can we get more revenue?" If the Government had done a reasonable amount of thinking, or consulted those who were doing the thinking, they could have been told a dozen ways to get revenue. But this taxation does hit the city working man, and what is worse, it hits the veteran. That is who it hits, and that moves me to the special condemnation—the damning charge against this line of taxation is that under it war wealth is left untaxed in any special way, and the profiteers and the millionaires are left practically intact, while you are striking at the men who saved their country and the men who work in the factories with their hands for a daily living. Now these are the characteristics of this taxation as I see it. Some of the statements I have made about it no one can controvert, it is impossible to do so; and yet my hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), claims for the Minister of Finance the quality of courage for putting on this taxation, well, Mr. Speaker, I can only say in regard to that, that you mistake foolhardiness for courage. However, I am willing to waive the point and give my hon. friend the characteristic of courage. He certainly has courage. Any one who becomes responsible for that taxation, whatever other qualities he has, has courage, but I want to say that the members of the Government do not share that characteristic with him.

Now my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce made a most interesting speech on the evening of the day the Budget was presented. He also said "You see we are coming to direct taxation." I was charmed to hear him. I had been urging that for years and been looked upon as a fanatic for my pains; but here is the most experienced politician in the House —I would not be far wrong if I said the ablest debater in Canada—a man of unexampled parliamentary experience, a man who must be nearer the end of his days than the beginning, who actually says what I have been saying for years—and yet I maintain a reasonable degree of modesty. Of course there is this difference between my hon. friend and myself; he says we must arrive at this very gradually. Gradually we are coming to direct taxation! Well the gradualness of the process was remarkable to behold. We met for the first war session in August, 1914, and I ventured to say something about income tax then. The Government raised the duties on sugar and coffee. They would not put an income tax on—"Oh, no," they said "You cannot collect income tax in this country." And income tax went by for 1914. Of course my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) believes in a gradual approach to direct taxation. The year 1915 came; the first real war session. Burden on the consumer but no income tax! The year 1915 witnessed a flat raise of taxation all around. More burdens for the common people, further protection for the millionaire and the rich man,— no income tax! The year 1916 came. All blank, no income tax, no foresight! All blank, not a cent! The year 1917 came. Then came the foresight. An income tax came along and the thing that could not be collected was collected, and we have been collecting a little more ever since. I give the Government and the Minister of Finance full credit for any raise he has made in the income tax, but it is a very,

very, sorry raise, it is a sorry attempt at direct taxation—a very sorry attempt. I give my hon. friend very great credit too for another thing; he states that this income tax has not been well collected. I am glad he has found that out, it is greatly to his credit. We have not got nearly as much out of the income tax as we should have, and now that the Minister of Finance has found it out I am sure he will correct that. The reason we do not have a higher income tax we are told, is, that we must keep step with the States; it would never do to have a higher income tax than they have in the United States. Well, I would never go to the United States, or anywhere else, for an idea that I did not believe in and could not defend on its own merits. I notice that this doctrine that we must keep step with the States is only used by the ministry when it suits their own need—they do not imitate the States in everything. You cannot make the States your guide in fiscal matters. I wish you would in some things. As I say I would defend an idea originating in the United States or Britain, or Timbuctoo, if it was a good thing in itself. But the United States has free boots and shoes, and free agricultural implements. If it be good doctrine that we should keep step with the States in the matter of income tax, why not keep step with them on boots and shoes and agricultural implements? Not at all, it does not suit your book. Then let me give another instance of how you do not keep step with the States, and I want to quote another little table of figures on this point. I have said again and again that our tariff in Canada is a monstrosity compared with the United States tariff, and some of my hon. friends have said: "You ought to prove that." I am just going to prove it. In the United States in the year 1917—and I am using the round figures again—$206,000,000 of duty were collected. In the same year in Canada, while $206,000,000 were being collected in the United States from 110,000,000 people, we collected $167,000,000 from 8,000,000 people. The average rate of duty that year was 7.09 in the United States and 16.8 in Canada. In 1918 the United States collected a total of $172,000,000 and we collected $154,000,000. The average rate of duty in the United States in that year was 5.85, and in Canada 17 per cent. In 1919 the United States collected a total of $249,000,000 from 110,000,000 of people, and we collected $168,000,000 from 8,000,000 of people. Their average duty in that year was 6.52; ours was 17.9. If it be a good thing to imitate the States in income tax, imitate them in tariff too, and get your duty down to an average of 6.52 where the United States tariff is, and has been for the last eight years, and you will make very great progress pari passu as the States have done in the last eight years; because, be it remembered, that the States never made such progress in her history as she has since President Wilson came into power and the Underwood tariff was brought into operation.

Just one more figure in this connection. It brings us nearly to date. The duty collected under the customs tariff in March last in Canada—and this is pretty recent history—was $24,000,000 in round figures, and it came to $3 per head of the population of Canada for the month. I have not the figures for March for the United States, but in the previous month the United States collected $26,000,000, or very little more than was collected in Canada in March. That represents 24 cents per head in the United States. If it is good to follow the States in income taxes, let us get our duty down to 24 cents a month, instead of $3 for every individual; $1.20 per family per month instead of $15 under our tariff. Imitate the States? Yes, where it is good for us to imitate them, imitate them by all means. You should certainly imitate them in the matter of the tariff. I do not think we have come up to them quite in our income tax yet. I have not had time to look into that, nor have I had all the material available, but I question if we are collecting as much by income tax, or at as high a rate, as they are in the United States.

I would not compare ourselves on this question of income tax with the United States. I would compare Canada with other portions of the great Commonwealth of Nations to which we all belong. I would want to see what the sacrifices are that are being made by the little Mother of Nations overseas. What is she doing about the income tax? Her exemption is a very low one. It would be too low for Canada. Her exemption is about $800—£160. She begins to collect income tax then, and how does she do it?—in the most drastic fashion. She charges six shillings in the pound or thirty per cent on the income of her citizens immediately the £160 mark is passed. That is her heroism at home as well as her heroism in the trenches, the heroism in money that our men showed in blood. That is where I would go for an example. I

believe our people would do it. I mentioned before that in the course of the war a gentleman in Hamilton actually sent three quarters of a million to the Government and said, "I do not want the stuff; take it; while the sons of Canada are shedding their blood I want to shed my money." The most terrible fault I have against this Government and against the Finance Department is that when the patriotic fervour of the people was at its height, when it was easy for them to be taught the lessons of service and sacrifice, year after year the effort to inculcate that lesson along lines of taxation was avoided and, while gathering their revenue from the tariff upon the consumers, the sheltering wings of the Administration seemed all the time to be cast over those who were making their millions out of the various lines of commerce in the war.

If you do not like the example of the Old Country, then why not go to New Zealand —little New Zealand away in the southern seas? What has she done in the matter of income tax? I have in my possession a quotation and I do not think I need do more than just read that. It is from an article communicated to the London Economist, with a table showing what New Zealand has done. I will not apologize for reading it to the House, because it presents the comparison between Canada and New Zealand in a striking and incontrovertible way:

> Now, as compared with New Zealand, Canada held a favoured position in respect to war orders. Owing to distance from the theatre of war, the scarcity of shipping, and the lack of large industrial plants, the former country could not obtain munition contracts, and, while most of her agricultural products brought substantially higher prices, there was difficulty in exporting them. The population of New Zealand is about one-eighth of that of Canada. Yet in the years 1915-18 inclusive, New Zealand collected in income taxes alone £11,817,124, which at the old rates of exchange is the equivalent of $55,085,620. On the basis of population, Canada, levying the same rates of taxation, should have collected on income and other taxes on wealth a total of $472,684,960. In actual fact during these four years Canada collected nothing in income taxes, and in excess profits and other minor direct taxation a little over $40,000,000. The comparison of the year 1918 alone is particularly deadly. In it New Zealand raised from incomes a total of £5,619,561, which is equivalent to $28,097,803. On the population basis Canada should have raised $204,783,240. But instead Canada raised not one cent on income taxes and only $21,271,038 on excess profits taxes, or about three-fourths of what New Zealand with one-eighth of the population raised by income taxes.

I leave the comparison at that. I leave it at that but it is a hateful thought to me that the country of my adoption, and in which my children and my children's children will live, should come so badly out of this comparison with the little country of New Zealand with her handful of people away in the southern seas. I do not blame the people of Canada. I am bound to blame the Government; I cannot praise them. These facts and figures stare them in the face and it is for them to give the explanation if explanation can be given. If we had collected $204,000,000 a year in money from the beginning of the war, we should have half the war debt we have at the present moment and our position would have been a much more favourable one. But that apparently was too much to hope for because Canada could not come up to the standard of New Zealand in these matters. She did in the trenches—thank God she did in the trenches —but in this other matter we have been frightfully remiss. We know it and everybody who looks into the question knows it.

My reason for bringing this matter up is that we are not doing one bit better now; we are practically leaving the millionaires alone while continuing to burden the consumers just as we have done during these last years and since the beginning of the war. Such is the policy of the Government as I see it. I cannot support it. The amendment after all, does call for a substantial reduction. We are brought face to face with this situation, that when we vote we shall vote either in favour of increasing or of diminishing the cost of living in this country. We cannot help ourselves; we cannot get away from that conclusion. If we vote for a substantial reduction of the tariff and against the Budget we shall vote for a reduction in the cost of living.

This is a very serious consideration for some of my hon. friends opposite. We shall vote either to increase or diminish trade. That has been proved. Internal trade is being diminished by this legislation at the present moment. We who vote for a reduction of the tariff will vote for an increase of trade. Those who vote for the Budget will vote for diminishing the internal trade of the country and therefore will vote for diminishing production. It follows that we who vote for the amendment will vote for an increase in the prosperity and wealth of the country. Those who vote for the Budget will vote for a diminution in the wealth and prosperity of the country. The amendment is not drawn by us who sit in this little group to your left, Mr. Speaker. If it had been it would have been a stronger article. But I cannot avoid voting for the amendment,

and I do not know how in the world the hon. the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) was ever got to swallow this Budget, because he once believed the same about the tariff that I do. What influence has been brought to bear upon him, or how he has been mesmerized I cannot tell because in the general course of his human intercourse he has more often been the mesmerizer than the mesmerized. On this occasion he has been mesmerized; he must have been. I wonder if it is not too late for him to mend? How well that huge brain would look on the cross benches. I would very much like him to pay attention to what I say; to give serious consideration to my modest and humble invitation.

And what about my friend from Neepawa (Mr. Davis) and my hon. and gallant friend from Skeena (Mr. Peck), whom I see before me? And there are others,—my hon. friend from Strathcona (Mr. J. M. Douglas) and my very much respected and valued friend from Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan)—are these gentlemen all going to vote for a diminution of the prosperity, the wealth and the trade of the country and for an increase of its tariff and its cost of living? Well, human nature is a funny thing; you cannot tell what it is capable of. I shall watch the operation of their voting with the very greatest interest. As for us, there is no doubt about where we stand.

We are against the Budget. We think the amendment is a little milk and watery. Our policy on the tariff is the tariff policy of the Dominion Council of Agriculture. If we were against the principle of the amendment I do not think we were made to think very much more of it by the speech in which it was introduced by the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). I do not want to say a single word in criticism of that speech; I would only repeat one single sentence of criticism that was passed upon it by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). The right hon. gentleman said: "I was very much pleased with the speech of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's. When my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) says that about any speech of mine on tariff matters I shall have my head examined by a doctor. I think that is the most effective piece of criticism in one sentence that was ever passed upon a speech in this House. When my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce stands up and says to the Opposition's financial critic, "I was very much pleased with your speech," the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), ought to know very well that he has, fiscally speaking, gone to the devil.

Now, I am having a little crow to pick with the Official Opposition. My hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Béland) whose attractive personality makes him an object of the love of every one in this Chamber, went down to a by-election in Montreal, and he said, in so many words: "I am in favour of a well-regulated protection of Canadian industry." Well, he is no good for the cross benches; I may tell him that out of hand; there is no place for him here. But he can line up splendidly with the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen) who went out to Winnipeg and said that he believed in a moderate tariff. "Well-regulated protection" and "moderate tariff" are very close to one another. For the life of me I do not see why the Minister of the Interior and my hon. friend from Beauce should not be absolutely in the same camp on tariff matters. Would Sir Wilfrid Laurier have said that he was in favour of protection? Never; the word never came from his lips except by way of condemnation. There has been a retrograde metamorphism upon the part of some members of the Official Opposition. If my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) had been in his place I would have tried to do a little Romeo business on my own account—this Romeo business is getting popular in tariff matters. I have done the best I could with the Minister of Immigration, but he is leaving the Chamber now; he is a very coy and unapproachable spinster.

I would like also to address a word to my hon. friend from Victoria, Alta, (Mr. W. H. White), for whom I have as much respect as for any member in this House, and who is, to my knowledge, almost a free trader. And my hon. friend from East Quebec (Mr. Lapointe) will never say that he is a protectionist. I really would like hon. gentlemen on both sides to consider where they are going to get by these mixed up rations. There is my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy), the ex-Secretary of State. He has very broad and advanced views on the fiscal question; he would never describe himself as a protectionist.

Mr. MURPHY: Hear, hear.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Why not come along and stretch out our number on these benches a bit? Bring the others along, too, and let the Progressive party get the majority and choose the best man from among them to be Prime Minister. I will not tell you who that Prime Minister would be; I hold out no bribes to the Official Opposition.

Contrast these statements. My hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's says that under certain circumstances bounties would be all right. He says: "I hold up my hand, theoretically, for free trade." Yes, and he would be prepared to hold out his hands for the bounties; that is the trouble. And my hon. friend from Beauce says: "I am in favour of a well-regulated protection of Canadian industry." I am going to give some quotations now, very brief, not for the purpose of recrimination; not to say whether the Liberal party did or did not do its duty, but to state the progressive fiscal policy that I have believed in all my life, and to give it as affirmed by a man who, being dead, still speaketh. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said before 1896:

> I submit to you that the ideal fiscal system is the British system of free trade.
>
> I come to expose to you the policy of the Liberal party. Let me tell you that the policy may be summed up in the good Saxon word "Freedom," in every sense of the term—freedom of speech, freedom of action, freedom of religious life and civil life, and last, not least, freedom in commercial life.
>
> I denounce to you the policy of protection as bondage; yes, bondage, and I refer to bondage in the same manner as American slavery was bondage; not in the same degree, perhaps, but in the same manner. In the same manner the people of this country, the inhabitants of the city of Winnipeg especially, are toiling for a master, who takes away, not every cent of profit, but a very large percentage, a very great portion of your earnings for which you toil and sweat.

That was sound doctrine, Mr. Speaker, when those sentences were uttered by the voice that is stilled forever so far as this scene is concerned, and it is as profoundly true and more applicable to-day. I am here to claim for the little group by whom we are surrounded that we inherit that doctrine. We are the inheritors of that creed. We come by it honourably. We followed and believed Sir Wilfrid Laurier then, and we follow his teachings now.

Mr. HAY: What is the date of that speech, please?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: These utterances were made either at the 1893 convention, or in speeches immediately preceding. I do not know what that has to do with the matter in hand; the doctrine, not the date, is what matters, as my hon. friend will probably find when he goes to his western constituency.

I was saying that we believe that doctrine is as true to-day as it was at that time. We believe protection is economic bondage. Sixty thousand of the brightest, best and bravest of Canada's sons are lying in France and Flanders to-day because they were prepared to die to accomplish the political freedom of the inhabitants of Europe. Any man deceives himself who thinks that their survivors, and the workingmen, farmers and women of this country, who stood behind them in the fight, are going to submit any further to economic slavery in Canada. It is substantially true that from Confederation to the present day Canada and her people have been owned by a few manufacturers, a few railroad magnates, and a few lumbermen, and we all know that. But the war has changed all that, and an army of emancipation is on the march. The sound of it may be yet as distant thunder, but it is getting nearer every day. The farmers are in that army; the workingmen are in it; the veterans are in it; the women are in it; the best journalistic heads in Canada are in it; men of goodwill of all ranks and classes are in it, and it is marching. We are its outposts for construction purposes. When that army arrives, it will say to all and sundry, whether they be Conservative-Liberals or Liberal-Conservatives: We have come to enter into the inheritance which our sons and brothers died to purchase; we have come to free our beloved land from economic slavery; we have come to put Canada where she belongs in the forefront of the battle of the free and democratic peoples of mankind.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, much as I admire the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) and, indeed, envy many of his gifts as a public speaker, I cannot say that I stand altogether appalled at the task of answering his arguments this afternoon. The hon. member has given us an example of the maximum of merit that a speech may reach, without the ingredient of logic and without the assistance of facts. There were, incidentally, as he proceeded, matters that emerged as to which I do not feel myself in possession of all the details and circumstances to enable me to reply. He made mention of certain items in the Auditor General's Report that were marked in that report "unaccounted for," and large items they were. These were referred to first by the hon. member for Guysborough and Antigonish (Mr. J. H. Sinclair). I was not in my place at that time; but I would presume that the items were British or foreign credits, the accounting for which had not yet reached the Auditor General.

and that consequently they appeared in the report in that form. But the hon. member for Guysborough, or the hon. member for Red Deer, knows that if there is anything he does not understand in the Report of the Auditor General, there is a standing committee of this House for the purpose of investigating every item questioned, and although we have been in session three months, that committee has never been called. If there be any reason for calling it, hon. members have it in their power to have it called, and if there be anything dark it will be revealed.

My hon. friend rather surprised me this afternoon by a prolonged and violent attack on what is described as the "luxury tax" of the Budget. He says that this is only a case of more tariff, 10 per cent upon sales of articles of special value; that is upon luxuries so far as luxuries can be isolated and designated by name. All these things, he says, are only additions to the tariff and cannot even enjoy the good name that belongs to an excise tax; there is nothing right about them; they are too big and they are too small; they came too soon and they came too late; everything that he can think of in connection with the luxury tax is wrong. He says: If this were an excise tax, it would be all right, because an excise tax is on home manufactures alone. Well, an excise tax is on home manufactures alone but there is always a corresponding duty against the import of the same goods, and this is exactly the same thing. There is here a tax on the goods produced in Canada, there is a tax on imported goods—there is the corresponding one to offset the other. If the hon. gentleman would have us pay ten per cent extra for a suit of clothes if it were made in Canada and nothing at all extra if it were imported from the United States, do you think, Mr. Speaker, many more suits of clothes would be made in this country? But that is the character of tax my hon. friend (Mr. Clark) says he would support. I would be sorry for the country that ever took the hon. member for Red Deer as its business mentor. My hon. friend says that we know where his political associates stand. I do not know where they stand.

Mr. COWAN: Nor anybody else.

Mr. MEIGHEN: His leader (Mr. Crerar), who sits to his right, was down in New Brunswick not long ago and he told the people of that province that he was against the tariff and that he wanted to raise revenue by a luxury tax. With the leader arguing in favour of a luxury tax and his first lieutenant opposing it, how are we supposed to know where they stand?

Mr. CRERAR: Does the minister consider a $45 suit of clothes a luxury?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If a $45 suit of clothes is not a luxury, then we have a pretty prosperous country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may be that the limit on certain articles is too low, but does that affect the principle? Would the argument of the hon. member for Red Deer not be just the same against a tax on a $100 or a $150 suit of clothes or against anything in the whole range of the luxury tax? He did not oppose any item in the tax; he opposed the tax on principle, and his leader supports the tax on principle. How then are we to know where they stand? The hon. member for Red Deer says that this tax will add to the cost of living. The reports that have so far come to hand—and they have come direct from dealers in these articles—are to the effect that the tendency has been to bring down the sale price below the limits of the luxury tax. That tendency is in operation and effect.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Where does the revenue come from then?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If we do not get the revenue, no harm is done, and my hon. friend would not oppose the tax; at all events, his objection is gone and we get the economy. Does the hon. member not know that in this country, no matter who should do the teaching, we should have less extravagance and more economy? Will he not admit that?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: On the part of the Government, certainly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will he not admit that that is necessary on the part of the people? He is silent; he knows he has to admit that. He knows the country stands to gain by a diminution of extravagance, by an increase in economy on the part of every individual. If that be the case, how is it wrong on the part of the Government so to arrange its taxation so as to encourage that result.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: My hon. friend is putting into my mouth words which are absolutely contradictory to what I said. I said that the State has not much to do with an individual's expenditure so long as he spends his own money. If my hon. friend was listening he could not help hearing what I said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know he said that, but I am arguing that he is wrong. If it is in the interests of this Dominion that we have less personal extravagance and more economy why is it wrong on the part of the Government so to arrange its legislation as to aim at that end? The hon. member is silent. I knew he would get silent just at the opportune time.

After getting $81,000,000 by direct taxation, here is a Budget that by a luxury tax and other means seeks to raise $100,000,000 more by direct taxation. That is $181,000,000 by direct taxation, and the hon. member opposes this Budget because there is a luxury tax.

He says he wants more income tax, and presented a rather prolonged argument along that line. He made some strictures on the Administration, strictures that are so commonplace and which have been so often exploded as to come better at this time from a member not quite so intelligent as my hon. friend from Red Deer—strictures on the Administration of saving and sheltering the millionaire and taxing the poor man, and he asks us to follow Britain's example in income taxation. Is he aware that as respects the men of higher income in Great Britain, the tax in Canada to-day is higher on them than is the British income tax?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I shall not accept that statement until proved by exact figures taking into account the super-tax.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will provide the hon. gentleman with the figures and they will show that beyond incomes of about $200,000 a year, as near as I remember—and I shall have time to get the figures—the tax in Canada exceeds the British tax and has done so for a year, and now we are adding five per cent more to it. We have been on a level with the United States for the last year, and we are now increasing over them by five per cent. The hon. member does not like following the United States in that regard. Well, it is not for the sake of following them that we do it. It is for the sake of seeking to collect the largest revenue we can. We are alongside the United States whether we like it or not. We are a people of eight or nine millions alongside for 4,000 miles a people of one hundred millions. There is no barrier between, no wall there. Capital is mobile, and as soon as you reach the point where it pays capital to go there instead of here, the tendency is likely to be for it to go there, and as soon as you reach the point where it pays capital to stay there instead of coming here, we are not likely to get much capital. It is not that we love their example. It may be all right or it may not. It is because conditions compel us in the interests of Canada to have regard to the level of income taxation that prevails in that country.

The hon. member also talks about New Zealand. Certainly New Zealand has a heavy income tax. New Zealand has had an income tax for twenty or twenty-five years. We have had an income tax for only three or four years. We were not in office twenty or twenty-five years ago, but some of the hon. member's friends were. I might point out that after New Zealand had had an income tax for ten years they were collecting less than a million dollars a year. New Zealand to-day collects a heavy income tax, but they do not collect any profits tax or any corporation tax. They do not collect any of these other direct taxes that are imposed so heavily in this country. New Zealand is not a manufacturing country, but they have so managed their affairs, (much to the delight of the hon. member for Red Deer) that they have to-day reached the point where they have a debt per capita three or four times as great as has Canada. We will reach their point in income taxation at the rate of increase at which we are proceeding, just as soon perhaps as the most ardent income-taxer in this country may desire, and we are a lot closer to them now than the hon. member for Red Deer would give us to understand. If he adds to our income tax our direct taxes, which are not imposed in New Zealand, and that is the only fair way to compare, we are up now to about half of the New Zealand tax per capita, and when he gets the tax of next year, which is a direct tax too, though not of the nature of income taxation in the same way as the corporation and the profits taxes are, the hon. member will have as much direct taxation as will make him as a public man comfortable in any constituency in this country.

My hon. friend devoted a considerable portion of his speech, although less than formerly, to a disquisition on the proper tariff policy for Canada. I purpose following him with some care into a discussion of that subject. The tariff issue has been again forced to the front in public discussion in Canada, and is likely to be there for some time to come. We have two wings of the opposing party, one represented by the hon. member for Red Deer and the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), and the other represented by those who, opposite, follow I presume, the leader of the

party, at all events follow one of the triumvirate which has shared leadership within itself for the last several months.

As regards the group angularly opposite, the principle that they expound is clearly known. They stand, as the hon. member (Mr. Clark) says, where Sir Wilfrid Laurier stood previous to 1896. I do not think there is any doubt that that is an accurate description of where they stand. They denounce the principle of protection. They denounce all tariffs. They believe that tariffs themselves are a curse, and argue that we should follow instead the example of England and abolish the protective tariff altogether and the "tariff tax", as the hon. member puts it, practically altogether too.

As regards those directly opposite, I am afraid it would be with a smile that they would read the enunciation of the doctrine of Sir Wilfrid Laurier previous to 1896. I watched them as I heard it read this afternoon. There was no clapping of hands, no rejoicing. It brought back to them memories not quite so pleasant as those that fluttered through the mind of the hon. member for Red Deer.

We are opposed by two wings of wholly opposite views, two wings, however, that gather around the motion of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), two wings that hope to go before the people of this country fighting under two flags and under two leaders, to make the pretence all the better, and who hope afterwards to coalesce and entwine the two flags in one in an infamous unity, who hope after taking one camp of public opinion behind them and the opposite camp as well, to the utmost of their power to end up by deceiving both, by betraying both, because they must either deceive the one or doubly deceive the other.

The hon. member for Red Deer points as he has done for ten years in this House, to the example of his native land. If I direct my attention chiefly to the hon. member for Red Deer, it is not that I feel that he is the embodiment or the head of this manoeuvring that is going on and that he is using his great ability as a platform speaker for its own ends. It is rather because he presents the case as an argument on principle. He has placed before us everything that can be said for his cause, and I believe he has placed it before us sincerely. He is a man who has shown his true worth as a citizen, he has shown that he possesses the realities of patriotism, and for him as a man I have the profoundest respect.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Coming to the issue that is now before this House in its naked form, I want to discuss whether we should be led by the example of England as depicted by the hon. member for Red Deer, or whether we should not rather have regard to the experience of Canada, to the experience of the United States, which of all countries, is most like us, to the experience of every advanced nation in the world, and particularly to the actual and true experience of the United Kingdom itself. He tells us, as he has frequently told us, that the United Kingdom is exceedingly prosperous, that it has been given its position of supremacy by a policy of free imports, that it is an example to the outside world, that its trade has advanced all through these years. In that, in some degree, he is correct. He has told us this afternoon that we in Canada must sell more goods than we buy; that it is the only way we can discharge our outside obligations, and he says that we must sell more than we buy to the extent annually of at least $200,000,000 a year. While I am free to admit that British trade has advanced in the last 10 years British trade shows certain features since free trade became the vogue over there that utterly discredit it as a policy for this or any other country that seeks to sell more goods than it buys. And it must be remembered as well that while there has been absolute advance, there has as compared with great rival countries been a melancholy relative decline. Aggregate trade is one thing, but aggregate trade in itself means very little. It is comparative trade figures that tell the tale; it is also the nature of the trade that counts. I do not know that any country is better off—in fact, I know it is far worse off—that buys, as the United States bought for many years, the whole of its tin plate, thereby adding to its import and its aggregate trade. It would seem to me that the United States was better off when it set about revising its tariff and so improved it that later on, in 1913, according to the figures given by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) in a speech pregnant with illuminating facts that go to the heart of this question, it made at home two billion pounds of tin plate in a year. The United States were importing 680,000,000 pounds of tin plate in 1890. This added to their aggregate trade, it is true, and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) would possibly think that was a glorious achievement. But they set about changing their policy, and instead of importing

680,000,000 pounds and making only 2,000,000 pounds at home, they imported 28,000,000 pounds and finally were making 2,000,000,000 pounds in their own country.

Now, coming to Great Britain, the remarkable fact about the position of that country to-day—and they know it over there just as well as we know it and regret it more keenly than we do—is, that while they have an aggregate trade which I think is second in the world, (being next to that of the United States of America), they are selling in the world to-day something over $3,000,000,000 worth of goods and are buying over $7,000,000,000 worth. They are buying at the present rate almost $2 for every $1 they sell, and that is directly the consequence of the trade policy they have pursued. The United States, on the contrary, with a bigger aggregate trade, is selling $8,000,000,000 worth (round numbers) and is buying only $3,000,000,000 odd, a balance in their favour of goods sold over goods bought—and surely that is what counts—of over $4,000,000,000 annually. Such was the balance in their favour in the year 1919. It was almost that in 1918, almost that in 1917, and back to the year 1893, you cannot find a year in American history in which they have not sold more than they have bought.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: May I interrupt my hon. friend? I do so only to elucidate the argument. Does my hon. friend really think that his argument, at the end of the war, is worth the breath expended on it? He should give figures prior to the war.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I went back to the year 1893 and that is quite a while before the war. If the hon. member seeks to dispute in any way whatever the facts I have stated, I have the exact figures before me. He will find that last year's American imports were $3,904,000,000 and its exports $7,922,000,000, and he will find for the year before the figures that are relatively the same. I can give the hon. gentleman the returns right back to the year 1860, and until he gets back at least to the year 1884 he will find only three years in American history, the last year being 1893—a long while before the war—when they did not have a balance in their favour of an immense sum as against the adverse balance of England. There was a time when things were not thus.

Before and at the year 1850 England had a favourable balance of trade. The hon. member, who reveres the memory of Cobden and Peel, will know that it was just before 1850 that they abolished the Corn Laws in the Old Country. In 1850 they had a balance of trade in their favour, but they did not hold it very long, and from about 1850 to the present day the trade of Great Britain has shown an adverse balance every year, at least every decade year; they have been selling less than they have bought, until to-day it is a case of almost two to one, and the situation is getting worse all the time. It is a remarkable fact that the year 1850 marks the turn when the change took place in the trade balance of Britain. Some years after that they had annually about £150,000,000, or some $700,000,000 against them, and as they approached 1913 and 1914 the adverse balance kept on increasing, and in the years 1917, 1918 and 1919 it had reached colossal totals indeed. Now, I know that the years of war were certainly not normal years, and British trade suffered severely. But since the war the same story is being told. The balance against Great Britain last year was no less than £670,000,000, and for the first three months of this year the trade returns show that they had a balance against them there of £170,000,000 which multiplied by four for the aggregate of the year, gives us a total of £680,000,000, a worse situation than that of the 12 months before. British trade is increasing because prices are increasing and because transportation facilities are increasing, but that adverse trade condition is present to-day in an even more aggregated form than at any time before in the whole trade history of Britain. In the United States, I repeat, the contrary has been the case. Since the year 1893, they have never had an unfavourable balance. Their people have become richer year by year, in that they bought less than they sold to the outside world. On the business done at home the United States was improving its position year by year, and so was Germany, and so was Canada. But that was not so in regard to Great Britain. Canada last year had a balance in its favour of $222,000,000; the year before some $300,000,000 odd; the year before a little more than that. It was only about the year 1915 that we caught up. Previous to that we had balances against us, as every new country has. But Great Britain should long ago have been in the position where its exports should far have exceeded its imports.

Now, the hon. member will no doubt ask me this question: How is it they get along when they are paying out every year £670,000,000 more than they are buying? Well, they get along for this reason: They as-

serted their supremacy as a commercial nation away back in the last and the preceding century. Great Britain was in those times the wealthiest nation by far on the face of the globe. Their people have had their money invested and year by year they have been investing more. Their returns from outside countries are great and they have investments as well on all the seas of the world. While last year they lost £670,000,000—"lost" is hardly the correct term to use; I should say, while they were behind about £670,000,000 in their balance of trade last year—they had an income of £520,000,000 from ocean transportation earnings, money invested in ships that were traversing the world, and from investments in the United States, and in Canada, and in other lands. They had £80,000,000 from certain outside investments, £40,000,000 from other outside banking and insurance earnings. These with £400,000,000, returns from their shipping interests all over the world, make a total of £520,000,000 in all to put against that £670,000,000 which they were behind in trade. Now, is it to be the policy of this country so to arrange its trade activities that we should have to make up every year by investments in other lands what we lose by making at home and selling less goods than we buy? Are we to direct our efforts to encourage our people to invest in the United States or to invest in France, Australia or New Zealand? What does it all result in? It results in the accumulation of money in the hands of a few people and not in the multiplication of industries, except in foreign lands. Money that represents the accumulated energy of the British people is spent to-day to expand the industries of the United States and of Australia, and South Africa and even of China. There is no doubt about that. And the result is—while it is putting it somewhat strongly, in substance it is true—a tendency to make the people over there, while solvent and while perhaps they are getting wealthier by reason of these investments, a nation of remittance men, and at the same time, to use the words of John Barnes, the Labour leader in England, to being a sea of workless workers surging around their doors.

It is not very long since the hon. member for Red Deer told this House that the condition of labour was most desirable in England and better than in this country and in the United States.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Not this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, better than in the United States; but that does not modify the statement in principle in any degree. Well, I think the hon. gentleman has respect for the authority of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and he no doubt knows the celebrated statement of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman in 1905 that there were 13,000,000 of the British population who were at or below the line of poverty, not having enough to eat.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Has the hon. member the quotation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes; I have it here in a book written by Messrs. Gray and Turner. Mr. Gray is an economist of Britain who has done much investigational work in this country and in the United States. He is a graduate of Oxford. I do not know who Mr. Turner is. They quote Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman as saying that "there are about 30 per cent of the British population on the verge of hunger;" that is about 13,000,000. In another work I have, it is put at 13,000,000 definitely; and Sir William Booth, who spent many years investigating the subject in the cities of England, and particularly in London, gives the number at 30.7 per cent who are below the poverty line. And Mr. Booth gives the cause as chiefly unemployment. Mr. Rowntree also, who is a celebrated authority—all these people are British people, not Americans—says that the same thing is true of every part of Britain as of the city of London.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Does my hon. friend not know that Mr. Rowntree is a temperance reformer?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was not aware of that fact.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: He is a temperance reformer and attributes the poverty to drink.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know what he attributes it to but is it not better to have as authority a man who is not interested in trade matters, and therefore not prejudiced, than a man who is prejudiced. This work (Gray and Turner's) is not written on trade subjects at all, it is written on social subjects. They present these facts in order that they may teach—not that there should be a tariff, that is not the purpose of the book; the purpose of the book is wholly different, it is to teach the value of improved methods. Consequently these men are not saying, or colouring, these things in order to make an argument against free trade; although it is not hard to tell what their opinions are. I quote this from those authorities:

It is generally known that American wages are from two to three times as high as the British wages. They are so very much higher than British wages because American production per man is from two to three times as great as is British production, as has been shown in sections 1 and 2.

Again we find these statements:

Those who know America and the British Dominions well are aware that not only are wages from two to three times as high as they are in this country, but that the workers live far better than they live over here, that they are better dressed, better fed, and are able to put by substantial sums of money.

In America, generally speaking, working hours are shorter than in Great Britain, and work is less arduous.

I would like to direct attention to these statements by men of authority, by men who have spent their lives in a study of this question —particularly the attention of the hon. member for Temiskaming (Mr. McDonald). Such statements could be cited page after page throughout this book; but the case is admitted by the British people. Mr. Lloyd George, stated before the Imperial Conference in 1907 that the degree of unemployment with which they were confronted in Great Britain was very "unpleasant to contemplate," and following that he said: "that undoubtedly the conditions of employment in Germany were far better than they were in England" and they were undoubtedly better in the United States. Further than that, at the time Great Britain was in this position, at the time Mr. Lloyd George made these statements, Great Britain was losing in population, chiefly her working men, at the rate of 225,000 a year. In 1907, 237,000 of her people left those happy shores, and at the same time Germany was gaining more in population, by immigration of working men, than she was losing. In 1906, 600,000 workingmen from other countries went into Germany and helped to enrich that protected country and that in great degree at the expense of Great Britain herself. Between the years 1850 and the year 1908, 12,000,000 people left British shores, and many millions of them entered the United States. All this was going on under the aegis of free trade with results which I shall describe a little more fully later on.

If the hon. member thinks—and he has argued it time and time again—that free trade is a great boon to the agriculturist why does he not contemplate his own native land. When free trade came into effect—I have the exact official figures before me from the statistical department—the proportion of agricultural population to the whole population of the British Isles was 49.8 per cent, or practically one-half. In the year 1913, before the war, that had been reduced to 21.9. One-half of the whole population when free trade came into effect, was agricultural; one-fifth of the whole population agricultural after it had been in effect for about 70 years.

Such is the result on agriculture. I give Mr. Lloyd George again as my authority for the statement (I feel sure it was he; anyway it is true) that between 1870 and 1905 3,000,000 acres in Great Britain went out of production in corn, and that in the year 1905 there was less wheat land in cultivation than had gone out of wheat production since the introduction of free trade. One million men to-day work in Great Britain in the industry of agriculture. There were more than twice that number at the time free trade came in to make them happy and rich! It was the manufacturers and not the farmers who wanted free trade in Great Britain and they had good reason then to want it as I will explain. Lord Macaulay in a speech delivered, I think, on his last election for the University of Edinburgh, about 1851, in ridiculing the antics of the men who opposed his party—I cannot help adopting his language now as regards those who oppose us—said that he did not know where any man stood on this question of free trade or protection. He went into the country and found that there were standards and printed flags, wherever the agricultural population predominated, bearing the legend "Vote for Smith and Protection." But as soon as he got across the river and into the city it was "Vote for Smith and Free Trade." These were the prevailing conditions at that time.

Why did England take up free trade? One never can answer for another but had I been at that time an Englishman, as I am to-day a Canadian, and had I expected as Cobden expected and believed that other countries would follow the example of Great Britain, I would have taken the step that Cobden advised. Why? Because British industries were then in a state of supremacy. They had the lead in magnitude, in perfection of operation and in the skill of their operatives. They had the lead over the industries of every other country in the world and England had more to gain by free access to the markets of other countries than she had to lose by free access being granted to her own markets. But had I been at that time a Canadian, or a subject of the Mikado of Japan, or a citizen of the United States, I

would not have consented to follow the free trade example that Great Britain has set to the various countries of the world for the very simple reason that the industries of the United States of America were less mature, than the industries of Germany, that they were in comparison with British industries, infant industries. These countries were, wisely for themselves, opposed to following Britain's example because they had more to lose by unrestricted access to their own markets than they had to gain by unrestricted access to the markets of Great Britain. And being at this time, as I am, a citizen of a country that in relation to the United States, to England, and to many of the great industrial nations, has its industries in a position of comparative immaturity I would say it would be madness—manifest madness—for us to adopt the principle enunciated by or to follow the trail blazed by the hon member for Red Deer.

Great Britain, he says, is the example for us, but still we must have an excess of exports over imports. If Great Britain has a deficit in exports, as compared with imports of $3,000,000,000 a year, how are we by following Great Britain's example going to get an excess of exports over imports which he says we must get to the amount of $200,000,000 a year?

Then he says, "Follow the United States in these matters; there you have a comparatively free trade country." I admire the hon. gentleman's ability in eulogy, and I admire the skill with which he is able to deceive himself. The United States a free trade country! If the hon. gentleman would go to the United States and make a speech such as he has made here to-day, in the presence of any number of its citizens they would not know what to do with him. A free trade country! If there is one country on the face of the globe that has been rigidly, emphatically and consistently protectionist, it has been the United States. I would like to know what the hon. gentleman means when he talks about the United States being a free trade country or a comparatively free trade country. Of course they have got to the position by their policy of protection where they do not have to import much except raw materials or semi-raw materials and raw materials in the United States are free just as generally they are free with us. When a country advances to a state of industrial predominance, it is not going to have very heavy import taxes imposed on the body of its people, because imports will be relatively small.

England, he says, got into its position whatever it is by following the path of free trade instead of adopting the course which the United States pursued. The tariff taxes in England are far greater per capita than they are in the United States and greater per capita than they are in Canada.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: So was their job in the war.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly their people were equal to the job of the war. They have a great many people of the type of the hon. gentleman himself, and as long as they have men of his blood and of the blood of his family, they may make grave blunders in tariff matters but they will not soon be beaten in war. The fact is that Mr. Austen Chamberlain contemplates collecting next year one and a half billion dollars through his tariff tax some of which is a protective tax. And so the change stealthily comes on. We do not contemplate collecting more than $150,000,000.

The United States, pursuing not a revenue tariff course but a protective tariff course ranging from 40 to 50, 55, 60 and 75 per cent on dutiable articles all down through the past sixty years to the present time, are now in a position where they are selling about $7,000,000,000 worth and buying about $3,000,000,000 worth a year, mainly raw or semi-raw materials. They do not need to import much manufactured goods to-day but Britain has to import manufactured goods and Britain does import manufactured goods and every other kind of goods to a greater extent than any other country in the world.

I mentioned a moment ago that the policy of free trade in England had reduced agriculture to a very low standard of prosperity. That is putting it very gently. No wonder the Lord Selborne Committee to which my hon. friend referred advocated that the people of England should grow more agricultural produce because agricultural production has diminished year by year. They produced less and less of what they consumed all due to this policy. Their farm lands diminished in value. While their farm lands diminished in value and were being abandoned we find that the United States, in the same period, multiplied the value of their farm lands from $19,000,000,000 to $41,000,000,000. In Canada the same thing is going on. It is not long since the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) was talking about the abandonment of farms in Canada. I have been through quite a lot of Canada. I have

seen many farms being worked that I thought ought to be abandoned because they were never fit to be farms but I never saw a farm abandoned that appeared to be fit for anybody to farm. And the figures are wholly against him—statistics that cannot be denied, gathered officially under the charge of a man who certainly has no political affinity with gentlemen on this side of the House. According to these figures, the average value per acre of farm land in Canada in 1910—and you could go back to 1896; it is just the same story—was $38, while in 1919 it was $52, an increase since 1910 of 37 per cent. Now, a basic asset like that upon which money must be made increases in value only because you can make more money out of it; it could not increase for any other reason. In Nova Scotia, the province from which the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) comes, the value of farm lands increased within the period mentioned from $25 to $41 per acre, an increase of 41 per cent, and in British Columbia the increase was from $74 to $174, an increase of 135 per cent. In every province of Canada the very same process has gone on, so much so that while we have had a tremendous increase in the value of our farm lands—I mean, in the lands actually farmed, because that is what these figures apply to—the value of farm lands in Great Britain according to Mr. Rowntree, went down under Free Trade by £1,700,000,000, or nearly $8,000,000,000.

Our rural population diminished between 1901 and 1911 from 62.35 per cent of the whole to 54.47 per cent—I do not think it diminished in the absolute, but it diminished as compared with the rest of the population. In the United Sates the diminution was very small, from 59.5 to 53.7. But, this diminution which has come to Canada, to the United States and to every country in the world—it is terribly aggravated in Great Britain by reason of their fiscal policy, undoubtedly,—this general diminution in rural population is inevitable; no change of policy can ever alter it. Why? Well, it seems to me that the reason is obvious. The farmer produces food; that is the great product to the turning out of which he applies his energy. As the world advances in population, people do not eat any more food individually; the need of food increases just as the population increases and no more. But as civilization advances the other needs and indulgences of mankind multiply a hundredfold. Transportation needs, clothing needs, entertainment needs, all these requirements advance by leaps and bounds, whereas food remains relatively stationary. Consequently a larger proportion of the world's people are engaged in making these other products and rendering these other services than are engaged in the growing of food. Do what we will, we would be foolish to try to beat back logic itself, and the whole trend and movement of the age. You cannot defeat these things; you cannot conquer economic forces. Our rural population then is diminishing—not in the absolute, but relatively. The rural population of Britain, for the simple reason that their farmers could not begin to compete with those to whom they were exposed to competition by the abolition of the Corn Laws, has gone down precipitately from great to small until to-day it is almost negligible in relation to the rest of the people.

While all this has been going on, have manufactures flourished? Have the great basic industries of England advanced? Did England find herself, when she was confronted with war with Germany, in a position impregnable or even desirable? Why, the story is so plain that everybody knows it. In the great key industries of Britain they found themselves in a position next to humiliation itself. Certainly they pulled through the war; they fought through, muddled through and got through. They got through, and all credit to them, but they got much of their great basic supplies from their Allies. They got their great supplies of iron and steel from other countries on whose friendship they had to depend and without whose friendship their position would have been worse than precarious.

Now when Britain was in the war and under Liberal leadership;—not under the guidance of the present Coalition leader, Mr. Lloyd George, but under the leadership of a man revered by the hon. member for Red Deer, Mr. Asquith—they set about to ascertain why all this trouble was; why it was that they had landed themselves in a position of comparative helplessness and of dependence upon other nations in this regard. I want to lay before this House the facts as to that investigation, in my judgment about as illuminating facts as ever have been presented to the world, on any subject, of commerce or trade.

Mr. Asquith's Government appointed through its Board of Trade, presided over by Mr. Walter Runciman, four committees, one on the iron and steel industry, one on the engineering trades, one on the textile

trades, and one on the electrical trades. The committee on the iron and steel trades was composed of seven men. Now, I want the House to keep in mind the fact that these committees were not appointed for the purpose of finding a certain verdict; they were appointed under the leadership of a Prime Minister who was a free trader and who doubtless hoped that free trade would be permanent in Great Britain. They were appointed under the presidency of Mr. Runciman who was also a free trader and who certainly would not engineer his department to bring in a verdict hostile to his own course and principles. But here is the verdict; here is the report, and to it I invite the attention not so much of hon. gentlemen opposite—because in my heart I do not believe that very many of them would disagree with a single line or letter of what I am going to read—but particularly to the attention of hon. gentlemen diagonally opposite, men who, I am bound to assume, are sincere in their discussion of this question; men who have gone up and down the township lines in Western Canada and in Eastern Canada and denounced protection as bondage; men who have pointed to the example of Britain; men who have referred to all whose products receive a protective duty as specially privileged persons—often, indeed, calling them "scoundrels great and scoundrels small." Here is the report of the committee on the iron and steel trades of a committee of Britishers. I do not know what they were before, but I know they were not free traders after they got into the facts:

A comparative examination of the iron and steel industries of the U.S.A., Germany and Great Britain reveals the fact that the proportional capacity of production of these three countries stands in the ratio of 40; 20; 10—

United States four times Britain; Germany twice Britain.

—millions of tons; and a survey of the historical progress of these industries indicates clearly that as a competitor in the markets of the world the United Kingdom has steadily lost ground. In 1880 Great Britain produced 7.7 million tons of pig iron; the U.S.A. produced 3.8 million tons, and Germany 2.7 million tons. In 1900 Great Britain produced 8.9 million tons, the U.S.A. 13.8 million tons, and Germany 6.5 million tons. In 1913, the record year of British iron manufacture, Great Britain produced 10.3 million tons of pig iron, the U.S.A. 31 million tons and Germany 19 million tons.

Forty, twenty, and ten! The committee goes on to say:

In 1880, therefore, Great Britain produced 54 per cent of the total output of the three countries. In 1900 her production was only 28 per cent, and in 1913 it had fallen to 17 per cent.

To-day it is probably 15 per cent of the output of these three countries—flourishing indeed! and all in the absence of "special privilege" and "scoundrels great and scoundrels small." But, to pass on, what is the remedy?

There is a general consensus of opinion among British manufacturers—

The men who wanted free trade in 1846, the men who forced it on agricultural England.

—that the British interests have suffered severely through the action of foreign syndicates which have been free to exploit the British home markets wherever it suited them to do so, while they themselves were protected from reprisal by the protection extended to them by their respective governments, and that British producers were defenceless against the aggressive methods of their foreign competitors.

The general result of these various conditions is that the iron and steel industries of Great Britain have become thoroughly discredited as a field for the investment of capital.

That report is signed by seven men out of the nine, and included in the signatures in favour of the report is that of Mr. John Hodge, labour leader of England and later Minister of Labour in the Government of Mr. Lloyd George. But I find two signatures against it, not of the plain people about whom the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) ranted so much; I find an hon. baronet, Sir Hugh Bell, and what he and a Mr. Davison say was so characteristic of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) that I had to look several times at the signature to be sure it was not "Michael Clark." This is what is said by Mr. Davison and concurred in by Sir Hugh Bell who dissented from the report:

While in agreement with the recommendations, and with the greater part of the report, I wish to record my complete dissent from those passages which appear to suggest the necessity of a change in the fiscal policy of the United Kingdom.

No reasons given. The report is all right, they say; it is true that the British iron and steel industries have gone down almost to decay; it is true, they proclaim, that other countries have taken from us the supremacy that we have enjoyed for years; it is true that we found ourselves faced with a war without such equipment in this great basic industry as would alone enable us to survive; all that is true; we hold up both hands as to the truth of every word of it; but we cannot stand for a change in the fiscal policy of England.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I suppose my hon. friend knows that Sir Hugh Bell is one of the greatest ironmasters in the north of England and, indeed, in the world, and he probably knows what he is speaking about.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That makes it worse than ever.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Why should he not want protection?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because of the very characteristic that—while it is admitted they have many great qualities—very often pervade the citizens of the British Isles, that dogged devotion to custom, obstinately refusing to make a change, that worship of tradition. These, notwithstanding many qualities that have brought them to the forefront of the world, have undoubtedly held them back and handicapped them in a war, and these, as nearly all of them admit now, have cost them thousands and hundreds of thousands of lives to succeed in the struggle, that has passed. Those peculiarities compelled them rather to muddle through instead of being in a position, by virtue of the very superior characteristics of that nation, to win the war at the least possible expense.

We must remember that this report is not the opinion of dogmatists; this is the deliberate judgment after thorough and complete investigation, the full facts of the matter having been laid bare. Does the hon. gentleman contemplate with satisfaction, to use the words of Lloyd George, a change from the position when free trade came on of supremacy in the iron and steel industry down to a ratio of 40 and 20 to 10 against Great Britain and in favour of the United States and Germany? Does he think that is all right? If it is not, how does he expect it is to be overcome? Do not have any artificial means, he says; everything is all right, cure it, somehow, but do not have the Government do anything. That is the policy of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark). Let us see, just by a few more quotations, what these leading Englishmen think of that policy. They say this in the report from which I am quoting:

> The war has taught at once how urgent was the need for vast resources of iron and steel, and how insufficient were the British iron and steel industries to meet that need. The causes of this insufficiency have been dealt with in some detail elsewhere, and the committee have made recommendations with respect to action within the industries which they believe will go far to remedy the defects which the strain of war has only too prominently revealed. Several of these causes, springing mainly from the pressure of foreign competition, cannot be removed by the private action of the industries themselves, and for their elimination direct governmental action is required.

What is that governmental action? They proceed to discuss dumping; they proceed to show that, by virtue of the free trade policy of England, dumping inevitably results that nations pour goods at below cost into England, not necessarily at a loss to the industry in the nation producing these goods because by doing so, the manufacturers were enabled to increase the scale of their product, and in that way keep down costs, while enabling them to destroy the industries of England at the same time that they were building up their own. They show that in the clearest terms; they advocate protection against dumping, and then they say:

> Moreover, the committee are convinced that for the future safeguarding of the iron and steel industries it will be necessary to establish a system of protective duties, and in this opinion they are supported by the practically united feeling of the British iron and steel producers who have given evidence before the committee.

These are from the same class of men who precipitated free trade on England, and they are practically united in their opinion that as things are going the industry cannot succeed, and without the iron and steel industry, what other industry can live? The iron and steel industry is the basis of a huge percentage of all other industries; it is the great substructure of all the industries of the country. But they go on:

> The maintenance of a great open market in the midst of the greater producing nations of the world is incompatible with the prosperity and even with the existence of a native iron and steel industry. Under modern conditions, the expenditure of capital is immense; renewals of plant must be rapid and frequent, and amortization must, therefore, be swift. This capital cannot be obtained unless there is reasonable security for the industry into which it is to be placed. So long as the British home market can be flooded with foreign imported material, a native industry will continue to be unprofitable and will become more and more unsafe.

I ask the indulgence of the House while I read further, because a more succinct and better informed presentation of the case, carrying clearer reasons with it, could not possibly be given:

> The conditions of competition between Great Britain and her rivals are thoroughly unequal.

Not because British character and ability are not equal to those of other nations, but for the reasons they set out:

The iron and steel industries of Germany and America are protected from retaliatory action by heavy tariffs.

That is, in a "comparatively free trade country."

Their home market is practically assured to the national industries, and the whole weight of their competitive force can be thrown into the trade in external markets. Great Britain depends for her prosperity much more upon exports than either Germany or America; but by reason of her free-trade system she has been compelled to divert her greatest strength from exports to the struggle for maintenance of her markets at home. The non-existence of a fiscal policy of any kind renders effective governmental action impossible, since Great Britain possesses no economic weapon by which concessions of any kind can be won from her trade rivals.

Now this is most significant, and I should like this to be read in association with the figures as regards the tin-plate industry given by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion):

A signal instance of this disadvantage is afforded by the history of the Welsh Tinplate trade after the introduction of the McKinley Tariff in the U.S.A., which resulted in the building up within a few years of an immense tinplate industry founded largely upon labour which migrated from South Wales.

"Which migrated from South Wales!"

The Welsh industry was for many years wellnigh ruined. Its mills and works were idle; its workmen were scattered far and wide, and cruel distress reigned in South Wales. Yet nothing could be done, save to yield to the operation of "natural" causes.

And as if to avoid plagiarism of the hon. member for Marquette they put the word "natural" in quotation marks. It goes:

The Committee therefore recommend that customs duties be imposed upon all imported iron and steel and manufactures thereof. They are of opinion that a specific duty should be levied upon each class of commodity, and that there should be maximum, general and minimum tariffs. The amount of tariff should be determined by consideration of the needs of the industry protected, and by the needs of the nation as a whole; and the amount of specific tariff should be varied readily, according to the changing demands of national policy.

Another familiar phrase!

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Was this committee appointed by the present Government in England?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, by the Asquith Government, distinctly a Simon-pure Liberal Government, and it just reported in 1918. It took two years for its work. It goes on:

[Mr. Meighen.]

The existence of a tariff of this nature would, in the opinion of the Committee, be of the greatest advantage to the industries and the nation. There is no reason to believe that the price to the consumer would rise.

Listen to this:

On the contrary, the increase in production at home would lead to very material reduction in costs, since it would be possible to effect economies in production by the installation of more complete and better plant. The experience of the United States proves that the stimulating effect upon production through the conservation of the home market results in an actual reduction rather than in an increase of price.

There is scarcely one of the romances in the theory which the hon. member for Red Deer has preached for the last twelve years that is not driven off the stage, or, as he himself expresses it, has not its head cut off at the tail, by this report of experts in his native land. It goes on:

Again, the existence of a tariff will place in the hands of the State a most powerful weapon of economic defence.

That is the argument urged by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's in the very first Budget Speech he ever made in this House—the existence of a tariff was necessary for economic defence. So impressed was he with that argument, that before his Budget Speech he did what no Finance Minister has ever done before. He made a preliminary statement in the city of Montreal in which he said that on account of the contemplated 75 cents a ton duty in the Dingley tariff, there would be no reduction in the coal duty in this country, and he further stated in the same speech that if they would dare to put on that 75 cents a ton duty he would retaliate with a duty on anthracite coal itself. Everyone gets to see these views when they get into office. The report goes on:

The weakness of any scheme of imperial preference has hitherto been the inability of Britain to offer any real privilege in return for those accorded to her by the Dominions. The possession of a tariff will enable this country to discriminate in favour of the Dominions and to give them concession for concession.

(8) A tariff will be no less advantageous in the course of negotiations with independent foreign countries. Here, too, Britain has in the past had nothing with which to bargain, and has, therefore, been unable adequately to protect the interests of her subjects.

(9) From the labour standpoint a tariff is no less necessary.

And remember this is signed by John Hodge. I emphasize this, because there is a sort of bewildering combination now being sought between the U.F.O. and Labour:

From the labour standpoint a tariff is no less necessary. The anxiety of Germany is to pre-

serve an open market in Britain; and it will not be to the interest of the workmen employed in the British iron and steel industries to permit the unchecked importation of the product of foreign labour, working under conditions far less favourable than those of British labour.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that report signed by Balfour or Burleigh?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I will give the signatures. I do not know who they are: G. Scoby-Smith (Chairman), John King, G. Mure Ritchie, Hy. Summers, Benj. Talbot. From that there is a dissenting statement by Sir Hugh Bell and Mr. John E. Davison.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The committee reported in 1918?

Mr. MEIGHEN: But was appointed in 1916 by the Government of Mr. Asquith.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has any action been taken by the British Government along the lines of that report?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think any action has been taken except what I shall describe a little later on. Over there they are now going through the contortions and groanings and sufferings that precede repentance.

As respects the electrical trades, a committee consisting of six men was appointed, and their report is unanimous. In the Old Country, just as here, these men are appointed for the purpose of a specific investigation, they are appointed because they have special qualifications for the purpose, the committees are composed of representatives of every class. They are confronted in Britain just as we are here, with orators of the same sort as the hon. member for Red Deer, and with demagogues like other hon. gentlemen who go up and down the side lines in Western Canada and elsewhere talking "special privilege." All that, they have to overcome, and they are now in process of overcoming it. The report on the electrical trades says:

> Again, foreign governments, appreciating the importance of conserving their home markets as a basis for the development of overseas trade, imposed protective duties, and exerted influence on State Departments to purchase native goods.

They go on and say:

> The necessity for protective duties has been emphasized by many witnesses connected with manufacturing interests and has been frankly recognized by representatives of purchasers.

Of purchasers. That is consumers.

> The Committee is convinced that adequate protection is necessary and should be given at least for a period.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Quebec East applauds.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The word "adequate" is so often used.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend ironically applauds at the phrase "adequate protection." The Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) whom he supported, the father of this milk and water amendment now before the House described his tariff, the Fielding tariff, as "adequate protection" himself, and I shall quote from his remarks after recess.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (resuming): The unanimous report of the British Government Committee on electrical trades states:

> The necessity of retaining the home markets as a basis of overseas trade has never been properly recognized in this country—

That is, in England; and their recommendation is as follows:

> The imposition of import duties sufficiently high to protect effectively the electrical industry.

And this following is something that is of moment in relation to a charge made in speeches of hon. members opposite, that Great Britain had been free from mergers and combines, which they seemed to believe were invariably against the interests of the consumers and the common people. This is the recommendation:

> The recognition of the advantage of combination among manufacturers, and official co-operation with such action.

I can be very brief with the other reports; they are all precisely to the same effect.

Mr. CHARLES MURPHY: Is the report from which the hon. minister is quoting signed by the same gentlemen as the report which he read this afternoon?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No; it is signed by a separate committee appointed on this subject. The members of that committee are: Hon. Sir Charles A. Parsons, Mr. John Annan Bryce, Mr. T. O. Callender, Mr. James Devonshire, Mr. Bernard Mervyn Drake and Sir John Snell. There was no minority report. In the case of the engineering trades the committee was composed of the following: Sir Clarendon Golding Hyde, Mr. Arthur Balfour—I do not know

whether that is Arthur J. Balfour or not; I do not suppose it is; Mr. Albert John Hobson, Mr. William B. Lang, Sir Hallewell Rogers, Mr. Herbert B. Rowell, and Mr. Douglas Vickers.

The report of that committee was to the same effect as the previous report and I can summarize it in a word. They first of all, of course, outline the difficulties against which the trades have laboured. They depict in very clear and emphatic language the position to which they have been relegated in the struggle for world trade, and they end with this recommendation, among others:

That a Government department be charged with the duty of exercising vigilance over the adequate provision in this country of manufacturers as distinct from our staple trades which are at any time essential to the national safety, such as tungsten and magnetos.

(b) That the development of the supply of raw materials within the Empire for such essential industries be supervised, encouraged and assisted by the Government.

(c) That all necessary steps to protect such essential industries be taken by the Government, whether by prohibition, tariff protection or subsidy.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: That is, during the war?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No; it is a recommendation as to what is to be done after the war. They do not refer to the war period at all. What would be the sense in starting a subsidy system or a protective tariff in 1916 to help England during the war?

The committee on the textile trades take up each separate department of those trades in England, and make investigation into their conditions and their needs. If there is any respect in which England has managed to hold part of her own in business, it is in the textile trades. As to iron and steel she long ago abdicated her position, but with the textile trades this has not been true to the same extent. Here is what the report says with regard to these trades. As to the cotton trade:

In the cotton trade there is very little demand for any change in our present policy. The trade is predominantly an export trade, 80 per cent of its output being exported, and it cannot expect to derive direct benefit from any system of import duties upon yarns or manufactured goods. On the other hand, there is a generally expressed fear that the imposition of anything like a general tariff might raise costs of production, and to that extent handicap and lessen efficiency of trade in world competition. A majority of witnesses were in favour of restrictions upon trade with the Central Powers after the war.

Mr. CRERAR: When was this committee appointed?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: In 1916.

Mr. CRERAR: All these committees were appointed during the war.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but they report what is to be done after the war, and they say so definitely in the report which they make in 1918.

They report late in 1918, having been appointed, under the Asquith Government, on the 27th of April, 1916.

Mr. DEMERS: What is the date of the report?

Mr. MEIGHEN: 1918 is the date of the report in the case of the iron and steel industry, and the date is the same in this case. I do not see that the report gives the day of the month, it gives the year.

Now in regard to the woollen and worsted industry the report says there is not unanimous opinion prevailing as to the trade in men's wear, the majority being against an import duty.

As regard women's wear the majority is the other way. But passing from that to the carpet industry let me read the report:

By a large majority the representatives of the British carpet industry advocate the imposition of minimum and maximum tariffs on foreign carpets entering the United Kingdom.

They go to explain that recommendation. Now as to the silk industry:

The Silk Industry.—This industry is practically unanimous in its request for tariff assistance on the ground that it cannot compete with the highly protected and carefully fostered silk industries of other countries—some of which habitually "dump" their goods in this market—unless such assistance is given at all events for a period.

Now comes the jute industry. In that connection the report says:

The Jute Industry.—This industry asks that an export tax of ½ d. per lb. (approximately £5 per ton) may be imposed upon all jute leaving India with a total rebate in favour of the British Empire, total or graduated rebates in favour of our Allies, and graduated rebates in favour of such neutral countries as may offer reciprocal concessions of some kind. In the case of the present enemy countries there should be no rebates.

They meet the case just the other way by an equal interference with free trade, an entire defiance of every principle of free trade getting at it by an export duty on the jute industry in India where the monopoly exists, with rebates to the British Empire, and lesser rebates for some other countries.

On the linen industry they report that—

the prevailing feeling in the linen industry is in favor of a graduated scale of duties on

manufactured goods, distinctions being made between Allies, neutrals, and enemy countries.

The Hosiery and Fabric Glove Industry.—There is a practically unanimous demand in the hosiery trade that duties should be imposed upon all hosiery, underwear, knitted fabrics and glove fabrics, whether of woollen, worsted, cotton or silk, imported into the United Kingdom from foreign countries.

The Lace Industry.—This industry is in practically the same position as the hosiery industry. One branch of it, namely, the manufacture of Leavers lace, plain nets, and lace curtains is prosperous and is able to hold its own in international competition, while another branch, namely, the manufacture of Plauen lace, Barmen trimmings and embroideries, encounters almost overwhelming competition from the specialized industry of Germany in these articles based upon large scale production.

This committee, in language the intent of which cannot be gainsaid but expressed in a sort of covering, concealed way, as if they were seeking to avoid political opposition, reports as follows:

That when the settlement of the general fiscal policy of the United Kingdom comes up for consideration and decision due attention should be given to the differing wishes and requirements of the textile trades, and to the facts in connection with international competition upon which they are based.

There is the clearest intimation in the report of this committee that by departure from the principles of free trade, and by that alone, can the textile trades in general expect to survive.

These are virtually all the industries of the United Kingdom brought under review by expert committees appointed by a Liberal Government. These committees report, not for temporary expedients as for the purposes of the war—nothing of that mentioned in the report at all—but on a permanent policy based on the lessons of sixty years of history.

Now I have taken up much time to indicate to hon. gentlemen of this House that no encouragement can be extracted from England for the free trade principle,—and remember it is principles we are discussing and only principles that count.

I can understand a man whose feet are based on free trade, however sinking the sand, voting against this Budget; but outside of merely the play of political purpose —what one might call political poker play— I cannot understand those who believe in the principle of protection voting against it. I have shown, I think, that there is no lesson to be learned for any no-protection principle in the United States; no lesson to be learned in Germany; the teachings are so plain in both countries that he who runs may read; and certainly, above all, there is no lesson to be learned in free trade England.

We are at a stage now where we cannot mistake the teachings of experience. We have seen the result through seventy years in the Old Land. It is traced in the history of their trade returns that turned in 1850, the last decade year when they had a balance in their favour. Every decade year since a large balance has been against them. Free trade has depopulated rural England; it has filled the emigrant ships with fugitives from her shores; it has scattered the manhood of Great Britain through the fields and workshops of the United States; it has starved and repressed and dwarfed the nascent industries of Ireland; it has reversed the supremacy that Britain held through centuries in the industrial life of the world, and caused her to concede the place to other great competing nations who adopted a different policy. Such is the history of free trade.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have been in a position to learn from experience. They went through a trial of fifteen years in office. They knew the principles upon which they were elected. They know the appeals they made and in those appeals they were associated with many hon. gentlemen in the Agrarian party. They know the appeals they made against protection in every form, of all characteristics and by whatever adjectives described. They know they appealed on a platform in 1893 that denounced the whole principle of protection as false and unjust to the mass of the people and that proclaimed their policy to have for its goal free trade with England and with the United States—that was the immediate goal and with the whole world thereafter. They know they confronted conditions in 1896 that made them determine rather than to sacrifice their country to sacrifice their professions. For myself I give them credit for that decision. When the alternative was what it was that was the right thing to do. But the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's comes into this debate and in support of his vague, misty amendment, he tries to indicate to all, if he can, that he is now for a lower tariff; he tells us that when he came into power before he did shape a different policy from that which had been in force, that he was true to this much described principle of Liberalism, whatever it may be. He says that in those days some one described his tariff as ruination to this country. No one ever described the Fielding tariff as it actually was as ruinous, or likely to

be ruinous, to Canada. At that time he brought down a tariff supposed to give a preference to Great Britain alone but which would in effect give a preference not only to Great Britain but to Belgium, and Germany, and by virtue of treaties, to nations practically all over the world enjoying favoured nation treatment; it was pointed out that its extension would be world wide. He denied the point when it was raised but he later conceded its correctness by coming down to this House and confining his tariff to Great Britain, because the treaties with these other nations had, I believe, at the request of Canada, specifically been denounced. But when the Budget Speech was delivered at that time the interjections which were offered by the Conservatives who were in Opposition clearly showed that they regarded the tariff that he had brought down as indistinguishable from the tariff which had preceded it and clearly showed that he then and there had departed from the principles to which his party had long given their adherence.

I hold in my hand the official percentage figures of duty charged under the tariff of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) and under the preceding tariff and I purpose to show the House just the extent to which his tariff was in the least degree different. The last tariff under the Conservative Government—because the scale had been reduced very much by the Conservative Government in the revision of 1894—gave an average percentage of duty on dutiable goods, (and these articles in effect remained the same) of 29.96 per cent. That was the tariff which went out of effect in 1897 when the Fielding tariff came in. The hon. gentleman gave us a tariff in which the percentage, instead of being 29.96, was 29.22, or the great reduction of .74 per cent. That is precisely the reduction that was made and that I suppose is all the hon. gentleman had to do to bring the tariff out of the Tory category and make it in keeping with the "historic" principles of Liberalism. The next year the percentage was 28.65. It remained around there till 1907. In 1908 it was increased and in 1909 it was further increased. It was increased indeed as much in 1909 as it was diminished in 1897. I do not know whether that was apostacy from the principles of Liberalism in 1909 but there was the same raise in 1909 as there was reduction in 1897 and in neither year was there anything like the change that was made by way of reduction by the Minister of Finance in connection with the revision that preceded it in 1894—nothing to compare with it in any degree and nothing to compare, in the whole fifteen years, during which the responsibility was upon the Liberal Government, with the reduction that is embodied in the Budget which we are debating to-day or even in the Budget we were debating last year. The reduction to-day is 40 times greater than theirs.

The tariff brought down now and under review by this House is the tariff of 1911 reduced in very considerable degree through all the long scale of articles enumerated in the excellent speech of the hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Elkin) a scale involving large aggregate reductions in the duties collected.

Now what position do we find ourselves in? In the meantime a new party has arisen. In the meantime the old creed—that which was the creed of the Liberal party of Canada before 1896—has been passed over to a new group originating in Western Canada and represented in this House by the members called the Agrarian party. The spokesman of that party this afternoon quoted the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1893 denouncing protection and stated that his party was the heir to that doctrine, which was in its possession now. It is not a legacy at all. It is nothing that passes by way of will on the death of the testator. It was assigned and put out of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's possession away back twenty-one—yes, twenty-four years ago. It was his property in 1895 but it never was his property afterwards.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: It is coming.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is coming, the hon. gentleman says. The hon. gentleman was complaining this afternoon that it was not coming. He was reading speeches to show that hon. gentlemen opposite are apostates to their doctrine.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Assiniboia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, there is the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould): I know he agrees with it, but how many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House agree with it? I shall proceed in a minute to show that in 1893, before they knew what the responsibility of office was, before they had come close up to the real situation in Canada and were compelled to study it with a view to action, these hon. gentlemen denounced protection in adjectives that would almost burn the tongue. Nothing was too strong. They put forward a plat-

form that denounced it. But in fifteen years of office what did they do?

They met last August. Did they denounce protection then? Not a breath! Last August they adopted a platform which started out with the resolution, moved now as an amendment by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). They had a platform last August which called for reduction with a view to securing these two visionary things that are so useful on the stump and so meaningless in themselves:

Diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country.

That was the first half of the Liberal tariff platform. Then it goes on—here is something practical; here is the method, here are the actual, specific, concrete things they are going to do in order to bring about these highly desirable results.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: An hon. gentleman says "Hear, hear." They proceed:

That, to these ends, wheat, wheat flour and all products of wheat; the principal articles of food; farm implements and machinery; farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and repair parts thereof; rough and partly dressed lumber—

The House will please observe the word "partly." In some of the newspaper editions of the platform they had it "dressed" lumber, but I see that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) has part of the "dress" off and it is "partly" dressed when it comes into the debate in this House. That is a significant difference.

—gasoline, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils; nets, net-twines and fishermen's equipments; cements and fertilizers, should be free from customs duties, as well as the raw material entering into the same.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The leader of the Opposition says: "Hear, hear." I will have a few questions to put to him later on, and I hope he will be as prompt with his reply. Then the resolution goes on:

That a revision downwards of the tariff should be made whereby substantial reductions should be effected in the duties on wearing apparel and footwear, and on other articles of general consumption (other than luxuries), as well as on the raw materials entering into the manufacture of the same.

That the British preference be increased to fifty per cent of the general tariff.

And the Liberal party hereby pledges itself—

Just think of what goes into that pledge.

—to implement by legislation the provisions of this resolution when returned to power.

Now, just let me read in that connection the platform of the Agrarian or Farmers' party that had previously been adopted, so that hon. gentlemen may get a little inside look into what went on at this Liberal convention, when they managed to evolve the beautiful production that I have just read. Hon. gentlemen will remember that the leader of the Opposition has been touring the country telling the people that the Liberals and the farmers were first cousins; that there was really little difference between them; that they both had the same great cause at heart; and he appealed and looked for a union of the twain, of course, under his supreme leadership. Now, here was the Farmers' platform that they were trying to copy; they wanted to produce a little ship painted as nearly like the Farmers' vessel as they could make it, and get it through the convention. The farmers wanted the high cost of living reduced, and wanted also the same thing with regard to the instruments of production. The first parts of these two platforms are practically the same. Now does the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) see why hon. gentlemen opposite sought to lure them with the milk-and-water resolution moved in this debate? I think he sees that all right. Now, let us look at the Farmers' platform.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I can let the hon. gentleman have a copy of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have it in front of me.

It says that our tariff laws should be amended as follows:

(a) By an immediate and substantial all-round reduction of the customs tariff.

(b) By reducing the customs duty on goods imported from Great Britain to one-half the rates charged under the general tariff, and that further gradual, uniform reductions be made in the remaining tariff on British imports that will ensure complete free trade between Great Britain and Canada in five years.

(c) By endeavouring to secure unrestricted reciprocal trade in natural products with the United States along the lines of the Reciprocity Agreement of 1911.

(d) By placing all foodstuffs on the free list.

This is the article that hon. gentlemen opposite took for imitation:

(e) That agricultural implements, farm and household machinery, vehicles, fertilizers, coal, lumber, cement, gasoline, illuminating, fuel and

lubricating oils be placed on the free list and that all raw materials and machinery used in their manufacture also be placed on the free list.

(f) That all tariff concessions granted to other countries be immediately extended to Great Britain.

That is the one they sought to imitate. It will be observed that in this second part enumerating the articles that they were going to have free, the farmers included agricultural implements, farm and household machinery, vehicles, fertilizers, coal, lumber, cement, gasoline, illuminating, fuel and lubricating oils, and no more.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my hon. friend if that part of the Farmers' programme is not taken from resolutions moved on this side of the House and supported by Liberals in this House in previous sessions? If there is any imitation, it is not on our side.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is contending that the farmers stole their programme from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Possibly that part of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That feature of it. Well, if that is the case, why did the hon. gentleman change it again at the Liberal convention?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was not changed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not changed? What about vehicles? What about coal? Did the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) put something over on my hon. friend? Where does he find coal in this list of free goods?—

Wheat, wheat flour and all products of wheat; the principal articles of food, farm implements and machinery; farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and repair parts thereof; rough and partly dressed lumber; gasoline; illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils; nets, net-twines and fishermen's equipments, cements and fertilizers.

No coal there; no vehicles there. Does the hon. gentleman think that the member for Cape Breton North and the member for Shelburne and Queen's would stand for free coal? Does he not remember the speeches of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's in this House when he was Minister of Finance? Does he think that the member for Cape Breton North would submit to free coal? Free coal is left out, but they meet the gentlemen of the Farmers' party half way, as they call it. How do they do it? They leave out free coal and vehicles, and they say to the gentlemen of the Farmers' party: Now, you just do without free coal and vehicles and we will give you—what? Free wheat, wheat flour and the products of wheat; farm tractors; rough and partly dressed lumber; nets, net twines and fishermen's equipment. We will put every one of these on the free list—every one of them was free before they passed the resolution and is free to-day. Of this list of eighteen articles that I have just read, the following are altogether free: wheat, wheat flour and products of wheat; farm tractors up to $1,400—that includes the bulk that are used—rough lumber; partly dressed lumber; gasolene—12 cents a gallon in free trade England but free in Canada—nets, net-twine and fishermen's equipment. Just think of the hon. member for Brome solemnly getting the Liberal convention to put in this new article in order to make the list look long: "nets, net-twines and fishermen's equipment" all of which, together with the articles that I have read, are free already. And this is the Liberal platform that takes the place of the pronouncement of 1893, where protection was consigned to everlasting oblivion. Even fertilizers uncompounded are free now, but of the eighteen articles I think it is eleven that are free already; and the making free of these eleven already free and of the six others that I will refer to in a minute constitutes the concrete policy of the Liberal party to-day.

Let me ask the leader of the Opposition why was not the Liberal tariff platform moved in amendment to this Budget?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall give the answer when I make my speech.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What has become of the Liberal platform? What is the matter with the latter half of it? The member for Shelburne and Queen's knows that he cannot move another amendment; he knows that right well. Why, they have taken this Liberal platform and they have cut the dog,—well, not at the tail, but they have cut it horizontally right through the middle; they have left the whole travelling part at home.

What is the matter with the active, concrete portions of the Liberal platform? Why is it discarded? Is it a scrap of paper? Has it gone the way of the Liberal platform of 1893 and the denunciations of protection? I think it has. The leader of the Opposition has a somewhat difficult task in trying to sing the siren's song to the Agrarian party and at the same time to keep pretty close to the tune of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr.

Fielding). But my prognostication is that my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) will get a great deal closer to the note of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's than he will to that of the hon. member for Red Deer. What has become of the active, concrete portions of the Liberal platform? Where is this 50 per cent British preference? Why has it gone by the board? Nothing doing! No one speaking! Where, too, has the Farmers' Platform gone, this Farmers' Platform which has been proclaimed not for months but for years in this country? Have we ever heard it moved in this House?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: We did pretty well in Carleton, N.B.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We shall stay in Ottawa just now. Is it the amendment to the Budget? Not at all. All they are seeking is to pick out something that is common to the two and that means the minimum, nothing, if they can get to it, in order, if they possibly can, to get a vote of want of confidence in the Government of the day. That is what I called political poker playing.

I set out to say that both parties, if you call them such, or rather both horses of the same team, for political purposes, pretending only to pull in opposite ways, ask for a reduction in the duty on agricultural implements.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Did the minister not move in this House in 1910 a resolution asking that all duties be removed from agricultural implements?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He did not. The trouble with hon. gentlemen opposite is that they do not investigate and get at the facts.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Perhaps I did not ask the question aright.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member asked the question aright, but he was under a wrong impression.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Perhaps, it was the wrong year. Did the minister do so at any time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, never in the world.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: All right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know what the hon. gentleman is thinking of. In the month of January, 1911, when the duties on farm implements were as I shall give them in a minute, I moved for a substantial reduction in those duties.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Just that and no more.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just that, and just that I obtained but not from the hon. gentleman's friends. Why, the hon. gentleman does not know what the duties are. The following are the duties that he supported and that hon. gentlemen angularly opposite supported through the whole fifteen years of Liberal government. I will give the reasons, taken from Hansard, why they did so. In order to keep things clear before hon. members, I had better give three scales of duties, first the one that prevailed for fifteen years. On some articles it was a little higher prior to 1907; they did not reduce the duty on farm implements by a copper between 1896 and 1907, a period of eleven years; then they took 2½ per cent off certain farm implements, and they said that was a very substantial reduction.

Mr. EDWARDS: And they increased the valuations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The valuations increased. Under the Fielding tariff the duty on ploughs was 20 per cent; under reciprocity it would have been 15 per cent; now it is 17½ per cent.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Fifteen per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it is 17½ per cent, although possibly I am wrong in that, but that I think is one of only two exceptions in the whole list where the present level is not as low as under the Reciprocity tariff.

	Fielding Tariff Per cent	Under Reciprocity Per cent	To-day Per cent
Binders	17½	15	12½
Mowers	17½	15	12½
Reapers	17½	15	12½

Mr. W. H. WHITE: At the same valuation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the Liberals raised the valuations.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: You have raised the valuation somewhat since.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The valuations rise with the value, and always did. I continue:

	Fielding Tariff Per cent	Under Reciprocity Per cent	To-day per cent
Seed drills	20	15	15
Weeders	20	20	15

The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's would not reduce this tariff.

	Fielding Tariff Per cent	Under Reciprocity Per cent	To-day per cent
Manure spreaders	20	20	15
Harrows	20	15	15
Traction engines	20	20	Free up to valuation of $1,400
Separators	20	15	17½
Farm wagons ..	25	22½	20
Windmills	20	20	17½
Fanning mills..	25	20	20
Cultivators	20	15	15

I have taken a list of the fourteen principal farm implements, and I find that the duties on eight out of the fourteen are lower to-day than they were under the Fielding tariff and lower to-day than they would have been under reciprocity.

An hon. MEMBER: Who lowered them?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Lowered by the Government of Sir Robert Borden. On eight the duties are lower even than under the reciprocity; on four more the duties are lower than under the Fielding tariff and equal to what they would have been under reciprocity; on two of them, or the balance, the duties are lower than they were under the Fielding tariff.

Mr. CRERAR: Why does the minister not get to work and reduce the duties on those articles still further?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will tell my hon. friend why just in a minute; but I have said enough to show that if in 1907 there was a substantial reduction made which hon. gentlemen supported as such, twice that reduction was made by the Government that is now in office. The duties on farm implements under the Fielding tariff would average 20.18; under reciprocity they would have averaged 17.32, and under the present tariff they average 14.64. What I should like to submit to hon. gentlemen is this. If they believe what they profess to believe on this question, would not the better thing for them to do be to support a government that acts, rather than a government that professes and fails to act?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I will answer that question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clark) has already spoken.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Might I suggest that the minister do not speak by way of asking questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: The minister is quite within his right to submit any questions he chooses.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just before the House took recess at six o'clock, I stated, in answer to an ironical interruption by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), who seemed to take a sort of sarcastic pleasure in the use of the term "adequate protection," that the leader whom he will undoubtedly now support and the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) whom he supported for many years, proclaimed the Fielding tariff as a tariff of adequate protection. Now I propose to show that that is correct, and I do not think he was very far wrong in his description. In fact, in some cases I thought, and think still, he had too high protection. Speaking on the 7th of June, 1904, in the Budget Speech he said that his tariff had:

included a considerable measure of incidental protection—

That was the favourite word of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's all the time he was in office in describing his protective tariff. He took care almost universally to call it "incidental" protection, as if it made a bit of difference what adjective he applied to it, whether it was incidental, accidental or transcendental. It was not the adjective, but the amount of the duty that counted, and those who were interested in the tariff of Canada did not care whether he called it incidental protection or anything else. He went on to say:

—and in that respect it will command the admiration perhaps of hon. gentlemen opposite who are more anxious for protection than some of us on this side of the House.

"Some of us." He did not name them. He goes on:

I think as to whether or not it is adequate protection we have some evidence of a gratifying character that the tariff, without being excessive, is high enough to bring some American industries across the line—

Pretty real protection!

—and a tariff which is able to bring these industries into Canada, looks very much like a tariff which affords adequate protection.

"Adequate protection."

And in the year 1909, I think it was or 1908, speaking on a motion for the further reduction of the duty on these very implements he made this statement, and I ask hon. gentlemen who feel like supporting the

hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's in this vague, visionary, misty, and cloudy resolution, after he has lopped off the specific and the actual, just to read what he said when in office and in which he still believes to-day, judging from the whole tenor of his speech. Opposing the motion for reduction he said:

With a moderate duty we have induced American capital to come into Canada and to establish that great industry (The International Harvester Company of Hamilton) and after we have brought it in and established it in Canada, I believe that if we were to pass this resolution—

Reducing the duties, not making them free, but still leaving on 10 per cent. He says:

I believe that, if we were to pass this resolution the company operating that industry would find it profitable to close the Hamilton factory and bring in goods which they make in the United States.

That was his reason for opposing the motion. He was opposed to reducing the duty by 7½ per cent when in office. But once out of office and when he wanted to perform a marriage ceremony with hon. gentlemen angularly opposite he is ready to take the whole duty off and leave it just as it was before 1896. He said:

On behalf of the Government I wish to say, following the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, that while we are not advocating a high tariff, while we are not advocating a Chinese wall tariff, while we are not seeking to shut everything out, we are willing that a moderate—

Listen to the words:

—that a moderate degree of protection, if you care to use the word, arising out of a tariff designed for revenue, but incidentally—

The same old phrase.

—giving some protection,—in some instances a considerable measure of protection—we are willing that, where there is a great industry in Canada, it shall receive a fair share of consideration which we have given by this tariff on agricultural implements, and so I must ask the House to reject the amendment of the hon. member for Souris.

Now it was argued in that debate, and argued again in the reciprocity debate in 1911, that the tariff that existed at that time, particularly the tariff on implements, was no more than a revenue tariff, and when the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's came back from Washington and announced his programme, he told the House that he could not reduce further the duty on implements, and he said that the reason was that to do so would be getting below the line of a revenue tariff. Now I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if, at a time when the revenue necessities of this country were $125,000,000, the Fielding reciprocity tariff was no more than a revenue tariff, how does a much lower tariff become too high for a revenue tariff when the revenue necessities of this country are $350,000,000? Besides, through all those years, and many of them were hard years—there has never been a depression in Canada for twenty or thirty years like the depression of 1907 and 1908—he adhered to these means, and these means alone, of raising the revenue and never dared to impose one dollar of direct taxation in this country. I ask again if that Fielding tariff, if that scale of tariff, was no more than a revenue tariff, when we had not the courage to have direct taxation at all, how can hon. gentlemen complain of this scale now that we have $81,000,000 by direct taxation and propose to have $181,000,000 next year? There could be nothing more inconsistent, nothing more ludicrously grotesque, than the position of hon. gentlemen opposite in respect of the scale of this tariff if they remember for one minute not only their own innate beliefs on this subject, but the beliefs they put into practice through fifteen years of power.

Now I observe in this Liberal platform of August last, the greater part of which is now left at home, that they have changed the words of the farmers' resolution which calls for all foodstuffs to be put on the free list to read "the principal articles of food." The House will appreciate the skill of the generality, but would it not be interesting, and, indeed, is it not absolutely necessary, that the people of this country should know from hon. gentlemen opposite what these principal articles of food are. What are the principal articles of food? May I ask, is tea a principal article of food? I venture to say I shall never get an answer from the leader of the Opposition, and I venture to say he will not give me an answer when he speaks in this debate. Is sugar a principal article of food? I would think it would be. We use something like $100,000,000 a year of sugar, we import $75,000,000, and we make quite a lot here. Is it the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite to put raw sugar and refined sugar on the free list? If it is, I think the country has a right to know. Whether it is their intention or not, I think the country has a right to know. Here is our tariff. What do you mean by your professions? Are meats a principal article of food? Are biscuits a principal article of food? Biscuits, the hallowed biscuits on which they never thought of revising the duty, even under reciprocity,

below 30 cents a pound. Are they a principal article of food? What are these principal articles of food? No answer, and there will be no answer, Mr. Speaker. It is in the vagueness and the generality of it that they take their refuge. Virtually all is vague and meaningless except the things that are free now, that were put in for mere padding, to make an appearance, and to paint a little ornament to look like the Farmers' platform. I have not succeeded in getting much in the way of answer from the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. PEDLOW: He has not been given an opportunity to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. leader of the Opposition will have his opportunity in due course.

Mr. PEDLOW: I—

Mr. SPEAKER: If any hon. gentleman has a remark to make he might do the House the courtesy of rising in his seat.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. PEDLOW: My point of order is, Sir, that by your ruling we are precluded from the possibility of answering questions asked by the member who has the floor.

Mr. SPEAKER: I fail to observe the point of order. The hon. member who has raised it has trifled with the rules of order of the House, which are clear and distinct. A question may be submitted by an hon. member who has the floor but no member has any right to make any statement in reply, even with the consent of the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was just a figure of rhetoric.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has been the practice that an hon. gentleman, with the consent of the member who has the floor, may reply. I do not wish to question the ruling of the Chair, but I want to add this, that no hon. member has been precluded from replying to any question by any act of mine, either on this or on any other occasion. In fact, I should be pleased if the rule of the House could be ignored so far as this point is concerned.

Now, I desire to refer to one thing else, and it is clearly in harmony with the whole proceeding we are witnessing now. Hon. members will recall that a leading figure in the Liberal Convention in August last was the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). Not satisfied with the result of his labours, and no doubt having some recollection of the agony he went through in 1896 and the humiliating position in which he was frequently placed thereafter, he went back and wrote in the Journal of Commerce, a paper which he edits in the city of Montreal, a clear intimation, which I can read to the House if it desires, that the only practical acceptation of the platform of hon. gentlemen opposite was one with "interpretations and reservations," and that anyway platforms that were made at conventions were made in a hurry and were not footstools of policy or declarations of principle, but were merely in the nature of platforms on Pullman coaches to get in upon. That is the frank confession of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, and this platform which he himself denominated as a mere means to get in on is the platform of which he takes a truncated section and brings it into this House seeking by so doing to get a vote of want of confidence against the Government.

I remarked a few moments ago that we never had even from hon. gentlemen of the Agrarian party any motion in this House asking this House to debate and declare its judgment upon the platform which they profess. A year, or two years ago—I forget which—we had an attempt on the part of the hon. member for Red Deer to bring in something of the kind. It was stated at that time by you, Mr. Speaker, that on a motion to go into Ways and Means, that is to say, on the Budget debate, one amendment could be moved and no sub-amendment could be moved thereto, and also that, no second amendment could be moved after the first amendment had been defeated. In other words, there can be only one amendment. Hon. gentlemen knew that right well. It was shown them clearly by Mr. Speaker two years ago. But they come to this debate with a motion in amendment made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, a member of the official Opposition; and members of the Agrarian party know that by allowing him to make this motion they are precluded from moving their platform by way of amendment. Why was that? Was a request made that they be allowed to move their platform by way of amendment, and was it refused? I think not. Is it not clearly the purpose to protect those hon. gentlemen opposite from declaring where they stand on the farmers' platform? The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) laughs. For two years, or for something more than

one year at any rate, the hon. gentleman has been a private member, and neither he nor any of his followers has ever put that platform on the Orders of the Day. They have never sought a discussion of it in this House; they have never challenged the opinions of hon. members in regard to it; they have never put hon. gentlemen opposite in the position of voting Yea or Nay. They have left them in such a position that they can go hand in hand with themselves in the country never having come into a recorded antagonism in Parliament. Each side can hold up a different flag and follow a different leader, seeking to get the free trade vote in one part of Canada and the protectionist vote in another, and then afterwards come back together to show the people of the country just what they care for the opinions and professions they make before a contest. That was the performance in 1897. It looks as if something even worse were on the programme to-day, and I am confirmed in that statement by the opinions freely and definitely expressed on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. I know that the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) went to Montreal to the sanctuary of Liberalism, the Reform club, and stated there at the time of the by-election in St. James, that he did not stand for free trade; that, in fact, there was not a single free trader in his party. He said he stood for a well-regulated system of protection. And the hon. member now for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) declared in his speech in that campaign that he too stood for the encouragement of industries by a protective system. He was elected, not on the platform that is here moved in amendment, not on anything that bears a family resemblance to the professions of hon. gentlemen in the Agrarian party. He was elected on the platform upon which this Government stands in regard to tariff matters. That, Sir, is what he was elected on. He utilizes the tariff policy of this Administration to get elected in order afterwards to vote a want of confidence in the Government that puts forward that policy. That is his position.

Mr. POWER: Why did you not get him elected?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, he got elected and the man on the other side stood for the same. As between the two, there was not much difference so far as we were concerned; and all we ask of the hon. member for St. James is that he now vote according to the professions he made, that he stand true to the electors to whom he made those professions, on the strength of which he got their votes. And what about the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb)? He too was in the Montreal Reform Club and made a speech in which he defined himself as clearly in favour of the encouragement of the industries of a country by legislation. That is where he stands. And what about the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) who represents the city of Sarnia and the thriving county of Lambton? He went to the same Montreal Reform Club and he denounced free trade hip and thigh. He declared himself in favour of a tariff not only for the purpose of revenue but because we had to have a tariff for economic reasons, for protective reasons, and he knows he stands for that principle. He knows he is an advocate of protection as a principle; he would not dare to vote for a resolution in this House that denounced the principle of protection. Now I ask him if in this debate, where there is nothing at all in controversy but that principle, to stand up and vote as he professes and believes.

We have all these declarations of faith on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite saying to the people of Eastern Canada to its farthest limits "Do not be afraid of us. Here is our faith presented by Mr. Pardee of Lambton, Mr. Rinfret of St. James, Mr. Béland of Beauce, Mr. Robb of Huntingdon, and Mr. Lemieux" —they might just as well add him and they could add fifty more—"here is our faith, do not be afraid of us, vote for us on a policy of moderate protection." At the same time we have hon. gentlemen across the way saying in Western Canada "vote for us as free traders pure and simple, seeking free trade with United States, and with Great Britain first, and then with all the world." Then we have the leader—who hopes to be the leader of both parties if they get into power—trying to sing a song that attunes with each, and telling the people in all ends of Canada that the Liberal party and the Liberal platform are, to all intents and purposes, the same as the farmers' party and the farmers' platform. That is to say that protection and free trade are to all intents and purposes the same. The one principle is the profession of my hon. friends opposite, the other principle is the profession of hon. gentlemen on the cross benches; and the leader (Mr. King) claiming them both as his own in order to pave the way for the great betrayal when the day comes, if it ever comes, that their

united numbers are greater than the numbers behind the present Government.

Now I stated a moment ago that in this country to-day we had not anything in the nature of an immoderate tariff. It may be —it doubtless is the case—that there are portions of that tariff that can be scaled down, that upon investigation it will be seen that deductions can be made. There may be other changes that may be necessary. The principle upon which the revision will be made is clear and well defined and all understand it. It will be designed to keep industries in Canada, to enable industries to expand, but will go no further than is essential for that purpose when accompanied by competent business management. Now surely that principle is plain. Will the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) say he could not support a tariff designed for that purpose and with that restraint? He could not say so. Why do not hon. gentlemen who believe in the principle I am expounding and who know this tariff is true to that principle—why do they not support it? Just in order that a political manoeuvre may be played and for no other reason whatsoever.

We have direct taxation now in this country, and the Government that imposed it is the Government in office. The Government that took all the responsibility and unpopularity of imposing direct taxation, that is the Government that now appeals to this House of Commons. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), the great champion of direct taxation, who has been preaching it in season and out of season all over this country, votes against the Government of direct taxation. He votes for hon. gentlemen opposite who never introduced the policy of direct taxation, and he holds the sheltering hand of his protection over Provincial Governments that do not put on the direct taxation that he advocates. Let us now have an examination into the policy of the hon. member. He says "I want to do away with custom duties." That is what he tells the people of the West,—do away with them. "It is no way in the world," he says, "to raise a revenue." "It is the most costly way" is the way he expresses in Brandon "ever devised by man."

Mr. CRERAR: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: "Hear, hear," the hon. gentleman says to-day; he says: put in its place income tax, a graduated income tax, and a tax on the unearned increment of land. That is his statement. His platform does not call for a tax on the unearned increments of land but for a tax on the unimproved value of land, a different thing altogether. However, I want the House to know that those are his two main substitutes. The others are purely provincial taxes, inheritance and the like—those first are the two main substitutes the hon. gentlemen advocates—land tax, and income tax. Now I hold in my hands the report of a tax commission appointed by the Government of Manitoba, the Government which is very close to the hon. member for Marquette, and whose continuance in office is one of the things dearest to his heart. I am not saying anything against that Government at the present time, that is not an issue in this debate; I am saying something about the consistency of the hon. member. That Government appointed a commission, and so far as I know a commission of pretty able men, to go into the question of this taxation and to report to the administration. That commission was composed of, I think, ten or a dozen men. There were represented on it the farmers of Manitoba, representatives of the rural councils of that province. Other interests in Manitoba were also represented, and among them the actual Grain Growers Association that is the very party that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crerar) champions and leads in this House. They were directly represented on that commission by two men. Of these, one, Mr. Peter Wright, is a director of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, is he not?

Mr. CRERAR: One of the directors.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One of the directors of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, the council that propounded this Farmers' platform, and Mr. W. Wood is the secretary of the Farmers' party in Manitoba. Now the commission examined into this land tax, it examined into the income tax, it examined into single tax, and all other taxes; it reported against single tax in the most decisive terms. On discussing the merits of the land tax, a tax on land of any kind—on unimproved land or an unearned increment tax—it decided that a tax on land was a good thing by local authorities for local purposes but that a tax on land was a bad thing for the federal authorities for any purpose at all. I have the very words of that report in front of me.

Mr. CRERAR: Did Messrs. Wright and Wood sign that report?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Wright signed the report. Mr. Wood did not sign the report

but he made no minority report. I have the report before me and Mr. Wright's signature appears thereon. Here is what they say about the land tax:

> There are accordingly several cogent reasons why the taxation of real property has tended more and more to become the special prerogative of the local authorities. For the Dominion Government in this country, for example, to encroach on the field of real property taxation would, in the light of both history and theory, be a distinctly retrograde step.

And that is one of the taxes that the Farmers' party led by the hon. member for Marquette says that we should adopt, that is one of the fields he says we should invade which the Manitoba Government commission unanimously find—every man who signs the report finds—to be debarred by its own nature from adoption by the federal authorities for any purpose. Then they go on to the income tax, and what do they say about it? I am sorry that the hon. member for Red Deer is not here. This would be very interesting to that hon. member who complains of the small amount of income tax collected from the farmers. The commission quote with approval what Professor Adams says:

> The income tax yields little or no revenue in rural or farming districts, and for that reason I would not recommend it to farming communities; but for thickly settled manufacturing and urban communities, it is bound to spread and in the end to supplant the relatively unjust and unfair tax on personal property.
>
> This seems to be the prevailing opinion everywhere.
>
> In the income tax provisions of the province of Ontario we find that the income of farmers derived from the produce of their farms is expressly exempted from taxation under the income tax law.
>
> We have carefully and fully considered this feature, and recommend that the provisions of any general income law that may be enacted in this province, be confined wholly and exclusively to urban communities.
>
> It is to be borne in mind that the application of a provincial income tax to the farmer would, in any event, be lost energy, in that, if such were imposed, and the amount derived in each municipality was returned to the source derived, it would be equivalent to travelling north by south.

There is the report of this commission unanimously adopted and concurred in by a director of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, Mr. Peter Wright. Mr. Peter Wright is a man for whose opinion and personality I have the profoundest respect. He is a man who has rendered splendid service in our soldier settlement work. Mr. Peter Wright, after investigation, signs that report and says that, of the substitute taxes which the hon. member for Marquette proposes to take the place of the customs tax, the land tax is one we should not adopt and that the income tax is all right so long as we do not touch the farmers of Canada. I will ask the hon. member for Marquette—I will not ask him to reply now but I will be happy if he will reply when he takes his feet: Does he propose to repudiate Mr. Peter Wright who has gone into this case and got the evidence, and who is a director of his own association, and one of the framers of its platform, or does he propose to change his policy?

I stated to the House that the tax on large incomes in England was lower than in Canada. This is interjected out of its place because I did not have the figures before me then. I stated that the turning point was about incomes of $200,000. I have been sent over from the Finance Department the figures which give the tax on incomes of $100,000, $500,000 and up to $1,000,000. I do not have the figures for an income of $200,000, but I think that is about the turning point. The tax on incomes of $500,000 in Canada, under last year's scale, is $303,190. The tax on the same income in the United States is exactly the same amount. The tax on the same income in Great Britain is $257,321, or almost $50,000 less than the tax that we collect in Canada.

Mr. CRERAR: Would the hon. gentleman give the tax on an income of $100,000?

Mr. MEIGHEN: An income of $100,000 is more heavily taxed in England, and so are smaller incomes all down the line. The tax on an income of $100,000 in Canada is $31,190 and in the United States the same. In England the tax is $47,327. Coming to the incomes of $1,000,000, our tax is $663,190 while the British tax is $519,812.77, or a difference of almost $150,000, between the tax on a million-dollar income in England and in Canada. Yet, we are upbraided—upbraided, it is true, for political purposes and no other—by hon. gentlemen opposite who say we are protecting the rich man and the millionaire and that we ought to follow the example of England. Our tax with respect to all these cases of high income is emphatically higher than in England, it is higher than in Australia, higher than in that paradise of income taxation referred to by the hon. member for Red Deer, New Zealand. Their tax on an income of $1,000,000 is $374,993—away below ours; and on an income of $500,000 it is $187,496 or very little more than half the tax in Canada.

I have sought to show that the tariff as now proposed should remain in effect pending a thorough revision, which hon. gentlemen opposite admit could not have been made up to the present time. The hon. member for Red Deer clearly admitted that. This is the tariff, and not higher, but lower than that adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in office under circumstances of far less urgent need. It is admitted to be a tariff which is lower than that which hon. gentlemen opposite unanimously supported all through those fifteen years. It is a tariff not designed to benefit the rich in this country; it is designed, so far as our own information goes—and it cannot be complete without investigation—only to give such measure of assistance as to retain within this country its industrial strength, and which does not alienate from this country a measure of the industrial strength that we have. We never can have a high tariff in Canada. We cannot have a high tariff in Canada for the most obvious reasons. In the first place, a high tariff is unsound in principle in that it tends to eliminate one of the factors of competition, namely, foreign goods. Foreign goods should be allowed to enter into competition under fair conditions in this or in any other country. But the conditions under free trade or without protection are such that the foreign competitor has every advantage.

Take an illustration. Here is a foreign competitor in the United States competing with the manufacturer in England. Are the conditions equal? Is a man in the United States, where he can get the biggest concern, the biggest industrial unit, the biggest output, in the same position as the man in England? He can have a much larger unit. He has a market of 110,000,000 assured to him right at home that no government can take away. In Great Britain he has another market of 43,000,000 almost at hand and free of access to him. He has the same show exactly as the British manufacturer in all the other countries of the world. He therefore has a free market of 153,000,000 to sell his output to. Where is his British competitor? What is his position? He has the bars up against him in the United States; he cannot get into that market save over the tariff wall. He has the same restrictions against him in other countries of the world and all he has left to him is that portion of his own home market of 43,000,000 that may be uninvaded by the products of other lands. Is that equal competition? Bring similar conditions here and you would soon paralyze and destroy the whole industrial fabric of this country. So I say we cannot have any immoderate or high tariff for the reason, first, that it tends to exclude that healthy element of fair conditions, namely, foreign competition; secondly, we have in Canada a territory of wide extent. We have one portion of Canada, newer than the other portion, a more predominatingly agricultural country, newer to manufactures and industrial development, and consequently the advantages of the tariff do not accrue to them as yet as they ultimately will accrue to them. They come more immediately to one portion of this country than to another. On account of these two reasons we must always have in this country nothing more than a moderate tariff under any conditions whatsoever. That will be the purpose of the revision, under the principles clearly set out, enunciated by the Minister of Finance, to which we adhere. On that policy I appeal to hon. gentlemen who have something great or small at stake in this Dominion—yes, I appeal to citizens, men and women who have nothing of this world's goods at stake, whose only concern is the well-being of their native land. There are those among us who will not see with their eyes or hear with their ears or understand with their hearts; there is that class in Canada, as in England, and there always will be in every country. I cannot appeal to those to whom experience has taught nothing and for whom reason has no persuasion. But to all others who will thoroughly study the needs of Canada; who will thoroughly study the example of other nations, and most of all, the example of the Mother Country herself—I appeal to them to yield support to what is fair and right. Come what may, good or ill fortune, I prefer to be of the number of those who have stood loyally by clear and well-defined and well-tried principles, who have been loyal to them in office and out of office, rather than among those who have two policies, one to profess and the other to practice.

Mr. M. J. DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I will not intervene in the contest between the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) and the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), because I admit I am not big enough to throw any light upon the question, for instance, whether the balance of trade should be considered in connection with the fiscal policy to be adopted by any country. I must say that after the speech of the Minister of the Interior I am more than ever in the dark as to that question of balance of trade. He told the House

that Germany and the United States were prosperous with a balance of trade in their favour, and that England was prosperous with an adverse balance of trade. This question has been an open one for centuries; I think that it will continue so for some few centuries to come.

The Minister of the Interior read to the House lengthy quotations from the report of a commission appointed to study economic conditions in England. The fact remains that since that report was submitted in 1918 nothing has been done to comply with the findings of the majority of the commissioners. We all know that many by-elections have since been held in England, and I do not think that the electors there approved in any shape or form of the changes proposed in that report.

I wish to refer to what the Minister of the Interior said in respect to a statement made by the member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). He said that the Auditor General's Report is open to revision and investigation by the Public Accounts Committee. I would like to remind the minister that the volume containing the particular item in question was brought down only last week, so we have had no time to take it up before the Public Accounts Committee.

The question before the House is a very important one. The ground has been pretty well covered since the beginning of this debate, but there are certain matters upon which I desire to express my views. I listened with interest to the speech of the Minister of Finance, which has been awaited with curiosity, I may say with anxiety. I was disappointed in it, because I found that the most important problem that confronts us, the cost of living, had not received the least consideration from this Government. I was disappointed to a certain degree, but not to the extent of being surprised, because it is well known that the Government have done absolutely nothing to bring relief to the consumers who have suffered and are still suffering to the extent of depriving themselves of certain necessities of life. All that the Government did on that account was to create a body known as the Board of Commerce, which, in my judgment, was an absolute failure. It will be said, I know, that the problem of the cost of living is a very difficult one. We all know that; but we all know also that it is not a more difficult problem in this country than it is in other countries. We know what has been done in some other countries, and we can appreciate the good results of the drastic measures which have elsewhere been taken against profiteers. The effect of the application of these measures, Mr. Speaker, was magic; to-day we witness a real race in the United States in the lowering of prices. England as well has taken action to fight profiteers and the high cost of living; the same is true of France and many other countries. Here we have had investigations which have shown how we have been oppressed by the profiteers in connection with the necessaries of life. It has been established that canners and packers and proprietors of refrigerating plants are mainly responsible for the increase in the price of foodstuffs. To my mind, it would have been easy to check them by a proper and strict control of their operations and by the enactment of laws providing stern punishment for unreasonable profiteering. The Government have been warned again and again without success. Notwithstanding the negligence of the Government in that regard to date, the people of this country were expecting an announcement of some measures of relief on the occasion of the presentation of the Budget. They expected that the production of foodstuffs would be stimulated by the removal of customs duties from agricultural implements and the necessaries of life generally. They, however, failed to see anything of the kind in the speech of the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), and their only comfort is to learn that the Government need money and that the people will be called upon to pay the bill. Increased taxes all along—that is the only relief offered to the people in the critical situation in which we are. We all admit that Canada must meet her obligations and that for that purpose the Government must levy taxes; but the reproach that we have to make to the Government is that we are called upon to pay for extravagances and waste, and also to pay our war debt when that war debt should have been paid during the war and since by the war profiteers and not by the whole community.

The other day the Minister of Finance spoke about economy. We can hardly reconcile the strong plea he made the other day for economy with the Estimates of $12,000,000 for military expenses. We cannot share the hopes of the Minister of Finance for the future of this country when we consider the shipbuilding policy of the Government. We cannot hope for financial success in the future when we consider the railway policy of this Government. I am not a pessimist, but for me to become an optimist would require a change of Gov-

ernment. If the ministers of the Cabinet are anxious to do something for the good of the country, let them dissolve Parliament. This is the wish of the people—of farmers, soldiers, labourers and consumers—and nobody can deny that. The people are not satisfied that we were elected in normal times and by normal means, and they believe that we received only a war-time mandate, because that mandate was given in a war-time election. Why should the Government accentuate uneasiness, discontent and indignation, by refusing to comply with the general and obvious desire of the people?

The Minister of Finance is standing by protection or by what is called generally the "National Policy." I am glad that this opportunity is afforded to me to express my views on the economic question as regards this country. I am not a protectionist; I stand for the Liberal platform of 1919 as enunciated at the Liberal convention, I am for a tariff for revenue. I want to speak frankly. If I had been in politics in 1878, I would have opposed the so-called National Policy, and I believe the situation and the conditions of the country in 1896, after eighteen years of that regime, would have justified my calculations.

The National Policy led the country to the verge of bankruptcy; it created large fortunes for a few privileged people; but it was detrimental to the great majority of the people of Canada. I am opposed to the so-called National Policy, although I must admit that in the framing of a fiscal policy for this country, we must take into consideration actual conditions as they were produced by such a policy. In 1893, the Liberal party pronounced itself in favour of the principle of greater freedom of trade, and to-day, the party is charged with not having fulfilled its promises in this respect. Every day we hear that the fiscal policy of the Liberal party when in power was the same as that of the Conservative party, and opponents of the Liberal party are naturally interested in trying to create that impression. It seems as if they fail to remember the great fiscal modifications brought about by the Laurier Government; they seem to forget that the Laurier Government lowered the customs duties on about 150 articles of the tariff and abolished the duties on many other articles of the tariff. They would not admit the real endeavour of the party to apply its principles, and in their appreciation of the fiscal policy of the Liberal party, they fail to take into consideration the fact that we had in this country during eighteen years previously to 1896, a regime of high protection. Was the Liberal party wheen it came into power to act by revolution or by evolution? The wisdom of the leaders induced them to choose the way of moderation and good order, and the party moved on gradually towards its aim, succeeding in reaching the reciprocity treaty of 1911. The fiscal policy of the Liberal party from 1896 to 1911 has been such that not one of its followers with lower-tariff tendencies thought it necessary to withdraw his allegiance from his party during the fifteen years of the Liberal administration. There were some Liberals who left the party because of its fiscal policy, but only those who were high protectionists. It is unfair to say that there is no difference between the Liberal and the Tory fiscal policies, for everybody knows that the Liberal party fell in 1911 in trying to put its principles of a low tariff into effect. There is absolutely no justification for saying that there is no difference between the two parties when not only were promises made but the Reciprocity Treaty was effected between the United States and Canada. In view of that treaty, I can hardly forgive those who persist in saying there is no difference between the Liberal and the Tory party fiscal policies. It is not worthy, it seems to me, for a public man to appear not to appreciate the difference that does exist between the two parties. The Liberal party stands by its principles. We have not changed. More than ever we believe that the application of a tariff for revenue should be the fiscal policy of this country, and that considerable reductions should be made in the tariff in the interests of the welfare and prosperity of this country.

With protection we have created large cities, but that policy has been detrimental to the farming community. Our country is mainly agricultural, and instead of establishing a policy the effect of which was to bring into the cities our young men of the country, I think it would have been far better to concentrate our energies on the development of our agricultural industry. For my part I would prefer Montreal with a population of 300,000 men and the other 300,000 on the farms, because I would be sure then that that other 300,000 would be engaged in the production of the first necessities of life. Agriculture is our principal natural resource. By high protection it has been deprived of the labour it requires to such a degree that a very serious problem has been created and is facing us at the present time. I have no hesitation in saying that because of the shortage of farm labour

our farms are producing only about half of what they could produce. This is the direct result of high protection, and we must face the situation. We must do something to improve our agricultural industry. I regret that there is nothing substantial to be found in the Budget to help relieve conditions in this vital industry. The Finance Minister should have immediately decided on the free admission of agricultural implements, and should have reached the conclusion that the Reciprocity Treaty of 1911 should be revived. The minister gives us a promise of tariff revision, but can we take his declaration as a certainty or even as a probability after the promise we had last year from another Minister of Finance of this same administration? The Finance Minister, however, has spoken of having a revision of the tariff. If such a revision ever takes place let us hope that its principle will be a tariff for revenue without a vestige of protection, for protection means privilege. We have made immense sacrifices in the past to establish the industries of this country, some of which were what I might call exotics; that is, they had to get all their materials from other countries. Some of them now are very prosperous indeed, and, due to the fact that the Government has given them such high protection, we have witnessed the scandalous spectacle of some of these industries selling their products cheaper in Europe than in Canada. I say, let these industries take care of themselves now that they are strong, and if they are to receive any protection out of the tariff, let that protection be only incidental. If we had given to agriculture the protection that has been given to other industries what a prosperous and happy population would be ours to-day. If we had had more solicitude and paid more attention to the development of our natural industries, such as mines, pulp, paper, furniture and all those industries using lumber or iron and steel as their raw materials, we would certainly have had a much more prosperous country to-day and a more contented and a happier people.

Those are my views on the fiscal question. I shall leave to other hon. members to answer the arguments of the Minister of the Interior specifically, because there are answers to give. I have given my reasons for favouring a tariff strictly for revenue, that is to say, the establishment of customs duties in order to get the money necessary for the good administration of this country.

Mr. EDGAR KEITH SPINNEY (Yarmouth and Claire): Mr. Speaker, I have hesitated in engaging in the debate on the very important subject now before the House, feeling that both the hon. members of this House and the public generally were already over-fed by the conflicting views expressed by hon. members.

May I be permitted, Sir, first to join with many other members of this House in extending to the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) my very hearty congratulations on the great care and honesty of purpose he has displayed in preparing his Budget, and on his clear and lucid manner of presenting it to this Parliament. His declaration of the huge debt confronting this country shows no disposition to suppress the ghastly facts.

While it is not my purpose to refer at any length to the horrors of the atrocious war which convulsed the nations of the world, and in which Canada was so deeply involved, I cannot permit this occasion to pass without giving expression to our deep gratitude to our brave soldiers who so courageously and promptly obeyed the call to arms in defence of liberty, justice and democracy—three principles for which all Canadians in conjunction with other portions of this great Empire stand. Their services are far beyond commercial value, as the enjoyment of our liberty to-day is due to their great bravery and valour in conjunction with the army of the Allies.

We are also proud as Canadians of the hearty co-operation of all our people in that crisis by their willing and generous response in providing the adequate funds necessary in the successful carrying out of that great war. I desire especially to pay a high tribute to the women of Canada who took so prominent a part in this important movement. They indeed set a good example to the sterner sex in the great sacrifices they made and in the successful efforts they achieved in connection with Red Cross work and in their constant endeavours to send comfort to our noble soldiers in the trenches. We can well say, from the depths of our hearts, God bless the women of Canada.

While the penalty of this terrible conflict from a financial standpoint is great, yet it has no comparison with the loss involved when, approximately, 60,000 of our brave soldiers were called upon to pay the supreme sacrifice. Our hearts go forth in deep sympathy to those who were called upon to mourn the loss of their near and dear ones. The sacrifice of these valuable lives to this nation cannot be estimated or overcome.

We can readily understand the great problem of acquiring a revenue to meet the obligations of Canada which have increased more than six-fold as compared with pre-war time; and to meet further necessary expenditures in order to develop the growth and expansion of this great country it must tax the minister to the limit; and in accomplishing that desired result I am quite safe in assuming that no member of this House would place any obstacle in his way. In his system of taxation it is only natural to assume there will be many objections raised. There are those who very strenuously oppose the business profits tax, holding some very strong arguments in support of their views. The future development of Canada must of necessity depend on the sound financial basis of its business institutions. It is claimed that this tax as originally applied to buiness operations does not lend itself to that most desirable object. Permit me, Sir, to refer to alleged inconsistencies. Take this illustration: A business corporation is formed with a capital of $150,000 with a volume of business, say $650,000 yearly, showing a profit of $45,000. This, being applied to capital instead of the yearly turnover represents a profit of 30 per cent; but on the basis of yearly turnover the taxes this corporation must pay would amount to approximately $18,000. Under normal conditions this would not appear to be so great an injustice, as after allowing 7 per cent on capital employed, they would have a credit balance on the year's operations of about $17,000. But let me say that in applying this system of taxation the yearly balance sheet is taken as a basis. Any one engaged in business operations will readily admit that the operations for the year cannot be closed and there must remain on their books or in their bankers' hands at least a balance of $150,000. Any losses involved in the collection of this amount must rest with the corporation against which they have no redress. Take another case. Through some misfortune, mismanagement or otherwise, an adverse balance of, say, $10,000 may be shown. It is true no taxation applies, but there is no consideration shown for this loss the following year when normal conditions may prevail.

In order to conduct a business of this magnitude a stock of goods valued at pre-war prices of at least $125,000 must be carried. With the abnormal price prevailing during the war and even now existing the stock would reach a value of $300,000. He would be a bold operator who would say that present prices would be maintained or that a sudden depreciation would not take place. Such a reaction must come, and in order to meet these conditions very heavy sacrifices must be encountered. If there is not a reasonable surplus left in order to meet such a loss bankruptcy must result with all its widespread influences. That system of taxation was also inequitable as business operations employing less than $25,000 escape taxation. Some of the evil effects following the business profits tax are briefly:—First it limits investment. The tax operates to discourage the investment of capital in two ways: First, it diminishes the amount of foreign capital available for investment in Canada; and second, it incourages the investment of Canadian funds in high-priced bonds and other securities rather than in industrial enterprises.

Second, the tax discourages personal endeavour. Because the individual knows that the greater part of his profits over a certain amount will be taken by the government, he tends to limit his activities; in other words, the tax is a fine upon initiative and efficiency.

Thirdly, it tends to limit production. A great deal of money now being paid to the government should be employed in extending present plants or in constructing others, encouraging greater production of manufactured goods and the necessarily greater employment of labour.

In making these criticisms, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I want to declare most emphatically that the business men of this country desire to bear in a reasonable and equitable manner their share of the costs of the war. They recognize, as all true Canadians should, that the sacrifice of the noble boys who went to their doom was not made for any individual or any class in Canada but for all citizens. Each one should bear a reasonable share, and should not hesitate for one moment to acceptt a system of taxation that would equitable distribute the burden. I want to inform the Minister of Finance that it is gratifying to know that he has made a reduction in the business profits tax in his present Budget, and we can only hope that he will be convinced of the necessity of eliminating the tax and adopting some other method of raising the revenue which it provides.

May I venture to predict with the great wealth in natural resources possessed by this great country, second to none in this world, and with the indomitable spirit and

determination of its people, the heavy burden of debt in which Canada is involved will be gradually dissipated.

Again, Sir, let me, with your permission, refer to the value of the great resources of Canada. The most important, and the one giving the very highest results in point of value, is that of our manufacturing industry. The products of Canadian manufacturers for the year 1919 amount to the large volume of $3,015,575,940. This magnificent business, which Canada cannot very well afford to lose in its future progress, employs 692,067 people, and the capital invested amounts to $2,786,649,727. There was paid in salaries and wages last year the large sum of $553,301,675. All must admit that in view of the magnitude of the interests at stake nothing should be done which will disturbe or restrict these wonderful resources. Anything that would bring about that effect would not only be improper but dangerous as well. From no individual source can Canada extricate herself from the debt in which she is now involved. It will be by co-operating in the development of all our resources and through united efforts by all those engaged in the various enterprises now being conducted in Canada, that the results we all wish for shall be reached.

One of our predominate resources is that of agriculture. Much has been done in its development, but the industry is in its infancy so far as future possibilities indicate. It is gratifying to know that financial aid extended by both federal and provincial governments in their endeavours to assist greater production and to attract an immigration suited for such occupation. A greater effort should be made to induce our young men to engage in agriculture. Under the able generalship of the present very efficient Minister of Agriculture, I am safe in saying every effort will be made in that direction. Permit me to give you some figures in connection with agricultural production last year. The value of farm production in 1919 was $1,448,153,500. This great wealth was produced from 667,951 farms, distributed throughout Canada and represents $165 per capita of our population. Comparing these results with those in the United States our figures are far in excess of that country. The estimate per capita production from agriculture in the United States is only $110 as compared with $165 in Canada.

Another very important industry and perhaps the most productive—bearing in mind the element of the cost of raw material—is our fisheries. It is an industry that affects my constituency perhaps to a larger extent than any other although we have some very important manufacturing industries there. I have prepared some figures in connection with the fishing industry from which it will be seen that in 1918-19 the value of the product was $61,368,502. The value of equipment was $37,169,328. The fleet employed consisted of 2,055 vessels and 42,236 boats, the employees numbered nearly 100,000. The Nova Scotia value of that production was $14,000,000, nearly one-fourth of the production for the whole of Canada, and employment was given in that province to about 30,000 men.

One very important branch of the fishing industry in Nova Scotia is the lobster fishery which is perhaps confined to a large extent to south-west Nova Scotia, eastern Nova Scotia, the Gulf, and Prince Edward Island. The value of the plants engaged in this industry amounts to $3,000,000, the pack of lobsters keeps 171 canneries employed, affords work to about 2,600 vessels, and gives employment to some 3,600 persons, the value of the output in 1919 being about $4,000,000. This is a subject which I feel justified in dwelling upon to a certain extent, on account of its very great importance. As I have already stated to my own constituents. In connection with the fishing industry the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) a few weeks ago gave a very illuminating and instructive address. My efforts will be in support of, and suggesting greater consideration from the Government for this very important and practically inexhaustible industry. It holds a superior place among all branches of production in Canada on account of the cheapness of the raw material which can be procured for the taking.

The fishing industry has undergone many vicissitudes during the past fifty years. In my own constituency, before the abrogation of the treaty between the United States and Canada, the large market for this product being absorbed by the former country, there was engaged in the deep sea fishery upwards of 200 vessels employing over 3,000 men. Owing to the unprofitable result of their operations under these conditions the vessels were disposed of in other occupations and this great army of our fishermen were forced to find employment in the ports of the United States. By this Act not only did Canada lose an asset of great value but a most lucrative business was built up for our neighbours to the south.

During the past few years conditions have changed enabling a large percentage of our men to return to their own home ports to continue their operations from their native land. That the maximum results may be reached, I desire to impress upon the Government the great necessity of extending to those employed in this most important and lucrative industry the same consideration and support as is given to other branches of industry in Canada. A system of education should be inaugurated to bring up our men to the full standard of other countries. Increased bounties should be granted to induce a larger number of men to embark in this industry in the effort to reach the greatest production from one of Canada's most important natural resources. The effect of this effort would be widely extended, promoting other industries such as the building of vessels and boats, increasing business prosperity by giving supplies to the great army of people depending for their support on those engaged in this work, and promoting the various interests of the country, especially in providing the Minister of Finance with an increased revenue. Other very important industries, perhaps of a minor character, might be referred to. One of the most important of our natural resources is that which is represented by our forests. We have unlimited resources which demand some care and protection on the part of the Government; otherwise they must become exhausted. We have a wonderful production of pulpwood. The production in 1919 reached a total of over $15,000,000. Unfortunately a large portion of that material which should have been manufactured into finished products, was shipped out of the country. Products represented by that raw material reached a volume of $75,000,000, an asset which was lost to this country. Not only was there a loss in point of the value of the products but also in the employment of our men in the various industries which would be required, to manufacture these commodities. I can only repeat, Mr. Speaker, what I have already stated, that with unity and determination taking advantage of all the resources which are available in Canada but have not yet been touched, there is no reason in the world why this country should not have an era of prosperity beyond our conception.

I refrain somewhat from referring to the amendment of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). He has been a lifelong friend in whose judgment I have always had implicit confidence in and whom I have followed during his long political career. It may be egotistical on my part to refer to the position I hold in this Parliament to-day, but I think it is necessary that I should state my position. I came here as a Liberal Unionist. I want you to distinctly understand the word "Liberal," for that means exactly what I am. I was induced to accept this position in a time of crisis in this Empire. I accepted it feeling that I was doing my duty and doing right. Support was given me by my constituents of Yarmouth, both Liberals and Conservatives voting for me and sending me here. My Conservative friends knew the conditions and they accepted me with my Liberal principles and policies. I have continued to support the Union Government. I am doing so to-day in the firm conviction that a united government can better deal with the serious problems now confronting this country than can a partisan government. I believe it is in the interest of everybody. I believe that from the political standpoint it will be in the interest of neither the Liberal nor the Conservative party nor, yet the Progressive party, which is growing very rapily, I see it has grown from two or three to twelve followers now. It would not be useful to a party of any political complexion to assume the duties of office to-day with the present unsettled conditions. Our soldiers came back from the war in an abnormal condition. The people of Canada are in a similar condition. They are still suffering from the effect of the war with its sad and hateful results.

I can only say that I regret that at this stage my hon. friend found it necessary to introduce his amendment which comes at a very inopportune time. It has for its purpose, I assume, the downfall of the Union Government or their return to the country to get a fresh mandate from the people. I do not wish to criticise, but as I am an honest follower of the Union party I must point out this fact that since they have been in power I have followed them as a free trader or rather as a revenue tariff Liberal. I am that to-day, but I do not believe that any tariff for other than revenue purposes could be satisfactorily dealt with in this country at the present time. Our progressive friends may declare for free trade. They have come out for free trade but I do not see where they propose to raise the enormous revenue to carry out the heavy responsibilities resting upon this country to-day. It means raising between $500,000,000 and $600,000,000 at least. You cannot get that by direct taxation in this

country. The people of Canada are not educated up to that. Neither are the financial resources of the country capable of responding to direct taxation. To my mind the idea is absolutely absurd. We have to raise a certain percentage of our necessary revenue through customs taxation, entirely aside from any question of protection. The Minister of Finance has maintained his reputation for honesty, and I believe he fully intends to give this country what he has promised in the way of tariff revision. When that revision comes in, if it should have any earmarks of protection, if this Parliament is in existence at that time they can bank on my opposing any such tariff.

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (Hull): (Translation): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the discussion on the Budget, I do not intend to retain the attention of the House for a long criticism of what the honourable ministers and the honourable members sitting to your right may have said. Moreover, in spite of their great speeches, as far as I am concerned, the situation is always the same. The Union Government, which was born in the midst of prejudices and racial divisions, and constituted for the sole purpose of winning the elections, never had any other fiscal policy that that of the old Tory party.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. FONTAINE (Translation): When it was formed, the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) had intended, by calling a few Liberals into his Government, to make the people believe that the principles of the two great political parties were equally represented in the new Cabinet. But to-day, Mr. Speaker, when three so-called Liberal ministers have resigned and have not been replaced, and when, on a total of fifteen ministers, there are but four left who are supposed to be Liberals, can it be claimed that the Liberal party is really represented? I say supposed Liberals, because one cannot seriously believe that the honourable President of the Council (Mr. Rowell), the hon. Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder), the honourable Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie), and the honourable Secretary of State (Mr. Sifton) do represent the Liberal idea in the Cabinet; so much so, that not a single one of the four gentlemen whom I have mentioned could get elected in any division of the country as a Liberal, and, Mr. Speaker, you are well aware of the fact that, long ago, they have sacrificed their political principles to retain their portfolios as ministers. Therefore, it is not to be wondered at that the Government should wish to maintain its protection policy. May I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to say right away, that I have no confidence in the protection which had no other effect than to enrich a certain class and to keep the people in a condition of hardship.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. FONTAINE (Translation): I want the tariff to be lowered. I believe in the Liberal platform which was accepted at the great convention of August last, and where every province and every class was represented; I have confidence in that platform, I believe that when it is put into effect, it will bring comfort to this country and will restore peace within its limits; we shall, then, hear no more of the uneasiness now prevailing among the workingmen, or of any United Farmers' party, because the Liberal flag is wide enough to shelter all the groups under its folds; it will satisfy the workingmen by lowering the cost of living, by doing away with the middlemen and the trusts who are growing rich at the expense of the people; it will satisfy the farmers by abolishing the duties on the farming implements and on all that which is necessarily required for a greater production.

Sir, I said that protection is the policy of the Government. That is so true that for two years they have been promising a readjustment of the tariff without ever redeeming their pledge. During the first session of 1919, I remember, the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), who was also Acting Prime Minister, only succeeded in placating his supporters by stating in the House that a committee would be named at once to travel around the country and revise the tariff. Over a year has passed away since then and nothing has been performed yet, and this year, facing the same wranglings among his supporters, the present Minister of Finance attempted to make the same promise, but the trick had been detected and the remedy was not as efficient. Having been deceived last year by the former Minister of Finance, they demanded the pledge of the real Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). But it was a serious, a very serious matter to disturb the Prime Minister who was sick, who had left a year ago for distant lands in order to recuperate. True it is that the press informed us now and then that he was recovering,

yet that hasty return might have occasioned a recurrence of his ailments. Never mind, said his followers, even if he were to die, he must come back and give us his word of honour that this time a committee shall be named and a readjustment of the tariff be made forthwith.

Confronted with that ultimatum, he had to comply and then on a fine day, Wednesday, May 12, we saw the right hon. gentleman taking his seat in the House. What transpired between him and his followers, God only knows. No doubt, he addressed them thus: "Gentlemen, let us put an end to our quarrels, our wranglings, and agree upon a protective policy; otherwise, we shall have to appeal to the people and to hold elections, and judging from the outcome of by-elections lately held, a very few will be returned. Therefore, we had better agree and remain in power as long as we can." Thus it is that Liberal members sitting on your right, Mr. Speaker, are to disown once more the Liberal party and to countenance the Tory policy of the Government.

Now, Sir, what had we from the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech. First, he told us that the country is in a critical financial situation, that the debt now amounts to $2,000,000,000, that the interest upon the indebtedness represents $188,000,000. This sum is equal to our whole revenue before the war and to face those conditions, he is going to levy new taxation. Thus, we shall have to pay ten per cent upon our clothing, our shoes, our hats, our underwear, all of which are necessaries, and even upon the medicines for our sick ones. Ah! Sir, how much we should lament all the useless expenditure, all the follies, I would even say all the outrages committed during the war. We can still recall the scandalous profits which corporations and profiteers realized; we can still recall that investigations disclosed that the Government enabled their political friends to grow rich and to reap millions by supplying inferior shoes to our men, by speculating in drugs and everything that was to be used for dressing their wounds. To-day, instead of compelling those robbers to return to the treasury those ill-gotten riches, they levy taxation upon consumers. The Government should begin to economize rather than establish those new taxes. Why should they have acquired the Canadian Northern which showed a deficit of $47,000,000 during the first year of its operation? Why should they have acquired also the Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific which will beget other deficits? Why should they have enlarged the militia establishments and compelled us to spend $12,000,000 a year for maintenance? What need have we for the militia during an era of peace? Moreover, where is to be found that great policy of reconstruction so much talked about? The Government are trumpeting forth that the country abounds with natural resources, mines, water powers, forests, which can provide for 200,000,000 people. That is true, but those resources must be developed; it is time for the Government to act.

We import coal by millions of tons from the United States and we are paying $15 and $16 a ton for that coal, while here in our own country we have mines which could furnish all the coal we need for our industries and home use if only the Government would help the owners of these mines by abolishing all duties on the instruments they require for the operation of their properties. But the Government doesn't move one finger; apparently this Government would rather promote the interests of the trusts and the speculators. Why isn't a start made, Mr. Speaker, on the Georgian Bay Canal which would do so much to develop this country?

In the riding which I have the honour to represent we have the Lièvre river, flowing through a beautiful countryside settled with industrious, well-to-do farmers; the only means of communication open to these people is a boat service which goes as far as Buckingham; this boat carries their produce to market. Would you believe it, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Reid) who is also acting Minister of Public Works refuses to build a wharf, which would cost only $3,000, at a place called Poltimore, on the plea that the Government haven't the necessary funds. Still the hon. minister found the money to buy the Canadian Northern, he found the millions necessary for the purchase of the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific. I suppose he would rather please the shareholders of these powerful railway companies than the honest farmers of the Lièvre river district.

In the city of Hull the mail service is very bad; we have only six postmen for a population of 32,000. Several times the city council and the Chamber of Commerce have requested the hon. Postmaster General to increase the number of postmen so that we might have two deliveries daily; but nothing has been done, always because the money isn't there. The Government finds money to help along its political

friends and to promote the interests of millionaire capitalists, but it has no money to help our good, brave people of Hull.

Before taking my seat, Mr. Speaker, I state with pleasure that I intend to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Hon. Mr. Fielding), who for fifteen years was Finance Minister under the Laurier Administration, and whose talent and exceptional ability did so much to make that Administration prosperous and progressive.

I invite all those hon. members of the Government side who believe as I do, who believe in a downward revision of the tariff, to shake themselves free of the Government's yoke, to declare their independence manfully and to vote with the members of the Opposition for the Fielding amendment.

M. J. F. FAFARD (L'Islet): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends will, I am sure, allow me to make a few remarks in French before I proceed with my speech.

(Translation) Mr. Speaker, we have listened this day to some very eloquent speeches, but the sun must set on even the most beautiful day. Since the beginning of the debate the hon. members who sit on your right have repeatedly congratulated the hon. Minister of Finance on his courage. I certainly have enough sense of the fitness of things to congratulate him on the eloquent manner in which he presented the Budget to Parliament; but it would be more fitting I believe to wish courage to those who will have to pay the taxes the hon. minister has devised. Mr. Speaker, if I thought a national debt was an asset I would agree absolutely with the hon. Minister of Finance.

In the first days of the colony the worth of an Indian warrior was judged by the number of enemies whose scalp he had taken; he carried these trophies proudly displayed on his belt when he went to bury the hatchet and smoke the pipe of peace. The politicians of the Unionist tribe have not yet buried the hatchet of war and the tomahawk of taxes still deliver some wicked blows on the heads of the poor Palefaces who have witnessed, with a sinking heart, the transformation of this Parliament into a primitive wigwam from which the Great Spirit has been driven away.

If the people are not satisfied with the state of our national finances the ministers of the Government certainly are satisfied. There is no longer any necessity, in this country, of knowing what we must save; all we need know is what we are going to spend.

Only a few weeks ago you saw the hon. Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Reid) come triumphantly before the House to tell us that his policy of public ownership of railways had surpassed his fondest hopes; the deficit was no greater than $47,000,000. He could have gone further and stated that the operation of the Grand Trunk will likely not bring a deficit of more than $25,000,000. I protested against this policy last year, Mr. Speaker, and I protest again this year. What the Government has adopted is not a policy of public ownership of railways, it is rather a policy of competition between the Government and the private railway companies. Public ownership implies service at cost, not service at $47,000,000 below cost. The Governments policy in the matter of railways, is entirely unfair. As the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) pointed out a few days ago, the Government is not treating the Canadian Pacific fairly, it is not treating the workers and the farmers fairly when it saddles them with a deficit of $47,000,000 for the benefit of the wealthy importers and exporters, since the mass of our people seldom use the railways.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): Dont forget the profiteers.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Mr. Speaker I would never finish if I were to recite all the instances of extravagance on the part of the present Government, an extravagance only too plainly revealed to-day by the taxes saddled on the country. Who will be taxed to pay for all the boards of enquiry appointed for the sole purpose of paying swollen salaries to political friends? Of what benefit were all these commissions? What did they do to decrease the cost of living? Absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker; instead they were perhaps instrumental in furnishing the profiteers with information which helped them to mulct the people even more.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): And thus increase the cost of living.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): This year we are going to spend millions on a standing army doubled since the conclusion of peace. During the war, in which we had such a glorious share, we were told in this House that all these sacrifices were necessary to encompass the defeat of Prussian militarism. Having seen the strength of our standing army doubled, having heard

certain hon. members on the other side of the House call upon the Government to establish compulsory military service, haven't we the right, Mr. Speaker, to conclude that the Government wants to set up militarism in Canada?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Translation): No.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): So much the better, then. Isn't the Government mocking those who gave their lives for a cause that was dear to them and who to-day are sleeping the glorious sleep of sacrificed heroes? Isn't it mockery in the face of the people of Canada to spend their gold for the establishment in this country of a system they gave their blood to destroy beyond the sea?

Either militarism is a good thing or it is not. If it be a good thing, Mr. Speaker, I wonder why we made such tremendous sacrifices to accomplish its downfall in Europe; and if it be a bad thing I am at a loss to understand the Governments efforts to bring it into being in this country.

The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), whom I congratulate on his eloquent speech the other day, told us how he became converted to toryism. He told us that his father was a Liberal and that he himself had been a Liberal up to the time when he was 21 years of age; according to the hon. member, when he was 21 neither party was any good and, since he could do no worse he voted for Sir John A. Macdonald. That is the only reason he gave this House for his political conversion. It appears to me that the hon. member would have great difficulty in finding a worse Government than the one we have to-day and he would be perfectly justified in declining to oppose any longer those who sit on your left, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for West Toronto, whose absence from the Chamber I notice with regret, spoke of the tremendous saving effected by the Government in letting out 300 employees of the Printing Bureau; however, if I remember correctly, we voted last year something like $500,000 to replace these 300 employees. I can't say that I find that very much of a saving. If the hon. member is of the opinion that the Government saved a lot of money by letting out 300 employees he will likely be scandalized to learn that this same Government has taken on 27,000 new employees since the end of the war.

As a consequence of such a policy we behold our young country to-day carrying a colassal burden of taxes on all the necessaries of life.

Those who raise a numerous family destined to furnish the country with valuable hands to insure production, will pay four or five times more taxes than the others.

I am in favour of taxing luxuries, but I do not consider that, at this time, a $9 pair of boots or a $45 suit of clothes are articles of luxury.

Nothing in the preparation of this budget has been done to decrease the high cost of living.

Hoarders fill their storehouses with enormous quantities of goods in order to bring about a rise in the prices. There is, at this moment, more sugar in the Canadian warehouses than there has ever been. The Government knows this, and it would be very easy to have a law permitting inspectors to go and visit such warehouses, and obliging the hoarders to put upon the market at current prices the commodities with which they are stocked, causing a rise in the cost of living. But the Government protects these profiteers at the expense of the public.

If you read the Budget carefully, Mr. Speaker—even though you will have heard a lot about it—you will find that two classes only have not been taxed. You might believe at first blush that one of them is the soldiers that have returned from the front and of whom we heard so much during the war; but no, these soldiers, for the Government supporters, are an interest of the past. Their praise was on their lips during the war; but no, these soldiers, for the Government one of the members who sit on your right will be willing to give them any credit. If we are to judge from their utterances in this House, it is evident that it was they and not the soldiers who won the war.

The only two classes of persons or things, which escaped taxing are the profiteers and the orders in council.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): A revision of the tariff would have had a good effect on the cost of living and would have reduced it. Nothing was done. I say that in order to decrease the cost of living, and towards furthering the general good of the country, a revision of the tariff is imperative at the present moment. The Government have no right to overburden the people with taxes in order to allow there favorites to build colossal fortunes. These favorites are but a few while the consumer is the whole people. In a democratic country, all the citizens

should be equal and enjoy the same privileges.

The hon. members of the right seem to believe that the fact of our favouring a decrease of the tariff shows a desire to ruin industry. A lowering of the tariff would have altogether another effect. The result would be manufacturing in larger quantities, as well as an increase in the revenue of the country.

It does not require to be an expert, but a little good will is sufficient, to understand that it is not so much the high rate of duty which piles up revenue as the quantity of goods coming through the customs. If you add to the tariff on certain articles, the present rate of exchange, you will find it altogether prohibitive.

Everybody complains, and justly, of the high cost of living and of the dearness of food. The cost of articles of food, as of the other commodities, varies according to the law of supply and demand, and it is evident to any observer that, since the war, the equilibrium has been destroyed.

When two workmen come to an employer and ask for work, it is the employer who fixes the pay; but when two employers seek the labour of one workman, it is the workman who settles the price. What is true in one case is true in the other. When there are ten workmen that are consumers to one farmer who produces, it is the farmer who fixes prices, and when there are ten farmers producing to one workman to consume, it is the workman who decides what shall be paid. Hence, I come to the conclusion that, for the last few years, our industries, owing to protection, have gone on at a faster rate—too fast even—at a faster rate than agriculture, which was neglected by the Government. If the commodities are too dear, it is evident that we must turn our efforts towards agriculture. It is true that the task is difficult and alarming, for the young are drawn towards the towns by the high salaries, amusements and shorter working days. It is absolutely impossible to find hands to work the land, the working hours are longer and the work is hard. The little money which the farmer puts by in the year, is due to his foresight, his economical way of living, and his long hours of labour. The farmers do not complain at all, they are happy and content with their lot. They only ask one thing from the city people: it is to cease their malevolent criticism. They do not blame the workmen for their day's work being shorter than their own. They do not begrudge them the few dollars which they can spend on amusements, for they understand that a man living in a city must need have recreation—They have no objection either to the workman eating oleomargarine if he wishes, provided this stuff does not sell for more than in other countries and is so marked that it may not be sold for butter.

It is said the farmer sells his produce too dear. The farmer does not go out of his way. It is the dealer who comes and offers him the price at which he sells his goods.

I can assure the hon. members on the otherside of the House who live in cities, that if they paid for foodstuffs the price at which they are sold in the country, they would enjoy immediately a great decrease in the cost of living, and I can assure them at the same time that if the farmers sold their produce at the prices they sell for in the cities they would all be rich men. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the middleman is the one to blame; and not only does he corner the goods, but he allows them to spoil. In the city of Montreal alone, 366,000 pounds of meat and vegetables were confiscated last year.

Besides the farmer is himself a workman, a workman in the first, the largest of all industries, agriculture. The tillers of the soil, in the early days of the colony, were not only settlers, they were heroes; armed with an axe they pushed back the forest, and armed with a gun they fought the enemy; not only did they succeed in broadening their land, they secured it to the British Crown; inch by inch they have brought it under cultivation and inch by inch they have defended it. This soil on which they live to-day, bathed with the sweat of their brow, they love it, they are jealous for it. They know no other fatherland than Canada; they are in this country the true Canadians. I call the attention of the Government to that class of citizens. They are the only ones who can bring about our return to the days of peace.

The faults that bring blame upon the present Government are one of the principal causes of unrest in the country. The ministers resign one after the other; they change portfolios so often that even the members of this House have ceased to know who are the heads of the different departments. The right hon Prime Minister is at home everywhere but in Canada. No sooner does a vacancy occur in a desirable post than the hon. members, all conscious of the fact that they cannot be elected again, all turn greedy eyes towards it.

There is a talk of appointing a representative at Washington, and if we knew the secrets of the ministerial circles, we should be surprised at the stir and discontent which is caused by this coming appointment—The hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) had been pointed to for this post; but the arrival of the Prime Minister seems to have unsettled the question. While on this side of the House we are not made acquainted with the ministerial secrets, we fully surmise that there are more than two candidates for the position.

This Government have ceased to represent more than a part of the country. The interests of all the counties from Montreal to Halifax have been altogether ignored by them.

It would have ben a good policy this year to have fostered an agricultural immigration to help the farmer, and also to have reduced the duties on implements of production. Instead of taxing the people in order to procure a revenue, the Government might easily have adopted a policy tending to increase revenue through the development of our natural resources.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that the Unionist tribe should bury the hatchet and that the hon. President of the Council should smoke the pipe of peace with his colleagues; I think it is time for us to cease talking war and to turn our attention towards cultivating good relations with our allies, and to the securing of a place in their markets.

I fear to weary you, Mr. Speaker, but I would also suggest to the ministers who have on various occasions to represent us in London, not to be content with abiding by the suggestions which they hear made to them, but to affirm there as they do in this House, that Canada is a nation and that as such we have the right to be respected. I would ask them to affirm our royalty, but not to represent us as valets ready to do any bidding.

In order that the restoration of our country may become an accomplished fact, Mr. Speaker, we need more unity between the different races; it is absolutely necessary that all Canadians should join hands in the pursuit of the same ideal, that is to say make a grand nation of this Canada of ours.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, I shall conclude my remarks in English. I thank you.

[Mr. Fafard.]

On the motion of Mr. Edwards the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Doherty, the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Wednesday, May 26, 1920

The House met at Three o'clock.

PAPERS TABLED.

Copies of Mortgage Deeds by the Canadian Northern Railway Company, 1918-19.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

NEWSPRINT CONTROL.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

Now that a decision has been rendered by the Supreme Court, is it the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation at this session in regard to the control of papers and newsprint?

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Any necessary announcement in regard to this matter will be made in due course.

BUTTER AND MARGARINE — FOOD VALUES.

Mr. GERVAIS:

1. What is the nutritive value of butter, expressed in calories, according to Government analysis?
2. What is the value of oleomargarine?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Butter.—Calories per lb., 3558.92; calories per kilog., (2.2 lbs.), 7829.62.
2. Oleomargarine. — Calories per lb., 3699.70; calories per kilog., 8139.34.

These answers are given both in calories by pound and calories by kilogram.

MR. WALTER DUNCAN.

*Mr. TOBIN:

1. Is Walter Duncan, now in the employ of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the individual on whose conduct and character an inquiry was held whilst he was chief of detectives of Toronto?
2. Was the department aware of the result of that inquiry when this man was appointed?
3. In view of the fact that at the said inquiry several witnesses gave evidence doubting his veracity, is it the intention of the Government to keep him on the staff of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes. Mr. Walter Duncan holds an honourable discharge from the Chief Constable, after thirty years' service in the Toronto

force, and the highest recommendations from the Police Magistrate, the County Crown Attorney and the Chief Constable of the city of Toronto, and has proved himself a most efficient special agent.

BAGOT COUNTY—POSTAL INSPECTION.

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. Has the county of Bagot been transferred, for postal inspection purpose, from the district of Montreal to the district of Sherbrooke?
2. If so, why?
3. Who asked for said transfer, for what purpose and who recommended said change?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.
2. In the interests of the Postal Service.
3. Transfer made towards equalizing the territory of Post Office Inspectorates and improving the service.

BURBIDGE—MESSINES.

Mr. BALL:

1. Is there a station on the Maniwaki Division of the Canadian Pacific railway known as Burbidge?
2. Has the name of the post office at Burbidge been changed?
3. If so, when, and what is the present name?
4. At whose instance was the change of name made?
5. Was it done on the recommendation or with the concurrence of the member for Wright county?
6. Was the original name Burbidge given in honour of the first judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada?
7. What are the reasons for substituting another name?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. 1st January, 1920, to Messines.
4. A petition was received from the majority of the residents of the place, advocating the change.
5. No.
6. Yes.
7. The request of the majority of the patrons of the office.

INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE ON COMMERCE.

*Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton):

Will the Government submit to Parliament at this session a copy of the report of the International Parliamentary Conference on Commerce which closed on May 7th instant, after having adopted a series of resolutions, the first of which requested that international legislation be enacted to control responsibility in sea transportation?

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, the Government was not represented at this Conference and had no connection with it. No copy of the report of the Conference has been received by the Government. If a copy should be received, there will be no objection to making it available for the use of any hon. member who may desire to peruse it. It does not, however, seem to be a report which would in the ordinary course be submitted to Parliament.

NEUVILLE STATION, C.N.R.

Mr. PARENT:

1. Is is true (*a*) that the Canadian Northern railway station at Neuville, county of West Quebec, has no telephone accommodation; (*b*) that, consequently, this state of affairs is very inconvenient to the travelling public; (*c*) that twenty odd dollars would be sufficient to provide this improvement to the service?
2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to take steps to remedy such a situation?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. There is a telephone in Neuville station.
2. Answered by No. 1.

ROSS RIFLE FACTORY.

Mr. BUREAU:

1. What was the inventory value of the machinery in the Ross rifle factory at Quebec when taken over by the Government?
2. What amount has been received from the sale of this machinery up to the end of the last fiscal year?
3. Was said machinery and other physical assets of the plant disposed of by public tender, through commission agents or by private sale?
4. What method is being adopted at present in regard to the disposal of machinery still on hand?
5. Who is the officer in charge, where and on whose recommendation was he appointed?
6. What prior experience has he had in regard to the valuation and disposal of machinery?
7. Has the Government a special auditor at the plant to check up prices, methods of sale and amounts received from the assets disposed of?
8. Is it true that some of the machinery in the plant has been broken up and sold as scrap metal instead of being sold intact at present market value?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. The Canadian Apprisal Company made inventory values as follows:

Reproductive value.. .. .. ..$875,000
Sales value.. .. ..$500,000

2. Approximately $400,000.
3. The means adopted for the sale of the machinery and other assets of the plant were intended to meet conditions as they occurred, and are as follows:

(a) By the circulation of printed lists;
(b) By advertising;
(c) By assistance from machinery firms;
(d) By personal calls and correspondence.

4. Machinery is now being sold as in "3" above, and in accordance with a price list.

5. Mr. W. S. Fisher is the commissioner in charge, and was appointed by Order in Council in April, 1917.

6. He has wide business experience in foundry and hardware business.

7. No. Systematic auditing is carried out by departmental auditors, and a special audit on the premises is made periodically.

8. Yes, a few special machines have been broken up and sold as scrap. However, these were of special design for the manufacture of Ross rifles, and, being absolutely useless for any other purpose, were unsaleable.

EDMUNDSTON POST OFFICE AND CUSTOMS.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. How much money was collected from the Collector of Customs at Edmundston, N.B., during the last fiscal year?

2. How much money was paid by the Postmistress at Edmundston, N.B., to the Post Office Department during the last fiscal year?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. $25,283.19.

2. $6,649.75.

MR. J. E. SMITH.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Is Mr. J. E. Smith at present with the auditor of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment at Montreal, the same person who once held the position of chief accountant of that department in Ottawa?

2. What salary did he previously receive and what does he receive at present?

3. For what reason was he transferred to Montreal?

4. In what country was he born?

5. Has he seen service at the front, during the last war?

6. On whose recommendation was he appointed in Montreal?

Mr. HUGH CLARK (Parliamentary Secretary):

1. Mr. J. E. Smit, who was recently appointed Unit Auditor of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment at Montreal was previously acting chief accountant of the department in Ottawa.

2. $2,500 per annum, which he will continue to receive as Unit Auditor.

3. The position of auditor in a Unit requires a detailed knowledge of the procedure of all branches of the department. In this respect, Mr. Smit, who has been 3½ years in the accounting branch at head office, is thoroughly qualified and most suitable for this position, to which he has accordingly been transferred.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

4. England.

5. No. Mr. Smit was born a British subject. His parents who were Dutch by birth became naturalized British citizens. He has resided in Canada for over twelve years, is 45 years of age, married and has four children. His wife is English by birth and parentage.

6. On the recommendation of the Supervisor of Expenditures of the department.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

What were the average prices paid for anthracite coal in Canada in the years 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918 and 1919?

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Who are or who were the men engaged by the Civil Service Commission to re-classify the Civil Service at Ottawa?

2. When were they employed and at what rate of wages?

3. Are they still in the service of the Civil Service Commission, or are any of them in said service?

4. How much was paid to each of such assistants from date of engagement up to the end of April, 1920?

5. What is the total amount paid to the men so engaged from the date of the engagement to the end of April, 1920?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. ROBB (for Mr. Parent):

For a copy of the Orders in Council: (a) concerning the establishment and the administration of a Board of Censors, (b) rules and instructions relating to said board, (c) letters and correspondence exchanged between the newspapers of Canada and abroad and said Board of Censors, or any of its members.

Mr. ROBB (for Mr. Chisholm):

For a copy of all telegrams, letters and other documents relating to the closing of the life saving station at Cheticamp, Inverness County, N.S.

Mr. ROBB (for Mr. Chisholm):

For a copy of all telegrams, letters and other documents referring to the application for the change in the site of the Scotch Hill post office, Inverness County, N.S.

Mr. ROBB (for Mr. Desaulniers):

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, reports and other documents regarding the establishment of rural mail routes in the parishes of Champlain, Batiscan and St. Luc, in the County of Champlain, Quebec.

Mr. ROBB (for Mr. Boyer):

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, telegrams and affidavits passed between the Minister of Railways and Canals and Mr. Arcade Bissonnette and others, in connection with complaints made against M. St. Amour, Superintendent of the Soulanges Canal.

FURTHER LEGISLATION FOR THIS SESSION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to ask my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) if the House has before it notice of all the legislation which the Government intends to introduce at this session, or whether further legislation will be brought down?

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That matter is not yet absolutely determined. I hope to be able to make an announcement to my hon. friend in a day or two.

MORNING SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): Have the Government any announcement to make in regard to morning sittings? There has been practically little or no committee work during this session, and there is very little now, and, in the historic phrase of the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid), "We want to go home."

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will refer to the Votes and Proceedings he will find that there is a notice of motion covering his question.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I had not noticed it.

THE BUDGET.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON THE ANNUAL STATEMENT PRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

The House resumed from Tuesday, May 25th, the debate on the motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Monsieur l'Orateur——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on in French.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Fafard) having opened his speech in English and closed it in English, I thought that I should show appreciation of that courtesy by opening my remarks in the language which falls with such melody from the lips of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I will endeavour to close my remarks in the same language.

Notwithstanding the very violent remarks that were made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) in opposition to the Budget introduced by the Finance Minister (Sir Henry Drayton) I venture to express my general approval of that Budget, and I wish also to extend to the Finance Minister my congratulations on the ability, courage and candour which he displayed in introducing the Budget. I entirely commend him for removing the 5 per cent and 7½ per cent special war tax or revenue tax; which tax was never intended for any other than revenue purposes. I can understand that with the pressing needs of the country for additional revenue there would be strong inclination on the part of the Government to retain that tax. But its retention would have been a great mistake and open to misinterpretation; furthermore, its removal clears the way for that general revision of the tariff which has been promised and which will come a little later. I also wish to commend the Finance Minister in that he is taking steps to raise his revenue by a tax on what may be regarded as luxuries,—at least, by a tax which will rest upon those who are most able to pay it.

The amendment introduced by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) starts out with finding fault with the Government for not having carried out an alleged promise of the ex-Finance Ministed (Sir Thomas White) last year in regard to an inquiry which was to be made and followed by a revision of the tariff. The attitude of the member for Shelburne and Queen's in that regard is all the more remarkable when we remember his attitude on tariff revisions in former years. If you refer to the Budget Speech delivered by the member for Shelburne and Queen's in 1904, you will find a reference to tariff revision in these words:

> But, sir, though we speak of that as an outline of the method by which there might be a detailed tariff change, we have to consider the question of things as they are to-day. We desire to deal with certain things as they present themselves to us to-day; we desire to deal with matters of urgency, reserving the question of a more general and more detailed tariff revision until an early date—I would say, hopefully, next session, but at all events as soon as a proper inquiry can be made.

These remarks were uttered by the member for Shelburne and Queen's on June 7, 1904, when he was Finance Minister of this country. I submit that in these remarks you have as distinct a promise of tariff revision as was made by the member for Leeds when Finance Minister last year. No commission of inquiry was appointed

immediately following that session. Time went on, and again in the session of 1905, on the 6th of July, the hon. gentleman brought down his Budget Speech. There was a further promise at that time of tariff revision. The promise of the previous year had not been carried out, and he asked for further delay. The matter went on for another year and in the Budget Speech of May, 1906, further excuses were given for his not having brought on this inquiry and the tariff revision which he had promised on the 7th of June, 1904. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that tariff revision did not take place until the 29th of November, 1906, or about two years and a half after the promise had been made. Now, this Government has not gone quite so far as that in this instance, and I submit that if there were reasons justifying delay at that time, in a time of peace, many reasons will suggest themselves to hon. gentlemen on both sides as justifying any delay which has taken place in connection with this tariff revision,—a revision which must be made in the very near future.

The member for Shelburne and Queen's was not, in my estimation, quite correct when he said that for many years our tariff discussions had been more or less "tinged" with free trade "Tinged" it strikes me, is rather too mild a term to apply to the abuse, I think I may call it—to the very strong utterances; to the denunciations,—that are to be found in speeches made from one end of this country to the other by hon. gentlemen opposite prior to 1896. The Liberal platform of 1893 contained this plank, among others:

> We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford relief to the trouble under which this country labours.

Now, I wonder if that is what the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's calls a "tinge" of free trade? Or would it be found in the remarks of the late Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier prior to 1896, when he said:

> If the Liberals are successful they will cut off the head of protection absolutely and trample on its body.

The hon. member for Red Deer said that that operation took place; that the head was cut off somewhere near the tail. My reading of the tariff changes that were brought about in 1897 leads me to the conclusion that only a very few hairs were cut off the end of the dog's tail,—hardly enough for the dog to notice. At all events, there was a very decided "tinge" of free trade in that denunciation of protection by the late Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I would ask this House to place along with that statement these words which were uttered by Sir Wilfrid Laurier on January 13, 1911, when a deputation of manufacturers came to Ottawa to present to him their demands. I especially direct the attention of the hon. member for Red Deer to this quotation, because that hon. gentleman speaking in this House yesterday, said that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had never said a word in favour of protection. The word "protection" he said, never came from the lips of Sir Wilfrid Laurier except by way of condemnation. These are the words uttered on that occasion by the late Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

> There is one thing in which this Government can take some pride and that is that we have been very very careful even when we had to reform, not to disturb conditions then prevailing in relation to the manufacturing interests of the country.

Those words contrast very strongly with the words he uttered previously to his coming into power when he was going to cut off the head of protection and trample on its body. You will, Sir, no doubt recall these remarks of Sir Richard Cartwright.

> Our policy is death to protection. Our policy from first to last has been to destroy the villanous system of protection which has been grinding out the vitals of the country.

These are the words of Sir Louis Davies:

> We are attacking this policy year after year. This is an accursed system, a system accursed by God and man.

It certainly was cursed enough by man at all events previously to 1896. Then we have this statement of the Hon. William Paterson previously to 1896:

> We declare for freedom of trade.

I have not any record of remarks made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) previously to that date, but I think I am stating a fact when I say that that hon. gentleman was backing up the position taken by the Liberal party during the years previous to 1896. The fact, however, remains that, although these people had been denouncing protection from one end of the country to the other as the vilest thing ever conceived of by any man or any government, when the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's and the Hon. Mr. Paterson went to Washington, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's took care that protection was maintained on coal, and the Hon. Mr. Paterson

took care that the duty was not eliminated from biscuits, a commodity which he was engaged in manufacturing. The virus of free trade has manifested itself at various times in certain hon. gentlemen opposite in one guise or another. Such as "unrestricted reciprocity," "continental free trade," "free trade as it exists in England." All of these had been inscribed on the banners of hon. gentlemen opposite previously to their coming into power in 1896.

Let me, Sir, call your attention for a moment to some tariff changes which were made in 1894. Reference has been made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's to "infant industries"; but this term was not coined by the hon. member; infant industries were referred to from the early days when the National Policy was first inaugurated. The general principle was that these industries, when starting in Canada, should be given a certain measure of protection until they got on their feet, so to speak, and, I maintain that that principle was adhered to by the Conservative party while they were in power. The National Policy was introduced into this country in 1878. What happened in 1894? Let me give one instance, in the matter of agricultural implements. The duty imposed on agricultural implements in 1878 was 35 per cent. Supposing a manufacturer of agricultural implements started manufacturing immediately after the National Policy was adopted, by 1894 his industry would have been in existence some thirteen or fourteen years, and the infant would have grown to be at least a good-sized boy. The Conservative party in power in 1894 introduced very radical changes into the tariff; for instance, they cut the duty on agricultural implements down from 35 per cent to 20 per cent, or a straight cut of 15 per cent. The trouble with hon. gentlemen like the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's was this, that, when he was in Opposition and before he came into power, while he talked destruction to protection, while he spoke of the iniquity of having any duty at all on agricultural implements, and while he spoke with disdain of infant industries, when that hon. gentleman took office as Minister of Finance, and apparently during the whole time that he was Minister of Finance, if we are to judge by the course he adopted, he accepted the legal definition of the word "infant", which, I think I am right in saying is, that a person is an infant until he is twenty-one years old. At all events, he apparently thought these industries should not be touched for at least twenty-one years, and that is practically the course he followed, because in the whole fifteen years that he was Minister of Finance of this country, all the reduction that was made on agricultural implements was a reduction from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent. The reduction was not even one of 2½ per cent, because in 1896 the valuation for duty, for instance, of a binder was $80 and at 20 per cent ad valorem a duty of $16 would be collected on a binder. But when the duty was reduced under the Fielding Tariff of 1907 from 20 to 17½ per cent, the valuation of a binder for purposes of duty was immediately increased from $80 to $100, so that a duty of $17.50 was collected on a binder, whereas formerly, at the 20 per cent rate, $16 had been collected. Therefore, I say that during the whole fifteen years that hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, they did not reduce the duty on agricultural implements by one farthing. Some consideration should be shown to the party on this side of the House for what they have done as regards agricultural implements. As regards mowers and binders, for instance, the first big cut was made from 35 to 20 per cent in 1894, and since this Government came into power, the duty on those articles has been reduced to 12½ per cent. A little later on, I shall have a little more to say as regards that and as regards the position taken by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's in that connection.

I said that drastic changes were made in the tariff in 1894. In that year sixty-five articles were added to the free list, and the duty was materially reduced on 165 other articles. Between 1882 and 1895, by gradually lessening the duty or by removing it entirely, the Government had remitted in taxes $43,630,000. The customs and excise taxes per head in 1894 under the Conservatives were $5.42, but in 1899 under the Liberal Government they were $6.58, and the proof of that statement will be found in the report on Trade and Navigation for 1899 at page 7. The average rate of duty from 1892 to 1896 on all goods coming into the country amounted to 17.47 per cent and between 1897 and 1899, it amounted to 17.17 per cent, or a slight fractional reduction after 1896. But the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's says that they entirely changed the National Policy, that so great had been the changes made by himself and the Government of which he was a member that the National Policy ceased to exist in 1897.

If that is true, the National Policy ceased to exist the moment any changes were made in the original draft. If the reasoning of the hon. gentleman is sound, I maintain I am right in that contention.

Now what great changes did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) effect in 1897? Under the heading of Animals and Agricultural and Animal Products there are 88 items in the tariff. These are things which are produced by the farmer, and in which he is directly and very materially interested. Of these 88 items the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, then Finance Minister in the Laurier Government, reduced the duty on four articles, increased the duty on five, and left the duty precisely as it was on the other seventy-nine items. That was the extent of the changes made in the National Policy by the hon. gentleman then.

Now let us come down to the year 1907 and see what he did. He has spoken very reverently of free trade. He says it is of divine origin. Evidently his reverence for free trade has been so great that when in office he thought it too sacred a thing to touch. In 1907, on butter, cheese, eggs, lard, apples, fresh meats, meats in the barrel, rye, wheat, wheat flour, oats, hay, live hogs and wool, he left the tariff exactly as he found it when he came into office. On canned meats he raised the duty from 25 to 27½ per cent. On beans he added 10 cents a bushel, on buckwheat, peas and potatoes he increased the duty by 5 cents a bushel. On vegetables he added 5 per cent. On animals he increased the duty 5 per cent. Out of 23 articles sold by the farmer he made one free, namely, corn; he increased the tariff on nine articles, and on the other thirteen left the tariff exactly as it was in 1897, and those are all things which the farmer sells.

Now let us take some of the principal things which the farmer buys and see what was done by this one-time advocate of free trade. On cultivators, seed drills, horse rakes, harrows, ploughs and farm wagons, bags, salt, tea, boots and shoes and white cotton, the duties for the time being were left as they were. Binder twine he made free. On coal oil, coal, common glass and wire nails he slightly reduced the duties. He increased the duty on cutlery, buggies, grey cotton, coffee, biscuits and agricultural implements. Therefore, of these 23 articles which the farmer has to buy, the duty was left untouched on twelve, reduced on five, and increased on the other six.

In regard to the credit which the hon. gentleman has frequently taken to himself for making binder twine and some other articles free I might call attention to this fact: Where as binder twine was made free and the duty on coal oil reduced, it is also true that the bounties were extended far beyond those in vogue previous to 1896. Speaking from memory I think that between $200,000 and $300,000 had been paid out in bounties on iron and steel up to 1896. After that, the bounties were extended to Manila fibre, going into the manufacture of binder twine, to petroleum, and several other things, and in the years which followed something like $17,000,000 was paid out in bounties. I have given these details because I should like, if possible, to form a correct estimate of where certain hon. gentlemen stand in regard to the tariff. In April, 1903, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's speaking in this House said:

> We think there is nothing in the present circumstances of the country which calls for a general revision of the tariff, and there are some strong reasons why any extensive changes in the tariff schedules would be inopportune.

Further on he said:

> But it is the simple truth that we no longer feel the need of reciprocity as we once did. There will be no disposition on our part, I am sure, to clamour for reciprocity with the United States.

That was what the hon. member, then Minister of Finance, said in April, 1903. At the next session, in 1904, he said:

> We quite realize the difficulties connected with tariff changes. We have always had a strong opinion that there was a great deal of merit in a policy of tariff stability.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman had a great deal of confidence in tariff stability subsequent to 1896, but previous to 1896 he did not like tariff stability, and apparently he does not want tariff stability now, although it seems to me that conditions today are such as would lead almost anybody to feel that it is in the interests of the country that there should be stability.

Coming to 1906, an incident occurred in that year which showed, I think very clearly, that the Finance Minister of that day favoured the principle of protection. The Grand Trunk Railway had sent some steel rails to the United States to be re-rolled, there being no machinery for doing that in Canada at that time, and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, then Finance Minister, would not permit those rails to re-enter Canada without a tax of 25 per cent being imposed on the labour of re-rolling. If that is not an indication of

favouring the principle of protection, I, for one, cannot understand the English language.

I want to refer the House to a few other statements which I am sure they will find extremely interesting, and particularly so in view of the platforms which have been placed before this House by the two parties opposite. I would refer hon. gentlemen to page 5621 of Hansard of 1907. The House was then in committee on a resolution fixing the duty on agricultural implements at 17½ per cent, and an hon. member, now Senator Schaffner, had moved that the duty be reduced to 10 per cent. The Minister of Finance, the present member for Shelburne and Queen's, opposed that reduction. He said:

> My belief is that if this motion were passed . . . . we would strike a severe blow at one of the great industries of the country. I believe the International Harvester Company would find it to its interest to close up its business in Hamilton, at least so much of it as is devoted to mowers and binders, and have them made at the American branch and bring them from the United States. The factory in Hamilton is an American concern. With a moderate duty we have induced American capital to come into Canada and to establish that great industry, and after we have brought it in and established it in Canada I believe that if we were to pass this resolution the company operating that industry would find it profitable to close the Hamilton factory and bring in goods which they make in the United States.

That was the expression of opinion of a man who had been for ten years Minister of Finance and who had consequently given close study to fiscal matters. He says that if you reduce the duty on agricultural implements to 10 per cent you will close that industry in Hamilton. There was a specific instance which the hon. member gave. Now he and those who support him say: "Remove the duty entirely; take all the duty off." I would ask my hon. friend what he thinks would be the fate of certain industries if the duty were entirely removed. On that occasion the Hon. Mr. Patterson, whose remarks will be found at page 5582, said:

> I do not disguise the fact that we propose to give these people nearly the amount of reduction in duty that has been made. For it must be remembered that 17½ per cent is no more than a revenue tariff.

I may also quote a statement made by Mr., now Senator Turriff, which may be found at page 5624 of Hansard of that year:

> Now coming to the present day, the Tariff Commission got information all over the country, and I do not think the farmers of the West, at all events, asked for a great reduction such as is proposed by this resolution on agricultural implements. . . They therefore asked that the duties be left alone. . . I say nothing further except that I shall give the Government hearty support on this question.

Mr. Knowles then member for Moosejaw speaking on that occasion said he would support the Government for the following reason:

> I believe the policy of the Government is in the interests of the country.

These are opinions expressed in 1907 by hon. gentlemen who declared at that time their opposition to reducing the duty on agricultural implements and their support of a tariff of 17½ per cent. I therefore say that the position taken then is not consistent with that which hon. gentlemen opposite are taking at the present time. I desire to add to the foregoing quotations. I statement made by the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier in regard to this matter. In March, 1911, he said in this House:

> While we limited our negotiations to that—that is, natural products, referring to the reciprocity pact—in doing this I know we have not gone as far as certain sections of the country wanted us to go. A certain section wanted free implements altogether, but we did not think it prudent or advisable to go that far.

Further on he says:

> If the duty were suddenly removed it would mean the annihilation of millions of capital overnight and the non-employment of thousands of operators.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is on the other side of the House an hon. gentleman for whom I have a great deal of regard. He is a very genial gentleman; I refer to the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). That hon. gentleman is great on resolutions; indeed, I might describe him as the great resoluter of the House of Commons. Last year on the 25th of March, the hon. member for Brome moved an amendment on a motion, I think, to go into Supply. The gist of that amendment was that the House should immediately accept the reciprocity pact of 1911 and that all staple food products should be made free on reciprocal lines and that farm and garden implements, etc., should also be free. It might be interesting to recall some references made on that occasion by the hon. member for Brome concerning the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). The latter gentleman at that time did not sit quite so close to the hon. member for Brome as he sits to-day. He was on this side of the House but was gradually moving down to the far end and a little later got pretty close to the cross benches, finally completing the circle by landing where we

see him to-day. The hon. gentleman's course in the House is typical of his course in connection with fiscal matters; he moves somewhat in a circle. This fact was evidently recognized by the hon. member for Brome, who on the occasion to which I refer pictured the ship of state with the Acting Prime Minister the present member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White) as captain, who was being warned by the starboard watch and the port watch. The hon. member then added these words:

> Then approaches with swift tread the quartermaster from Shelburne and Queen's and he says: "Captain, I belong to neither the starboard nor to the port watch. I believe in party government, a party of one. I tender you, captain, my independent support until I consider it is time for me and my friends to unite and make you walk the plank.

To this statement the hon. member for Brome adds:

> I do not know whether I can congratulate or commiserate the Acting Prime Minister, the captain of the ship, for the support he gets from the eloquent and revered quartermaster from Shelburne and Queen's.

I wonder just how much the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's thinks of the support which he gets now from the hon. member for Brome in his amendment. That amendment of the hon. member for Brome on that occasion was opposed by all on this side of the House and, I think, by practically all of those who now sit in the third party. I know it was opposed very strenuously by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg), and the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). All of these gentlemen voted, and many of them spoke, against the amendment. What was said by the hon. member for Marquette on that occasion? What reason did he give for opposing the amendment of the hon. member or Brome,—an amendment which was proposing many things that are found in the platform of the third party to-day? He said, as will be found on page 821 of Hansard:

> If the amendment were accepted it would mean the overthrow of the Government and a general election, with all the necessary turmoil that would ensue. . . . . I say that it would mean the plunging of the country into a general election and that is not desirable at this stage. It is wholly undesirable for several reasons, which I do not need to enumerate.

He charges the hon. member for Brome with having introduced a resolution for no other purpose than to embarrass the Government in carrying on the business of the country. Well, I wonder what he considers is the object of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's in the amendment which that hon. gentleman has moved to this Budget? Is it not for the purpose of embarrassing the Government in their conduct of the business of the country? If accepted will it not put the country into the turmoil of a general election? All the reasons for which he condemned the motion of the hon. member for Brome in March 1919 will apply with equal force to the condemnation of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's which I assume, he intends to support.

That amendment of the hon. member for Brome was moved in the first part of the session of 1919 and was taken exception to very strongly by the hon. gentlemen I have named, but on June 9, the great resoluter on the other side of the House, the hon. member for Brome, introduced another resolution, the terms of which were practically the same, in substance and principle, as the terms of the amendment which he had proposed in March. Now ten weeks had passed since his former resolution had been condemned in unmeasured terms, but the hon. member for Marquette, the hon. member for Red Deer and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's had experienced a change of heart. A change had come over the spirit of their dreams in these ten weeks and these same hon. gentlemen who had charged the hon. member for Brome with trying to embarrass the Government, and with having introduced a motion for the purpose of trying to throw the country into the turmoil of an election, got up two and a half months later to support the second amendment just as strongly as they had condemned the amendment on the former occasion.

Let us refer to some remarks made by some of these hon. gentlemen when the first amendment was introduced in March. I refer to them because they are indicative of the opinions which were held at that time on fiscal matters. Take, for instance, the hon. member for Red Deer who, speaking in the House on the 25th March, 1919, said:

> In the year 1896, the so-called Liberal party came into power in this country, and in 1897 they introduced some trifling reductions of the tariff, and put two or three articles of importance upon the free list. They also introduced the British preference, which was also a fairly substantial piece of tariff reduction, and then they went to sleep for ten years. That is not the way Mr. Gladstone tackled the tariff. For ten years, from 1897 to 1907, my hon. friend—

Referring on that occasion to the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie):

—who is so excited now—who says there is to be no such thing as waiting—waited with absolute patience during that long term, because the tariff was practically passed over for ten years, and then it was—I was going to say tackled, but that would be an absurd misuse of language—flirted with again in the year 1907.

Well, what happened to the tariff in 1907? Absolutely trifling alterations were made to it, and in some cases, so far from following the example of Mr. Gladstone, the tariff was raised, in favour of those woollen goods about which my hon. friend is so anxious at the present moment.

Two months later the hon. member for Red Deer was raving in the wildest manner against the iniquity of having a duty on woollens in a climate like that of Canada. This shows the change in the position adopted by the hon. gentleman in the course of a few weeks. In the same debate the hon. gentleman made use of these words which I commend to hon. gentlemen opposite:

The manufacturers of Canada were told by some one high in the authority of the Liberal party on that day, that they were not hurt in the reciprocity agreement.

He was referring to the spring of 1911 and he says that at that time the manufacturers had been assured that they were not hurt and would not be hurt, by the reciprocity agreement. Let me quote a few more sentences from the hon. gentleman:

When one thinks of the fifteen years' record of the Liberals in power, which practically amounted to the tariff being untouched, and not proposed to be touched in any way worthy the name in the reciprocity agreement.

Again:

What patience they had in power compared with their eagerness and impetuosity when they are in Opposition.

I venture to say that there has been no person in this House who has given evidence of the virtue and the fault to a greater degree than the hon. gentleman himself. He gave evidence of the virtue of patience when he sat in support of the hon. gentleman who was then Finance Minister, the present hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, and he is as impetuous as any youth in the eagerness of his demands now for tariff changes notwithstanding the condition in which the country is. Note these further words of the hon. gentleman:

And yet my hon. friends opposite have such confidence in their ability that they say, "In your very first Budget, within three months of peace being declared, we want you to make ten times as drastic tariff changes as we were able to do in fifteen years in the times of piping peace." Is that a reasonable proposition to bring before this country on a motion for going into Supply?

Two months later the hon. gentleman was taking that very course; the course which he condemned in March he was willing to accept as the proper course in June of the very same year.

If the hon. member for Red Deer were here I would like to ask him one or two questions. I would like to ask him in regard to his own position on tariff matters and whether it has been as consistent as he would like the country to believe. I entered this House in 1908 at the same time as the hon. member for Red Deer, and I have no remembrance of a single occasion when the hon. gentleman ever did anything more than quote Cobden, Bright, Peel, "Lord This" and "Duke That" in regard to free trade in tariff matters. The hon. gentleman talks about Gladstone—what would Gladstone do if he were here?—he talks about Peel and Cobden. Well, I venture to say that if any of these men who are mentioned as free traders in theory, and who might also be free traders in practice, were members of this House they wouldn't sit here for twelve years without going on record as having introduced at least one resolution proclaiming their convictions in regard to free trade. Yet during all the time that the hon. member for Red Deer has sat in this House he has never presented one single specific resolution along the free trade lines to test out the House in regard to the matters which he claims to have so much at heart.

4 p.m.

Not only that, but may I refer you to what he said in this House in the month of April, 1909? You will find his words at page 4704 of Hansard of that date. He was discussing the tariff. The Budget had been brought down by the Minister of Finance, the present hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. The hon. member for Red Deer got up and, after lauding to the skies the Finance Minister for his Budget, and after congratulating him on resisting the demands of the manufacturers, when, as a matter of fact the only changes made in the tariff of 1909 were changes in the interest of the manufacturers, he went on to use these words:

Whereas, under what I still claim is a revenue tariff, you have had a series of surpluses under the able administration of the Minister of Finance.

So that in 1909 the hon. member for Red Deer did not regard the tariff as a protective tariff. He says distinctly that it was not a protective tariff, but that it was a revenue tariff, and he reiterated his claim to that effect. Note these words, page 4717, Hansard:

Give them (the farmers) a chance in the markets of the world by keeping your tariff down to a revenue basis.

The hon. gentleman says "give them a chance"—give them a chance by keeping the revenue tariff not by having the tariff removed. He was then sitting here supporting the Government of which the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) was Minister of Finance. Again in January, 1910, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) expressed himself as very well satisfied indeed with the way things were going. As a matter of fact, the hon. member when supporting the Government of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier was extremely patient. At that time apparently he was in no hurry for free trade, for he lauded the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on every occasion when he brought down his Budget; and we have only to compare the tariff of that date with the tariff of 1894 to see that there was very little difference between them, and no difference whatever so far as the protective principle was concerned, that principle having been admitted, in practice at least, by both parties.

But while the course now advocated by the hon. member for Red Deer is along the line of wiping out entirely all duties, what course is being taken in England at the present time? I have here a clipping taken from the Montreal Star of May 22, signed by the well-known correspondent "Windermere," and having reference to the attitude of the British Government in regard to redeeming their election pledges to the farmers of Great Britain. He cables:

Their Agricultural Bill, now before the House of Commons, is of especial concern to Canada as the "Future granary of the Empire."

Taking the wheat prices of 1919 as a basis, the Bill established a guarantee of 68 shillings per quarter of 504 pounds weight for wheat, and 46 shillings per quarter of 336 pounds for oats. But as wages and the whole cost of production have greatly increased since 1919, the Bill decrees that the minimum prices for 1921 and subsequent years shall be fixed by three commissioners, and four years' notice is to be given before this system of guaranteed prices can be ended.

There is the attitude of the Government in free trade England towards the farmer. If that is not a protective measure, I do not understand what protection means.

May I also call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to one or two other features of British policy? What about the embargo on Canadian cattle; is not that protection? Why, if they placed a duty of $100 per head on the cattle we want to ship to that country, they could not exclude them any more effectually. It is a drastic form of protection beyond all question. Then what about their attitude in regard to fixing the price of bacon? They have fixed a very low price for imported bacon, but no restrictions whatever have been placed on the home grown article; what is that but protection? I could mention many other articles of food on which there is a specific duty, and others on which there is an ad valorem duty, and those duties in many cases are very much higher than the duties we impose. For instance, there is no duty on gasoline coming into Canada; there is a duty of 12 cents a gallon on gasoline imported into Great Britain. Our highest duty on coffee is 2 cents a pound; their duty is 6 cents a pound. Our duty on tea is 10 per cent, except where it is imported direct, when it is admitted free; their duty is 24 cents a pound. In addition they have duties on condensed milk, plums, prunes, raisins, cocoa, chicory, figs, molasses and other articles of food, all of which must be regarded as necessaries of life. And yet hon. gentlemen like the hon. member for Red Deer would have us believe that no duties are imposed in England, when as a matter of fact their customs and excise duties per head of population are pretty near double those imposed in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to direct your attention to fiscal matters in 1909. In that year the Liberal party discovered a new star, and the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) entered this House as Minister of Labour. In 1910, under the direction of that hon. gentleman, a report was prepared on wholesale prices in Canada over a period of twenty years from 1890 to 1909. I would call particular attention to these words in the preface to that report:

For some time past, especially since the beginning of the present century, one of the most important features of the general economic situation in Canada has been a rapid and continuous advance in prices and the cost of living. When the history of 1910 comes to be written not the least memorable of its happenings to be chronicled will probably be the great agitation, partaking of the proportions of a national revolt, against the high prices of food.

I ask the House to note the concluding phrase:

—partaking of the proportions of a national revolt, against the high prices of food.

Mr. SMITH: Who said that?

Mr. EDWARDS: That is at the beginning of the report prepared at the instance of the present leader of the Opposition and sub-

mitted by him to the House and to the country with his approval. That is a very startling statement, Mr. Speaker—that the prices of food had risen to such a point in the Dominion that the people were on the point of revolting. That sentence is a rather severe comment on the praise which has been bestowed by certain gentlemen opposite on the conduct of affairs when they were in power. If, as is asserted so frequently by hon. gentlemen opposite, the remedy for excessive prices for manufactured goods is to remove all tariff walls, manifestly the way to bring down the high price of food is to open our doors to the surplus food products of the world. That is apparently what these gentlemen think.

In the report to which I have referred, which was prepared and presented to this House and the country in 1910 and which, it was said, was of great use to the negotiators who went to Washington to negotiate the reciprocity pact, 230 articles were considered. Of the 230 articles, 40 represented what the farmer sells and 190 represented things which he and others have to buy. So convincing was that report that the Government of the day considered that it would be in the interests of Canada, in the interests of the farmers of Canada, to whom they were appealing for support, to take the duty entirely off the 40 articles that the farmer had to sell and leave it absolutely untouched on everything that he had to buy. That was the conclusion that was come to by them in 1911 in the reciprocity pact, and that is the argument that they are presenting to this House and to the country to-day. Yet they pretend, as do the little group who sit angularly to my right, that they are the friends of the farmers of this country. I want to place before you, Mr. Speaker, some of the prices which obtained at that time,—prices which the present leader of the Opposition said were so high that the people were on the point of revolution. The following statement shows, the lowest prices obtained for any of these articles in the whole twenty years, the highest prices obtained for any of these articles during that period, and also the average price. Bear in mind that these figures are wholesale prices, which means that the farmer realized much less than the amounts given:

	Low.	High.	Average.
Butter—			
Dairy solids. . . .	10c	26c	16½c
Creamery.	14c	32c	22c
Cheese.	7c	14c	10½c
Eggs (Storage). . .	6½c	28c	16c
Milk (gallon). . . .	12c	22c	15c
Hogs (Selects). . . .	$2.75 cwt.	$8 cwt.	$5.52 cwt.
Sheep (Export ewes) . .	$2.25	$7.50	$3.94
Cattle (Butchers' choice steers).	$2.75	$6.40	$4.26
Apples—barrel.	75c	$7.50	$2.50
evaporated. . .	5c lb.	16c	7c
Potatoes (bag). . . .	18c	$1.30	68c
Turnips (bag) . . .	20c	80c	45c
*Wheat (bush.) . . .	52c	$1.40	79c
Oats (No. 2 white). .	17c	60c	33½c
Barley, No. 2. . . .	26c	90c	45c
Peas—Ontario No. 2.	38c	96c	64½c
Rye.	31c	88c	56½c
Corn (Yellow No. 3).	21c	78c	51c
Wool—Washed. . . .	12c	26½c	18½c
Unwashed. . .	7c	17c	11c
Calf skins.	5c	14c	9c
*Hides (No. 1 Steers and cows inspected.	3c	14c	7½c

These are the prices taken from a report prepared at the instance and under the direction of the present leader of the Opposition covering a period of twenty years. I may add in passing that these figures show that on all except two articles the lowest price was obtained during the time that these hon. gentlemen were in power. But, Sir, what do we find? Again I direct your attention to the remarks in the preface to that report: that prices obtained by the farmers at that time had gone to such a pitch that in order to bring these agrarian plutocrats to their knees; in order to bring them to time; in order to stem the tide of revolution which was threatening on account of the high prices which were being obtained by the farmers, they made this proposal to throw the doors of Canada open to the surplus farm products of the world, at the same time compelling the farmer to continue to pay duty on everything that he had to buy. When butter rose to 22 cents a pound; when eggs were 16 cents a dozen and milk 15 cents a gallon, the dreams of the then Minister of Labour were disturbed by visions of the red flag of revolution. Something had to be done to bring things down to a reasonable basis. Sixteen cents a dozen was far too much for a farmer to get for eggs; 22 cents was entirely too much for a farmer to get for a pound of butter. Why, it was preposterous; sixteen to eighteen cents a bag for potatoes—whoever heard tell of the like? Was there not every excuse for the people taking up arms in rebellion against that sort of thing? So my hon. friends proposed to open the doors of Canada and to admit an exportable surplus of 462,000,000 pounds of butter; to admit 256,000,000 dozen eggs in order to bring the price of this commodity down from 16 cents a dozen, and to let in 2,290,000,000 pounds of meat in order

to bring down the exorbitant price of meat. The farmers were getting too much for their cattle when they were selling them at $4.26 a hundredweight. They were getting an exorbitant price when they were selling sheep at $3.94 a hundred and hogs at $5.52—why, that was an outrage indeed. Notwithstanding the fact that they had all these figures before them as to the prices obtaining at that time—these ridiculously low prices that the farmers were getting for their stuff, prices which meant that the farmers were leaving their lands because they were not able to make one-quarter of one per cent on their capital investment—notwithstanding all that, Sir, they proposed to open the doors of Canada to the surplus production of practically the whole world in order to bring down the prices that the farmers were obtaining for their produce. Yet these hon. gentlemen are obsessed with the idea that in the election of 1911 they were right and the people did not know what they were speaking about.

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am not in the least surprised to hear that exclamation from the hon. member for Brome. In that "hear, hear," he is simply giving an example of that peculiar form of political, delusional insanity, if I might say so, whose saddest feature—

Mr. McMASTER: I rise to a point of order, and I would, with all cordiality, geniality and politeness draw the attention of the Speaker to the fact that to apply the word "insanity" to any remark made by an hon. gentleman is not Parliamentary, nor even polite.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have not yet heard the end of the sentence of the hon. member for Frontenac. If it be his intention to apply the word "insanity" to an hon. member, the point of order is well taken.

Mr. EDWARDS: I had not the slightest intention of applying that term to the hon. member for Brome. What a useless waste of words it would be for me to say anything reflecting on the mental calibre of the hon. member! He has given in this House instances enough of his mental capacity or incapacity, according to the way in which one looks at it. Why should I waste time referring to the mental capacity of the hon. member? I merely said that the trouble with these hon. gentlemen was that they still think that they were right and that the people were wrong in 1911, and that is a form of delusional insanity, the saddest feature of which is that it is apparently incurable. If the hon. member for Brome thinks that is a reflection upon the gray matter which is inside that glistening dome of his, I can only express my extreme regret and pass on to the next point.

The hon. member for Brome would have us believe that he is an out-and-out free trader; at least, that is the line which he very frequently takes in this House. Is he an out-and-out free trader or is he under certain circumstances a very practical politician? Let us see what the Globe says in its issue of the 7th August, 1919, when it was reporting a very interesting occurrence which was taking place in Ottawa, namely, that last Liberal convention in which the hon. member for Brome held, I believe, the distinguished position of chairman of the resolution committee. One can readily understand why the hon. member was selected as chairman of the resolutions committee. He is the great "resoluter" of this House; he has been "resoluting" ever since he came into this House. True, he was put out of that little job this session, and I do not think he feels very comfortable about that. Another "resoluter" has taken the place formerly occupied by the hon. member for Brome. But on that occasion he was "resoluting" before that great convention, and this is what he is reported in the Globe to have said:

> I have got to say that we must keep the tariff as an engine of raising revenue.
>
> Voices—we have not.
>
> Mr. McMASTER: Well, until you devise and put into successful operation some other scheme, I submit that you have got to.

Therefore, while in this House he does not propose any scheme, while he simply denounces protection, hip and thigh, and announces himself as an out-and-out free trader, still, when he was in convention with a number of other hon. gentlemen who were looking for and devising ways and means of getting into power, he then became the practical politician and said: "Well, it is all right for me to talk free trade in order to catch those who have that bee in their bonnet; but when the question comes down to a matter of practical politics, you have to have a tariff for revenue purposes; you cannot get along without it." That is the position of the hon. member for Brome, and he is not the only one of that calibre on the other side of the House. We have the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould), who declares himself as an out-and-out free trader. I am not very much disturbed by that, because

the hon. member for Assiniboia may any day get word from that committee of fifteen to become an out-and-out protectionist, and he may change his policy when he gets the proper notification.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) has been making speeches in various parts of this country; he was particularly active around Ontario before the elections which took place last fall, and he has made certain statements which I am going to challenge, notwithstanding the assurance of the hon. member himself that he knows all about economics from A to Z. I am going to question his right to that claim and also some of the arguments which he has advanced from time to time in various parts of this country. The hon. member for Marquette has said that the tariff is the cause of rural depopulation. I might ask the hon. member to consider this proposition. If a protective tariff or a revenue tariff be the cause of rural depopulation, how does the hon. member account for rural depopulation in free-trade England? Or if his statement be correct that if the farmers of Ontario had access to the markets across the line, there would be no further migration of the farmers; if he be correct that free entrance to the American market would mean so much to our farmers, then I would like him to explain why it is that rural depopulation is going on in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and other States, just as it has been going on in this country. There are no tariffs between the state of New York and the state of Pennsylvania, nor between the cities of New York, Brooklyn, Pittsburg and other centres of population.

Why then is it that the rural population is leaving the farms if my hon. friend's contention be sound? The fact is that the rural population has been decreasing not only in this country but in every other country, and the tariff is not and cannot be said to be the reason for that rural depopulation. In the United States the rural population in 1890 was 63.9 per cent; in 1900, 59.5 per cent; and in 1910, 46.3 per cent; while in Canada in 1890, it was 68.1 per cent; in 1900, 62.4 per cent, and in 1910, 54.5 per cent. It is, I think, worth while noting that in each decade, with the exception of the state of Nevada, every state in the Union shows a decrease in the rural population. Speaking in this House in 1909, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark), said that during the first eight months of that year, more people had left the United States than had come into that country, and he brought that forward as an argument against the principle of protection in the United States. If his argument in that regard was sound, I might use the same argument against free trade because of the people leaving the farms and country districts in free trade England. I might even produce as an illustrious example the hon. member for Red Deer himself, and ask why he and thousands of others have seen fit to leave free trade England where they would have all the advantages of farming under free trade conditions, and come voluntarily to the Dominion of Canada to farm in a country where they are hampered by protective tariffs or any other kind of a tariff. Why is it, if conditions here are as bad as the hon. member for Red Deer and the hon. member for Marquette would have us believe, that we have people voluntarily leaving free trade Britain by the tens of thousands to take up farming in this country? Why have we people coming from the United States to farm in Canada? We certainly have very few people leaving Canada to farm in the United States, and we have no people leaving Canada to farm in England. That seems to me to indicate that conditions cannot be as bad in this country as these gentlemen would have us believe, and I am going to prove that. I want to say a few words more on this matter because of certain aspersions which have been cast on the province of Ontario and the farmers of Ontario by the hon. member for Marquette. I will not give the percentage of rural population in all of the provinces, but for the purpose of my argument I wish to give the percentage in Ontario. In 1891, the rural population was 61.2 per cent of the total population of the province, in 1901, 57.2 per cent, and in 1911, 47.4 per cent. In Michigan the percentage of rural population in 1890, was 65.1 per cent, in 1900, 61.7 per cent, and in 1910, 52.8 per cent. You will see from these figures that the percentage of rural population in Michigan is practically the same as in Ontario. Ontario and Michigan are very much alike in other respects. Farming, mining and lumbering are carried on in each, and there is practically the same number of farms in Michigan as in Ontario.

I would ask the members of the House to pay particular attention to the figures which I am going to give, and which I am giving because of certain statements which have been made at various times for political purposes by the hon. member for Marquette when he was endeavouring to influence the farmers of the province of On-

tario. In the ten years from 1898 to 1908 the number of farms in the state of Michigan had increased from 175,000 in 1898 to 178,000 in 1908, and in the same ten years the number of farms in Ontario had increased from 177,000 to 183,000. I also want to give some figures which I have taken from the census returns for 1911 in Canada and the latest census returns compiled in the United States. In the ten years from 1900 to 1910, in the case of the United States, and from 1901 to 1911 in the case of Ontario, the value of Ontario farm buildings increased by $115,285,449, and the value of farm buildings in Michigan increased by $2,614,200. The value of live stock in Ontario in those ten years increased by $82,270,433 and in Michigan by $26,022,651. I would call particular attention to the figures I am now going to give, which seem to me to indicate very clearly that conditions in this country are not so bad as certain gentlemen, for political purposes, would have the country believe. Farm mortgages in the province of Ontario in the ten years I have mentioned decreased by $64,800,000, and chattel mortgages on farm stock by $280,424, or a total decrease in the ten years of mortgage indebtedness on farms and farm stock in the province of Ontario of $65,080,424. In the state of Michigan in the same ten years the mortgage indebtedness on farms increased by $77,602,491, and the indebtedness on chattel mortgages increased by $2,295,999, or a total increase in the mortgage indebtedness on farms and farm stock of $79,898,490 in the state of Michigan, as compared with a decrease in Ontario on practically the same number of farms of $65,080,824.

Let me point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that there was nothing to prevent farmers in the state of Michigan from entering urban centres like New York, Brooklyn or Detroit, which urban centres hon. gentlemen opposite claim it would be a great boon to the farmers of Ontario to enter. Notwithstanding all they say in that regard, the facts and figures are there, and I defy any hon. gentleman in this House whether he sits in the Opposition or with those people who are specially elected to look after the interests of the agriculturists in this country, to refute one single figure I have advanced, because they are all taken from our own official returns and from official returns which I obtained by writing to the city of Washington.

That is the condition in regard to Ontario and Michigan, but there are other

States, and in order that I may not be accused of having taken merely an isolated case let me refer to conditions in the States of New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio. According to official returns which I have here, and which any hon. gentleman is privileged to examine if he wishes—they are issued by the American Bureau of Census and are absolutely official—I find that in the ten years 1900 to 1910 there was a decrease in the number of farms in the State of New York of 12,070, in Pennsylvania a decrease of 5,854, and in Ohio a decrease of 5,336, or a total decrease for the three States of 23,260, whereas in Ontario in the same ten years there was an increase in the number of farms of over 6,000. In the improved acreage in these three States there was a decrease in the same period of 1,358,000 acres, whereas in Ontario there was an increase in improved farm acreage of 386,811 acres. In the total farm acreage there was a decrease in these three States of 1,893,000 acres, whereas in Ontario in the same ten years there was an increase of 822,261 acres. Every province in the Dominion of Canada, so far as the censuses of 1901 and 1911 are concerned, shows an actual increase in the acreage of farm lands occupied, as well as an increase in the improved farm acreage, except Nova Scotia, which shows a slight decrease of 19 acres as between 1901 and 1911.

There is another matter I want to take up, and that is the statement which is frequently made by certain hon. gentlemen that Canada's natural market is the United States. That statement in my opinion is absolutely ridiculous. Canada's natural market for her farm products is where there is a lack of those farm products—not where there is a greater surplus. The farmers of the county of Frontenac would not think of looking to the county of Leeds to sell their surplus cheese, because the county of Leeds produces more cheese than the county of Frontenac. It is just as reasonable to say that the natural market for Ontario wheat is Winnipeg, and the natural market for Quebec potatoes Prince Edward Island, as it is to say that the natural market for Canada's farm products is on the other side of the line. I make this statement, and I am prepared to prove it to the hilt, that of everything the farmer produces in this country and has to sell there is a greater surplus production in the United States, except in the one article of cheese, of which we have the greater surplus production. Outside of that, the United States have a greater sur-

plus in every line of farm products. You would think, to hear the hon. member for Marquette talk, that there were no farmers on the other side of the line at all, that it was wholly a city population of consumers. What are the facts? The rural population of Canada in 1911 was 3,927,000, and in the United States 49,348,000. The number of farm holdings in Canada in 1911 was 714,000, and in the United States 6,361,000. The acreage of improved farm lands in Canada was 48,000,000 as compared with 478,000,000 in the United States. So we find that on the other side of the line there are thirteen people living in the country to every one living in the country in Canada, that there are nine farms in the United States to every one in Canada, and ten acres of improved farm land in the United States to one in Canada.

The following is a comparative table of the stock owned in Canada and the United States:

	1911. Canada.	1910. United States.
Number of horses and mules	2,598,000	25,163,000
Number of milch cows	2,595,000	21,801,000
Number of other cattle	3,930,000	47,279,000
Number of sheep.	2,174,000	57,216,000
Number of swine.	3,634,000	47,782,00
Production of butter (lbs.)	201,599,000	1,619,000,000
Production of cheese	201,275,000	320,532,000
Production of eggs (doz.)	123,071,000	1,591,000,000
Production of wool (lbs.)	6,933,000	281,892,000
Production of wheat (bush.)	132,077,547	621,338,000
Production of oats (bush.)	245,393,425	1,186,341,000
Production of barley (bush.)	28,848,310	173,822,000
Production of potatoes (bush.)	55,368,000	400,000,000

222,000,000 bushels of potatoes produced in those States touching the Canadian border.

I should like to present to the House the following figures which show the exportable surplus of Canada and the United States in the years 1916, 1917 and 1918 of the commodities mentioned:

—	—	Canada. 1916.	1917.	1918.
Butter.....Lbs.	Exports.....	3,441,183	7,990,435	4,926,154
	Imports....	4,309,831	997,335	434,049
Surplus.....	.....	−868,648	6,993,100	4,492,105
Cheese.....Lbs.	Exports.....	168,961,583	180,733,426	169,530,753
	Imports.....	971,821	785,221	343,209
Surplus.....	.....	167,989,762	179,948,205	169,187,544
Eggs.....Doz.	Exports.....	7,898,322	5,167,343	4,896,793
	Imports....	3,783,952	3,038,843	4,274,452
Surplus.....	.....	4,114,370	2,128,500	622,341
Lard.....Lbs.	Exports.....	24,998	1,405,623	1,955,222
	Imports....	7,369,945	4,525,961	3,962,130
Surplus.....	.....	−7,344,947	−3,120,338	−2,006,908
Milk and cream.....	Exports.....	$1,961,426	$2,279,873	$5,862,976
	Imports....	317,763	385,129	354,092
Surplus.....	.....	$1,643,663	$1,894,744	$5,508,884
Meats.....Lbs.	Exports.....	229,772,287	282,046,876	323,775,815
	Imports....	78,696,644	168,196,697	107,702,185
		151,075,643	113,850,179	216,073,630

—	Total of Butter, Cheese, Eggs, Lard, Milk, and Meats expressed in Dollars. $	$	$
Exports.....	70,143,629	97,735,721	127,165,333
Imports.....	12,280,438	29,093,903	27,897,394
Exportable Surplus.....	57,863,191	68,641,818	99,267,939

—	—	United States.		
		1916.	1917.	1918.
Butter..... Lbs.	Exports.....	13,487,481	26,835,092	17,735,966
	Imports....	712,998	523,573	1,805,925
Surplus.....	.....	12,774,483	26,311,519	15,930,041
Cheese..... Lbs.	Exports.....	44,394,301	66,050,013	44,303,076
	Imports....	30,087,999	14,481,514	9,839,305
Surplus.....	.....	14,306,302	51,568,499	34,463,771
Eggs..... Doz.	Exports.....	26,396,206	24,926,424	18,969,167
	Imports....	732,566	1,110,322	1,619,069
Surplus.....	.....	25,663,640	23,816,102	17,350,098
Lard..... Lbs.	Exports.....	479,854,649	501,120,033	423,784,737
	Imports....	None.	None.	None.
Surplus.....	.....	479,854,649	501,120,033	423,784,737
Milk and cream.....	Exports.....	$13,237,378	$25,390,270	$68,272,966
	Imports....	1,515,354	1,746,446	2,997,051
Surplus.....	.....	$11,722,024	$23,644,824	$65,275,915
Meats..... Lbs.	Exports.....	1,339,101,654	1,378,524,101	1,833,641,409
	Imports....	94,196,797	21,742,769	29,567,020
		1,234,904,857	1,356,771,332	1,804,074,389

—	Total of Butter, Cheese, Eggs, Lard, Milk, and Meats expressed in Dollars.		
	$	$	$
Exports.....	297,244,376	410,833,681	687,528,808
Imports.....	25,789,652	20,542,075	43,407,764
Exportable Surplus.....	271,454,724	390,291,606	644,121,044

In 1916-17-18, it will be seen, we had a surplus of butter, cheese, eggs, lard, milk, cream and meats. I take these things because they come under the head of provisions. But while we had an exportable surplus of $57,863,000 worth of these products in 1916 the United States had a surplus of $271,000,000; in 1917 we had a surplus of $68,000,0000 and they had a surplus of $390,000,000; our surplus in 1918 was $99,000,000 and theirs was $644,000,000. Now, Sir, what I object to in connection with this amendment is its utter lack of consideration for the interests of the farmers. We imported last year over $9,000,000 worth of provisions from some thirty different countries and exported about $128,000,000 worth to thirty or forty different countries. We are exporting various farm products which I have named, such as butter, cheese, meats, etc., to thirty or forty countries throughout the world, and we have a proposition brought down by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's which would open the doors of Canada to the surplus productions of every country on the face of the globe. The surplus farm production of every country in the world, under the hon. gentleman's amendment, would have the right to come into Canada, while if we wanted to get our surplus products into outside markets we would have to face a duty For example, the surplus products of New Zealand would have free access to this country to compete with the products of our farmers, while if we wanted to put any of our surplus products on the markets of New Zealand we would have to pay from 25 to 30 per cent duty. If the object of my hon. friends opposite is attained, Australia will be able to send butter and cheese into Canada free of duty, although if we wanted to find a market for our surplus butter and cheese in that country we would find a duty imposed on those products. This is the condition of affairs which hon. gentlemen opposite desire to bring about. What have the farmers of Canada done to hon. gentlemen opposite—apart from what they did in 1911—that those gentlemen should try to do them this wrong? Mr. Speaker, it must be

obvious to any one who gives the matter even the most cursory study that if the platform of hon. gentlemen opposite is carried into effect, if the platform of either the Liberal party or the other party is adopted, the doors of Canada will be opened to the surplus food products of the world; and so far as the Canadian farmer is concerned, there would in that event be only one absolute certainty: he would be obsolutely sure that he would never be allowed to get the highest price for anything he has to sell but would always have to take the lowest price. I say that for this reason: just as soon as the prices of any farm product would become attractive in Canada, our doors being open, the exporters of surplus products of the world would immediately take advantage of those attractive prices here, and down would come the prices of Canadian farm produce to the lowest level. That is the situation with which we are confronted by the proposal which hon. gentlemen put forward with such seriousness on the other side. Well, I have no doubt in my mind as to what would happen to those hon. gentlemen if they went before the people with a proposition of that kind and after the people had had an opportunity of sizing the matter up. I think there can be no doubt as to what the result would be. I have always maintained, Mr. Speaker, that any argument that might be advanced by protectionists in favour of protecting infant industries in Canada by a tariff is an argument that applies with peculiar and added force, to the tariff duty on farm produce, and I will tell you why. It has been alleged by hon. gentlemen in this House that the farmers of this country do not ask for favours. That is very true; I accept that statement. The farmers do not want favours but they do want a square and a fair deal. That is all they ask, and I say that it is absolutely unreasonable, unfair and unjust to ask the farmers of a country like Canada, with a climate such as we have, to compete on even terms with the farm products of all the countries on the face of the earth. I shall prove the unfairness of the proposition to the hilt. Take a map of the United States and draw a line from east to west along the southern boundary of the state of Pennsylvania, let us say, and you will find that the States of the American Union south of that line have practically no winter at all. Let us go further and take the state of Oklahoma, which has pretty nearly the same number of farms as we have in Ontario with stock of pretty nearly the same value.

But what do we find? We find that in Ontario our farmers have 187 million more dollars invested in farm buildings than have the farmers in the State of Oklahama. Will you tell me that the farmers have no right to look for any interest on that capital invested? That is what hon. gentlemen opposite are telling them. Why is it that the farmers of Ontario, with practically the same number of farms, have had to invest nearly $200,000,000 more in farm buildings than have the farmers in Oklahoma? Because their climate is such that their stock cannot remain outdoors the year round and they require to erect expensive barns and stables. In Ontario, Quebec and other parts of Canada it is not merely the amount of capital that is invested in barns and stables, but the farmer has to employ high-priced labour to feed and look after his stock for five or six months in the year in order to be able to make a few dollars out of it during the summer months. Yet these hon. gentlemen tell you that the farmer in Canada, with a climate such as we have, and with millions invested in buildings should produce and sell their product in their own home market as cheaply as those people can produce in States like those I have named, Argentine, Bolivia, and some other countries, where they have cheap labour while our farmers are up against the problem of exorbitant prices for farm labour, and are unable to get labour which will compete with the cheap labour of China, Japan, Patagonia, Bolivia, the Argentine Republic and many other countries throughout the world. The position assumed by hon. gentlemen opposite is illogical and unfair, and is a position which will not be endorsed by the farmers of Canada when they have an opportunity of looking into this matter and seeing what it means to them.

5 p.m.

These hon. gentlemen talk a great deal about their interest in the farmer. The hon. member for Marquette assumes that he is the great guardian of the farming interests in this country. The hon. member for Marquette and those associated with him have taken some very peculiar ways of showing their interest in the farmer. The statement may be made, and very properly made, in regard to hon. gentlemen sitting across the way who represent themselves in this House and in the country as the special pleaders for the farmers of Canada, that while the farmers farm the farms they farm the farmers. They have farmed the farmers of this coun-

try, they have farmed them to a nicety, and I propose to show you how in some repects they have done so.

Take, for instance, the Grain Growers' Grain Company of which the hon. member for Marquette is president drawing his salary of $15,000 a year, while the secretary of the same company draws a salary of $13,000, the manager at Winnipeg a salary of $11,000, the manager at Calgary a salary of $5,200, and a young secretary a salary of $5,000 or an aggregate of nearly $50,000 a year. The first two or three members are farming the farmers to some purpose. We had the hon. member for Marquette speaking in this House in June last year and referring to certain manufacturing establishments like Dominion Textiles, Monarch Knitting, and Canners Limited. He called attention to the fact that some of these companies were making as high as 31 per cent. He pictured in strong terms the iniquity of the whole thing and fastened it all upon the fact that we have a tariff in this country. Thirty one per cent! Let us see. The company of which he is the president in 1916 made $855,288 profit on their capital, or 62.2 per cent. Who said that? That is the sworn evidence of Mr. Rice Jones, secretary of the Grain Growers Grain Co., before the Costs of Living Committee of this House last June. In the year 1917 they made $844,401, or 44.9 per cent on their capital. This company was also handling machinery.

Mr. SMITH: Are these farmers?

Mr. EDWARDS: These are supposed to be the heaven-sent pleaders for the farmers interests in this country. They handled things such as binder twine, fence posts, fence wire and machinery of various kinds. What profit did they make out of machinery? In one year they made $272,215 or a profit of 21.6 per cent. Here we have these people, the tears running down their faces and falling in splashes on the floor in their sympathy for the farmers, ranting and raving against the iniquity of 12½ per cent duty on harvesters. They figure out that 12½ per cent on a $200 machine amounts to about $25 and these same gentlemen, through the operations of their own company, take about $40 out of the farmer on his binder. You would at least have thought that when it came to farm implements they would have handled them for nothing out of love for the farmer. Not so. They do not even give the farmer one hour of credit. They have no expense such as other firms have in connection with these matters. They sell for cash; there is no six or nine months' credit for them. Give us the cash and we will know what to do with it. We will pay it out first for the good salaries that some of us have the good fortune to receive.

Then there is another matter—the handling of elevator screenings. The average price for elevator screenings for six years up to 1919 was $8.84 but when the hon. member for Marquette was Minister of Agriculture he paid $35 a ton for screenings. The hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) came in there and I believe that I am right in saying that his company sold 1,600 tons to the Government and that there was a Government loss on the transaction as a result of buying these screenings of about $80,000. It is a wonderful interest they have in the farmers, is it not? They took these screenings and sold them to the farmers at $35 a ton.

Then there is the New York Export Company of which the hon. member for Marquette is also president. They had a profit of $550,000 in one year on a capital investment of $250,000, or 220 per cent. There was only $100,000 of that capital actually paid up in cash. They had a profit of 220 per cent counting the capital at $250,000 and not $100,000 which was the actual amount of cash in the business, leaving out the water. Still we have these gentlemen, headed by the hon. member for Marquette, ranting and raving from one end of this country to the other about profiteers. They talk about what a terrible thing it is for a man to pay ninety cents on a barrel of apples or a third of a cent on an apple. They are talking about profiteers making their millions but they do not call attention to their own overages in five years in their elevators of 357,000 bushels or $418,000 worth taken absolutely out of the pockets of the farmers. These are things which they do not particularly call attention to, for very obvious reasons.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the whole history of the two political parties that have held power in this country from Confederation down to the present time in dealing with manufacturing establishments of one kind or another—pampered industries, if you like, there has never been an instance where we have had such colossal and unscrupulous profiteers as the Grain Growers' Grain Company, presided over and represented by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). It is the biggest profiteering concern that ever was organized in the Dominion, and it is taking money right and left from the pockets of the farmers—those farmers whom its

members profess to take such a great interest in. And they take such a great interest in the farmers for the reason I mentioned before,—that they can "farm" them, and they are doing it to the limit.

Why, Mr. Speaker, do you want another example of what they are doing along that line? Take what they did in regard to red clover, alsike and timothy seed. The "Farmers Sun" of March 13, 1920, contained an advertisement by the United Farmers' Co-operative Company, Limited, of Toronto, offering No. 1 red clover seed at $47 per bushel; No. 1 alsike at $41 per bushel; No. 2 timothy at $9.75 per bushel. Those seeds are not sold to the people as breakfast foods, they are sold to the farmers to sow; and those were the prices the United Farmers' Co-operative Company, Limited, was asking, and getting, from the farmers of Ontario. At Sussex, New Brunswick, is published "The Maritime Farmer," and the editor of that paper, taking an interest in farm organizations, proceeded to purchase the same grades of these seeds for disposal among the farmers and the agricultural societies as well as the branches of United Farmers of New Brunswick. After paying the freight from Toronto to Sussex, he sold No. 1 red clover $4,450 cheaper per carload; alsike $3,550 cheaper per carload, and No. 2 timothy $1,365 cheaper per carload than these Toronto philanthropists were charging; or at the rate of $38.10 per bushel for No. 1 red clover as against $47 per bushel; $33.90 per bushel for No. 1 alsike as against $41 per bushel; and $7.56 per bushel for No. 2 timothy as against $9.75 per bushel charged by the aggregation in Toronto. We have other instances. In my county a week or two ago the United Farmers' Company brought in a carload of seed potatoes from New Ontario, and they soaked the farmers $2 on every bag for just simply handling that carload. I say, Sir, that we are only beginning to turn over the leaves of this book which will demonstrate the truth of what I say, that the most colossal profiteering concern that has ever reared its head in this Dominion is that which is presided over by the hon. member who leads the third party triangularly across the way.

Now, Sir, there is not a member in this House who has less personal interest in manufacturing than I have; there is not a constituency which has less direct interest in manufacturing than my constituency. Up to the present moment there is not a single manufacturing establishment in the county of Frontenac, unless we can so term a cheese factory. I could come to this House and denounce manufacturers as roundly as any hon. member without running much chance of hurting the feelings of the farmers of my county. But I take this position: I want to see manufactures in the Dominion, because so far as Ontario is concerned, at least, 90 per cent of all her farmers have to sell is sold at home. And I maintain that whether it be Ontario, Manitoba, or any other province, the best market for the Canadian farmer is his home market. That market I want to see retained and enlarged for him.

The trouble is that because of the very bigness of this country we are running into the danger of trying to legislate for this district and for that district, forgetting that if this is ever going to be a great country we must remember that we are members of the same family and must pull together. A little more team play is what we want. May I call the attention of hon. gentlemen from the West to one or two things which I will ask them to very carefully consider? In all seriousness I would ask them not to consider tariff matters entirely from the standpoint of the man who does nothing but produce wheat. I might remind them that to the two old provinces of Ontario and Quebec must be given credit for 52 per cent of the value of our horses; 60 per cent of the value of our cattle; 70 per cent of the value of our sheep; and 80 per cent of the value of our swine sold. I would ask them to bear in mind that the farmers in these old provinces have diversified interests, and I would also ask them to seriously consider that we cannot build up this country by simply throwing open our doors and saying: Because we do not produce any fruit on the prairies, therefore we have no interest in the thousands of fruit farmers in Ontario, British Columbia and the other provinces who do produce fruit. We will never build up this country in that way. The trouble is that the representatives of the different provinces are inclined to act more as if they were the envoys of rival nations rather than the representatives of provinces which should be brothers in the same family.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that to my mind the most illogical and unfair proposition that could possibly be made is contained in this amendment and in the platform supported by hon. gentlemen opposite—a proposition which tells the farmers of this Dominion: You must climb the tariff walls to get your stuff into other countries, but so

far as your own country is concerned, you will have to compete with the surplus products of the world. That is unfair, that is illogical, and if we carry that process far enough we are going to simply ruin this Dominion.

I wish to express my appreciation of the patient attention which hon. gentlemen have given to me, and I will do so by saying, merci beaucoup.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE: (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everybody in the House and everybody in the country must have recognized quite clearly, after the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen) sat down yesterday, that the clarion cry for the new party had gone forth; that once more hon. gentlemen opposite were to go to the country shrouded in the old flag which is to be taken out for the occasion and wrapped around him and his Haman's gallows tariff policy. It must indeed have been rather surprising to some of my Liberal Unionist friends sitting on the other side to find themselves surrounded with the old guard of high protectionist Tories and to hear all around them the slogan of high protection and vested interests; and they must have wondered to themselves as they went to bed last night: "Where do I get off at?" I wonder where!

At the end of his speech last night the Minister of the Interior, almost with tears in his eyes, made a touching plea to us. He said: Why not support us? We have the same platform as you have; you are only camouflaging; get in with us; we are the real party. The hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Edwards) says: "Why has the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) such an awful grouch against the farmers? He is going to ruin them with the amendment he has brought in." Which is right? Which is wrong? It is the same old story we heard away back in 1897; the tariff that we brought in was damned from the housetops by members of the opposite side; Sir Charles Tupper himself said that it would ruin the country. Who was right and who was wrong, Mr. Speaker? I shall say further on this subject only this: if there was one treat to me in the House last night more than another it was while the Minister of the Interior was making that high protectionist, Haman's gallows speech, to see the beatific expression on the face of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt); it was beautiful to a degree. He said to himself: "Ah, now have we got away

[Mr. Edwards.]

from the deleterious opinions of these Unionists; we are out again in the open with the same old Tory policy,—plows and machinery up in the air so far as tariff goes; now may I sleep happy; now may I be comforted."

I want to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) upon the Budget, in this respect only,—that he was courageous enough to reach out and try to find some new way of getting taxes. But I cannot congratulate him upon his method; I think that he reached out the wrong way. When the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) spoke the other day he gave us some very good advice, as he very often does. He said: "What the people should do is stop grumbling; stop growling; stop grouching and striking." That is perfectly true. I do not intend to go back into ancient history on tariffs; the only thing that interests me to-day is what is the best tariff for 1920; what is the best for the Dominion of Canada. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that these things should be stopped, and in that I agree with him. Then the thing that we as members of this House have to consider is, how are they to be stopped? Why do strikes take place? People want higher wages. What do they want higher wages for? To buy food. Food is one of the necessaries of life; it is constantly increasing in price; consequently higher wages must come in order to enable the people to live. The fact of the matter is that the necessaries of life have to-day attained such a high price that with the ordinary man it is a question of making both ends meet. What is the remedy for that state of affairs? If the labourer has to continue to pay enormous prices for his food and his clothing—because you must feed him and you must clothe him, and so it must be for his family—what will be the result? More strikes; more confusion; loss to the country; unsettled conditions.

For two years we have been promised tariff revision, and we are still promised it. I sincerely hope that it will come; it is necessary in the interests of the country that it should come. Now, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne) the other day found fault with this side of the House because, he said; "You criticize but you offer nothing constructive." Now, I am going to offer him something constructive, though I doubt whether the minister will agree with me because I well know the trend of his mind along these lines. I have only to repeat what I said last year in speaking to the Budget in this House:

In my opinion the only method of making food cheaper is to produce more, and if greater production is desired, the tools with which men produce must be made cheaper. Therefore, my first argument is that the tariff on farm and other implements of production should be reduced to the lowest possible rate. In the second place, all foodstuffs and clothing should be free, and in the third place, there should be a downward revision of the tariff.

I have always been prepared to take that attitude, and I am prepared to take it now. That is where I stand to-day; I have no objection to going before any audience, be they of farmers or others and stating my position. I say to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and to the Government that, having regard to the present condition of the country following the war, you could not do anything more constructive than adopt such a tariff as I have suggested. You want a happy and a contented people; you want wages which are sufficient to keep the people in that state, and you want foodstuffs as free of duties as possible. Just take the ordinary man—I will enlarge on this a little later—and see what he pays by way of duty on the actual necessities of life:

Oatmeal, per 100 pounds	60 cents.
Rice, cleaned, per 100 pounds	75 "
Eggs, per dozen	5 "
Cheese	3 "
Canned meats	27½ per cent
Butter	4 cents.
Tea and coffee, per pound	10 "
Beans, per bushel	25 "
Peas, per bushel	15 "
Cornmeal, per bushel	25 "
Barley, per bushel	15 "
Wheat flour, per barrel	60 "
Sago and tapioca	27½ per cent
Biscuits, not sweetened	25 "
Biscuits, sweetened	30 "
Maccaroni and vermicelli, per 100 pounds	$1.25
Potatoes, per bushel	20 cents.
Canned fruits, per pound, including packages	2 "
Candles	25 per cent
Paris green	10 "
Sewing machines	30 "
Cotton and linen thread	25 "
Wearing apparel and ready-made clothing	35 "
Undershirts, drawers, socks and stockings	35 "

Then, on the needles and pins that the thrifty housewife uses, she pays 30 per cent. On the lamps that the workingman uses when he cannot pay for electric light, he pays 30 per cent, and 25 per cent even on the lamp wicks. On the tables and chairs that the workingman uses when he takes his frugal meal, he pays 30 per cent. On the cotton and cotton fabrics which every family must use, the duty is 20 per cent to 32½ per cent. On boots and shoes, it is 25 per cent plus 10 per cent luxury tax; on hats and caps, 30 per cent, plus luxury tax. On the ordinary woollen blankets used in a country as cold as Canada, 35 per cent is charged, and on plain flannel blankets, which are so much used, 35 per cent. Every one of these articles enters into the daily use and the daily consumption of every man, woman and child in Canada; yet, Sir, the duties upon them range all the way up to 35 per cent, even on those articles which are most necessary. Does anybody argue—and I propose to produce some figures later on to support my contention—that that kind of protection is necessary in order to enable the carrying on of the industries that produce these goods? It is not so; they do not need it; consequently the duties ought to be reduced.

Is the consumer helped by this Budget in any way at all? The consumer is not helped; he is hurt. As to the 10 per cent on boots and shoes, 10 per cent on hats and caps and so on, the consumer, as Mr. Breadner said last night, in the end pays every single dollar of that luxury tax. This is the same old proposition—taxes raised, not from the proper source, but from the consumer who puts up practically every dollar of the revenue of this country. In order to see the anomaly of this matter, let us take as an illustration automobiles that cost say $1,000 each. For many years on a $1,000 automobile, you paid 35 per cent duty, or $350, and in addition, under the war tax, you paid 7½ per cent, or $75, bringing the cost of the automobile up to $1,425. If you add ten per cent luxury tax on to that $1,425, or $142.50, the final cost of that automobile would be $1,567.50. To-day, under the tax of 15 per cent as levied by this Budget, an automobile costs, say $1,000, duty $350, luxury tax, $202.50, or a total of $1,552.52, or, under the present scale, a difference of $15. Thus, there is really not one per cent of a luxury tax on automibiles. What does the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) do? Let us ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) what he does. In these Budget proposals which he says are so good, he makes up what he can for the luxurious man who buys an automobile, and then he takes that out of the poor person who buys a nightshirt, an undershirt or a petticoat.

These taxes are called excise taxes, and while I am not going to find any fault with that term, they are not strictly so. As I said before, however, they are not collected from the right source; in every case —and my opinion is borne out by what Mr.

Bredner said last night—they are paid by the consumer. As regards clothing, 35 per cent plus 10 per cent, and as regards boots and shoes, 25 per cent plus 10 per cent is added on to the cost. My contention is that the excise duty should be paid by the manufacturer; it should be deducted by the manufacturer from the manufactured article and paid into the treasury at the time of the sale. Why could not that be done? On a $25 suit of clothes, the manufacturer would pay into the public treasury 10 per cent on the cost of the manufactured article, or $2.50. If you did not have an excise duty against the imported article, you would be absolutely all right; but having it against the domestic and also against the imported article gets you nowhere. If you would leave the tax off the imported article and charge it as a home excise duty which the manufacturer had to pay, he could not charge it up against the customer, and consequently he could not pass the tax along, because if he did, the importer would be able to sell his goods more cheaply than the home manufacturer. Therefore, the tax would necessarily have to come out of the manufacturer himself, and the consumer would be protected. Surely that is good doctrine. The Government recognize that policy themselves, because that is what they did this year in regard to patent medicines. Formerly, you bought a package of whatever it was and paid for it 25 cents, or whatever the cost might be. Under the stamp tax the vendor put a stamp on the package and the consumer paid 26 cents for the article. The Government recognized the fact that that was not good business, and now they make the manufacturer of the patent medicine put a stamp on, and the manufacturer, not the consumer, pays the stamp tax. The policy is absolutely the same; if it is good in one case, why is it not good in another? I cannot see what the difference is, and I think what I have suggested is what ought to be done.

Some time ago in Montreal I advocated an excise tax to be paid by the manufacturer just in the manner that I have described. I argued then that the manufacturer had been a large profiteer during the war and that, therefore, he should pay, as he is best able to. My reasons are these. In the first place, this would save the consumer, and in the second, it would get back from the manufacturer some of the war profits which he had made. In England, there is talk of getting back some of the war profits. Why should not a small portion of these war profits be taken from the manufacturer in the way I have eendeavoured to describe, and why should not the common man be saved that additional tax? By taking this tax from the manufacturer, we collect it from the man who is best able to pay, and that is what we want. Let us also remember that under these Budget proposals the tariff is left exactly as it was before; it has not been touched in any way whatever, and consequently the manufacturer is not hurt.

The other night the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) quoted a speech I had made in Montreal.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Hear, hear.

Mr. PARDEE: My hon. friend says hear, hear. The only thing that the minister did was to quote my speech incorrectly. In other respects it is all right. This is what the minister said:

> Well, the leader of the Opposition had scarcely delivered that speech when one of his followers, the member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) made a speech before the Liberal Reform Club in Montreal. He said nothing about the policy of free trade as enunciated by the leader of the Opposition in his St. John speech, and he carefully avoided any reference to the Liberal tariff policy as adopted at the Liberal Convention held in Ottawa during last August. But I must say that I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for West Lambton on that occasion. He said that he was a protectionist; aye, he even went so far as to say how he would fix the tariff.

Both of those assertions are absolutely wrong. I did not say that I was a protectionist.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the hon. member has been incorrectly reported in the press, then, of course, I shall withdraw the statement that I made. But the Montreal Gazette reported the hon. member as saying that he was a protectionist and that he would even go so far to say that, in his opinion, the tariff should be 25 per cent.

Mr. PARDEE: I can quite understand that in the Montreal Gazette and in my hon. friend; the wish is father to the thought. I did not say that I was a protectionist, and if the speech was wrongly reported, I cannot help that.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: You did not say you were in favour of a tariff of 25 per cent?

Mr. PARDEE: I did not. What I said was this: I went on to point out as best I could the condition in which this country was financially. I said that we needed money, and if we needed money we must have a tariff. I said: Supposing you take, merely for the sake of illustration, a tariff of 25 per cent and you split it up 17 per

cent and 8 per cent, 17 per cent as a general tariff and 8 per cent as an excise tax, you would accomplish the purpose. I did not lay down a 25 per cent tariff. Surely my hon. friend would not expect me to say anything of the kind reported in the Gazette.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The newspaper so quoted you.

Mr. PARDEE: That may be, but the newspaper quoted only just so much.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did the hon. gentleman intend 17 per cent to be the average over all the range of imported goods?

Mr. PARDEE: I did not intend that 17 per cent or 8 per cent to be fixed at all; I could have taken 40 per cent or 50 per cent and split it up in the same way. I only gave that figure as an illustration which we could divide into general and excise.

Mr. MEIGHEN: About what figures would the hon. gentleman fix?

Mr. PARDEE: The hon. member will gather that from my remarks before I am through.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not so far.

Mr. PARDEE: Patience is a virtue. I further stated in that speech that I suggested what I did because I did not feel this country was yet ready for a full measure of direct taxation. That is the reason I spoke that way and it is the reason I am speaking that way here to-day. I have pointed out what I hope will be a constructive thought to the minister in raising revenue.

Now let us turn to another phase of this tariff discussion, which is rather illuminating. The woollen textile industry, which has not been touched by this tariff, has a range of duty from 3 cents a pound specific duty to 30 per cent ad valorem, and it has a capital invested of $19,268,202. All these figures are taken from the Statistical Office. Its net profit was $3,578,318, or 18.41 per cent on its capital invested. Unitemized expenses, $1,107,126. The average wage paid to its employees—and I would call the attention of hon. members to this—was $624.04 per annum. The industry employs 2,530 males and 2,489 females, and operates 75 mills. That is a synopsis of the woollen textile industry.

The hosiery and knit goods industry has a capital invested of $31,092,866, and it made a net profit of $7,709,246, or 24.7 per cent. The return shows "unitemized expenses," $1,715,847. What these "unitemized expenses" are is beyond my conception. It has 108 plants, employing 9,000 females and 4,000 males. The average wage paid for 1918 is $516.32 per annum.

The cotton textile industry has a capital invested of $53,796,394, and it made a net profit of $1,344,913, or 25.8 per cent. Again "unitemized expenses," $4,819,860. It operates 26 plants, employing 8,279 males and 7,725 females. It has a protection of 35 per cent. The average wage paid is $538.23.

Now we come to the Canada Cottons, the statement for which was published in the Montreal Herald. The profits in 1917 amounted to $1,126,125, in 1918, $1,563,103, or 19 per cent, and in 1919 to $1,839,443. The surplus in 1919-1920 was $454,585, and their total surplus to-day is $2,683,479. The industry enjoys a duty of 20 to 32½ per cent.

There is one striking thing about these figures, and it is this: Every one of these industries is manufacturing goods which are required by every man, woman and child in this country. The industry enjoys a tremendous protection and is piling up surpluses every year. It pays enormous dividends to its stockholders, but if the figures I have given are correct the employees receive scarcely a living wage under conditions as they are to-day. I have often heard protection held up as the one thing that protects the workingman and gives him good wages, but here we have startling examples of what protection does not do in the way of giving working people a living wage. All these industries have a large protective duty, and it does not strike me that they are now altogether in swaddling clothes. The reason the protection is kept so high is this: The woollen textile industry, for instance, operates 75 mills; the cotton textile industry, 26 plants, and the hosiery and knit goods industry, 108 plants. Many of these plants are up to date, with the newest and best machinery and the best driving power that modern invention can give them. But some of them are weak sisters and have to be supported, and just as long as the weak sister is there, just so long you will find her willing to lean anywhere she can. Therefore it is that the people of this country have to dig down in their pockets and support the weaker plants in order that the whole combination may show a profit. That is the real reason why the duty is kept where it is. It appears to me that is a remarkably good example of what a tremendously high protective duty does—it does not foster enterprises or advancement, but rather retards it.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us the other night at a little dinner that what this country needed was people, and he

never spoke a truer word. I would ask my hon. friend how you are going to get more people in this country if you go on making the high cost of living still higher? Indeed, how are you going to keep those you already have here? Will people come to this country to-day with the high cost of living increased so tremendously by this Budget, and with your franchise law standing as it is? They will not. Now, you must have people in order to make a country great, and I would therefore suggest a different mode of taxation. In Great Britain there is a tax on wealth, a tax on property, a tax on all those surroundings where you find wealth. In Canada you have a tax on people; you have a tax on food, clothes and comforts; you have a tax on the man and his family. It is not right. It is not the way to get people to come to our shores. It is an absolutely fallacious proposition. The two systems of taxation differ as widely as possible. I think the Canadian people might well take a lesson from the British system.

Sir, I hope I fully realize the present position of this country. I know the country needs money; I know that we have to pay our way; I realize the fact that a country for which we sacrificed so much is worth still more sacrifice. But what is the best thing to do? I say again, that you must not drive people who have come to this country, away from the country, and you must not deter from coming those who want to come here. We must make the conditions in this country such that Canada will be a good place to live in. We have tremendous areas in this country which we must fill up with people and get them producing. I say, make a tariff for revenue, not for protection, have it properly adjusted, and I repeat, make the necessaries of life free. In following this course the Government, I humbly submit, would be doing something constructive. Get your money from those who are best able to pay, and thereby reduce the cost of living to the consumer. The manufacturers, I am sure, will be patriotic enough, indeed, they must be patriotic enough, to help pay the debt of the country which has protected them while they have been building up their business. The manufacturer, I am satisfied, will be patriotic enough if the Government is strong and forceful enough to reach him in the right way, and not be entirely subservient to the vested interests of the country.

In conclusion, Sir, I desire to say that I do not believe that the taxes proposed by this Budget will produce results. I think that with the complications and the machinery required to enforce it you will find that the retail stores will have to largely increase their staffs, and if they are put under the necessity of having to pay more money to carry on business what will happen? Once more you will pile on to the consumer something extra which he will have to pay, and I do not think there is any question about that. For instance, apply this to such a firm as the T. Eaton Company. I was speaking to a large departmental store man the other day and he assured me that so far as he could see their staff would have to be largely augmented to carry out the tax provisions imposed by the Minister of Finance. I have no doubt there will be all sorts of evasions of this tax. There will be thimble-rigging in every conceivable way, and although I recognize the great ability of the Minister of Finance, I think it will require a far cleverer head than his if this tax is to be adequately collected. I am speaking with all seriousness. I believe, Sir, from what I can gather, from what I can hear amongst the retail merchants and amongst the people themselves in regard to the tax, that there will be evasions in every way which will largely augment the cost of goods while it brings no return to the treasury. Then if this increase is brought about, it means that once again the consumer will have to go down into his pocket to pay. So far as I can see, Mr. Speaker, this scheme will not, as the Minister of Finance hopes, prevent the abuse of the tariff for the exploitation of the consumer; vastly otherwise will it prove, I think. Nor do I think that it will, in the words of the Minister:

> Safeguard the interests of the Canadian people in the existing world struggle for commercial and industrial supremacy.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. J. F. REID (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, before making the few observations which I propose to offer to the House, I desire to say a word or two with regard to some statements made by hon. members who have spoken before me. I wish to refer briefly to the attitude of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) in his bitter and unjustified attack upon United Grain Growers, Limited, the farmers company of which the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) is president. Some men are born natural leaders and they have the ability to conduct big business. Naturally, people find them out and ap-

point them to the highest positions which they are considered so well qualified to fill. That honour has fallen to the hon. member for Marquette who is to-day the president of one of the largets corporations in Western Canada with a membership of 36,000 or 37,000. Reference was also made by the hon. member for Frontenac to the salary that is paid to the president of this company. Perhaps it would do the hon. member for Frontenac good to know that the salary which is paid to the president of this farmers' company, is paid as a result of the expressed desire of the shareholders of the company that it shall be paid. The hon. member for Frontenac and myself, no doubt, were not born under such a lucky star as we have not achieved that enviable position to which the hon. member for Marquette has climbed. That of course is our loss.

The hon. member (Mr. Edwards) also used very strong words in regard to the character of the United Grain Growers, Limited. He found fault with it for establishing a subsidiary company in a foreign country known as the Grain Growers' Export Company. If those composing the United Grain Growers, Limited is worthy of such a character as that which the hon. member for Frontenac has ascribed, it is surprising that this company has so steadily grown from a very small beginning with an investment of $1,000 away back in the early days, to the position which it occupies to-day, a company which has practically unlimited credit at the bank when it chooses to borrow its millions of dollars to finance its business.

About the establishment of this export grain company in New York, I fail to see what harm is done by forming a grain export company in the land to the south of us to carry on a very profitable business there and to bring home to Canada the profits of that business. Then again Mr. Speaker, in regard to the profits of the parent company, the United Grain Growers, Limited, I would point out that the profits are returned to the farmers who do their business through the company. It is their own business; they produce the grain, they put it through their own company and the profits are turned back to the farmers in the shape of dividends for the most part and in the shape of the commodities and necessities which are used on the farm such as machinery, supplies, binder twine and many other articles which are supplied at as low a rate of profit as possible consistent with good business.

Mr. SMITH: Do they first take it out of the farmers and then refund it?

Mr. J. F. REID (Mackenzie): I fail to catch the point. I have stated plainly that the farmers who produce the grain trust their own company to handle it for them and the profits made from the earnings of the company are returned in dividends and by furnishing to the farmers necessities which are required on the farm at as low a rate as possible consistent with good business. Has my hon. friend any fault to find with that?

Mr. SMITH: In the first place they take it out of the farmer.

Mr. J. F. REID: There is a vast difference between an organization of that kind and joint stock companies, some of which are to-day being swallowed up by a merger. In the United Grain Growers, Limited, there is not one dollar of watered stock. Farmers believe that the only place for watered "stock" is back on the farm and not in a corporation.

I have a word or two to say in reply to the hon. member for St. John city and counties of St. John and Albert (Mr. Elkin). I want to be very careful as there are two members for this constituency. I direct my remarks to the hon. member (Mr. Elkin). I shall read from the Parliamentary Guide of 1919:

ELKIN, STANLEY EDWARD (St. John city and counties of St. John and Albert). B. October 12, 1880, at St. John, N.B.

and so on. Then the biographical sketch proceeds:

A manufacturer. Managing director Maritime Nail Company, Limited; president of Motor Car & Equipment Co.; vice-president Canada Nail & Wire Co.; vice-president Wilson Box Co., all of St. John; president, Rodstan & Co., London, England; director, Union Bank of Canada; was member of Canadian Government Commission to Washington, January, 1918, to formulate policy for war organization in Canada and to study United States war organization; chairman of the Liberal Association for the constituency which he now represents; etc.

When the hon. member entered this House he declared himself a free trader. But what do we find to-day? He is an avowed high protectionist. And he has been admitted into the steel merger—that merger which is known as The British Empire—and the rest. I understand that before admission into that merger the candidate must swallow an antidote, which causes him to lose his personality and to speak, not for himself, but for the merger.

When my hon. friend purchased steel rods from Germany and manufactured them

into nails and sold those nails under a protective tariff, and when he returned his money to Germany to buy more steel rods for the same purpose, was he not sending his money to that country to help the Prussian war lords to manufacture guns and ammunition and poison gas to kill our soldiers when they went overseas to fight for us?

The hon. gentleman finds fault with the United Grain Growers for purchasing agricultural implements in the United States. When he was speaking I wanted to inform him why our organizations were compelled to take that course, but the rules of the House prevented me from doing so then. I wish now to enlighten him. It was not because the United Grain Growers, or rather their board of directors, preferred to buy in a foreign country rather than at home, but because of the fact that our Canadian manufacturers absolutely refused to sell to us, saying, "No, we will not sell to you, you are pirates in the trade." Those "pirates" were compelled to go aroving and to purchase their machinery in the States, where they found that the manufacturers were very glad to get their money, the business being spot cash; and if any harm has been done, this House may judge now who are to blame for the course taken by the United Grain Growers, Limited.

But Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not exactly fair. He said that we tried to so conceal implements of home manufacture that our people would not be able to recognize the Canadian implements which we had for sale. As a matter of fact, Sir, many of our Canadian manufacturers do sell goods to us to-day, for they recognize now that we are not "pirates," but that we are in the trade to stay; and therefore to-day we are selling Canadian-made goods wherever we can procure the right sort at the right price.

I understand that the financial position of my hon. friend (Mr. Elkin) is very much better to-day than it was before the war—my information comes from a direct source—and that he may be justly called a "war lord" or a "war profiteer." And no doubt since he has entered the merger he will be a participant in the $77,000,000 of watered stock that is now being issued by that huge amalgamation. This reminds me of the statement made by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), that before the farmers' organizations accused the manufacturers of reaping undue profits their own hands should be clean. I think it would be well for the hon. member for St. John city to see to it that his hands are clean, but I am of opinion that to get them clean he will have to scrub a long time.

I wish to say a word in passing in reply to the hon. and noble member for Fort William (Mr. Manion). I say "noble" because he enlisted of his own accord as a true Britisher. The hon. and noble member claimed that 48 per cent of our population belongs neither to the manufacturing nor to the agricultural class. In reply to that statement I want to draw his attention to the circumstance that although a large number of our people may not be directly employed in agriculture or in manufacturing, when we look at the tonnage we shall find that our agricultural products form a considerably larger volume than do our manufactured articles. The tonnage of our agricultural products in 1917—and the figures have very much increased since—was 27,000,000 tons; live stock 3,000,000 tons; mine products 37,000,000 tons; forest products 16,000,000 tons; manufactured articles 16,000,000 tons; miscellaneous 8,000,000 tons,—that is, tons of freight traffic moved on our railways. So I claim that this 48 per cent includes many who no doubt are employed in the transportation of agricultural products, while a lesser number, of course, are employed in the transportation of manufactured articles.

The hon. member for Fort William in making his comparisons was very careful not to declare himself either as being in favour of free trade or of protection; he simply gave us some figures. Then he asked the question: How is it that no great power, other than Great Britain, has adopted free trade? Well, an answer to that might be: how is it that during the war Great Britain's allies had to go to Great Britain, which is called a free trade country, in order to procure financial assistance? In fact during the war Great Britain practically financed all her allies.

Then again, the hon. member says let us create home markets for our farm products. Well, I agree that we should endeavour to create home markets for our farm products. But he also told us that eighty per cent of our wheat was exported. How long will it be, Mr. Speaker, before the population of Canada will be so large that it will consume eighty million bushels of wheat? In my opinion, it would take at least fifty million people to consume that quantity of wheat, and when Canada's population reaches that figure the production will still be on the increase. I think the idea embodied in that remark is an absurd one.

The hon. member made reference to the United States as being a country of high protection. When we look into it we find that the following goods are free in the United States but are not free in Canada: binders, reapers and mowers; threshing machines and parts thereof; cultivators, plows, harrows, horse rakes, seed drills, wagons and other agricultural implements; cement, leather, boots and shoes, pegged or wire fastened, other boots and shoes in soles, etc., harness and saddlery. The Government are in the habit of going to the United States for examples in regard to how they may raise their finances. Why do the Government not go to the United States once more for an example? Why do they not say to them: We will put on the free list in Canada all the articles which you put on the free list in the United States? Are we afraid of our American competitors to the south? I do not think so. I know that the farmers of Western Canada are not afraid of any farmer who grows produce on the American continent, and I am further of the opinion that our Canadian mechanics are second to none in the world. If we go to the United States we find Canadians at the head of many of the large institutions there.

Mr. BURNHAM: What is the hon gentleman's opinion on dumping?

Mr. J. F. REID (Mackenzie): I will come to that later. In the United States the average ad valorem rate of duty on all goods dutiable and free in the year 1917 was 8.31 per cent. The average duty collected per capita was $2.11 and the percentage of imports from Canada free of duty was 69.46 per cent. The average ad valorem rate of duty on all goods free and dutiable imported into Canada during 1918 was about 17 per cent. The percentage of imported goods which were free to Canada was only between 43 and 44 per cent. During 1918 we paid duty to the amount of $161,000,000, in round figures, making a per capita tax of $20. Now, let us summarize that:

Percentage of goods imported free into the United States	69.46 per cent
Percentage of goods imported free into Canada	43 "
Duty collected per capita in United States	$2.11
Duty collected per capita in Canada	$20.00

Then, taking the average family of five—the average family of working people would, I believe, be more—and we have the following:

Duty collected from family of five in the United States	$10.55
Duty collected from family of five in Canada	$100.00

There is where the shoe pinches, Mr. Speaker—in the large family. Then, my hon. friend went on to say that living conditions in Germany—I assume he had reference to conditions before the war—were much better than they were in England or in Scotland; I will not mention Ireland. He also told us about two gentlemen who went over there to write books. Now, I have every respect for the journalists and for those who write books, but I myself lived in the Old Country quite a few years ago. I worked with mechanics who came across to Scotland from Germany and I received first-hand information in regard to conditions in Germany. Certainly the men were much better paid in Edinburgh and in Glasgow than they were in Germany, and certainly they lived better; so I consider that my hon. and gallant friend's information was not correct. Surely if conditions were better in Germany than they were in England, these men would not have come there from Germany.

The member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) told us that the capitalization of the railways in Great Britain was very much higher than in this country and that the rate of freight per ton mile was much greater there than in Canada. The figures he gave are as follows:

	Average rate per ton mile.
England	2.31 cents
Germany	1.41 "
France	1.46 "
Austria	1.49 "
United States	0.80 "

Some of the information which I have I got direct from the Railway Department. But I wish to explain briefly the difference between railway conditions in the Old Country and those which prevail here. We have a very long rail haul here. In Great Britain there is a very short rail haul; in fact, ten miles in the Old Country would be a comparatively long haul. My information is that twenty-four miles in Canada is the minimum haul; if you have to ship your carload of freight over a distance of eight miles, the eight mile haul will cost you just as much as a twenty-four mile haul would cost. In fact, one of my neighbours paid at the rate of six cents per ton mile for the hauling of a car of settler's effects eight miles. It would not matter whether or not

the minimum tonnage was in that car; the ful freight rate would have to be paid. Therefore, I think I have made my point clear that the rate on our short haul in Canada is very much higher than the rate on a similar haul in England.

My hon. friend made this remark, which I did not like to hear:

> Before the war the United Kingdom surpassed either Germany or the United States in foreign commerce, but since the war the United States has completely overtaken the United Kingdom.

Any hon. member must know that during the greater part of the war the United States was absolutely at liberty to pursue her industries to the very best of her ability; her industries were not disturbed at all; her commerce was disturbed only by the submarines. She stayed out of the war long enough to get all the loose moneys of the world; so that it is no wonder that to-day Great Britain finds that the United States has surpassed her just a little bit as regards commerce, and the comparison should not have been made.

I wish to make just a few remarks in reply to the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens).

Mr. McMASTER: A little louder, please.

Mr. J. F. REID (Mackenzie): Move down this way. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre made the statement that the poor farmers of the prairies were being robbed by the United Grain Growers, Limited, and a statement made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) to-day was but a repetition of this statement. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre went a little further; he told us that he had lived on the prairies, he did not say how long, but long enough to find out that it took considerable grit to stay on the prairies. We notice that the hon. member had not the grit and so he left the prairies. Evidently he found the Pacific slope a more congenial clime and his associates there more of his own ilk. He found that on the prairies the high protectionists had hardly a place to stand on, but on the Pacific coast they are, I understand, in the majority at the present time. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre is the mouthpiece in this House of certain big interests, a World in Vancouver, a Telegram in Winnipeg and a huge private terminal elevator at the head of the Lakes, and the owners of these are the gentlemen who are pushing our worthy friend forward as their spokesman in this House. He has condemned the action of the Government in appointing a Wheat Board, and for this reason solely: that his associates cannot get into the wheat game with their gambles, and their private elevator is not being well filled. I am very anxious to find out just why the hon. member for Vancouver Centre is championing the cause of the poor farmers, as he chooses to call us, who live on the prairies. There must be some motive behind all this; and while the hon. member was speaking, I tried to read his thoughts, and I have come to the conclusion that I have struck the nail on the head. While the hon. member was speaking, I interrupted him once for this purpose. I wanted to give the hon. member an opportunity of correcting himself as he made a statement which is entirely aside of the facts. The statement that he made when I interrupted him was that he claimed that storage charges are charged on grain when loaded into a box car and on the wheels and in process of transportation. In other words, he claims that after the grain is loaded out of a country elevator into a box car and is in the process of transportation, it still carries storage charges. I defy the hon. member to find in the Canada Grain Act, and from where else does he get his information unless it be from his associates? Further, there are fifteen days' free storage in country elevators, and that includes not only the handling charges and storage charges, but fire insurance charges. Again, at the head of the Lakes, in the terminal elevator, ten days' free storage is given before storage charges begin.

The hon. member also made a bitter attack on the farmers' organization, the United Grain Growers, Limited, for illegally taking grain from the farmers in the shape of overages. "Illegally taking," I interpret as stealing. In other words the hon. member claimed that the United Grain Growers, Limited, with other elevator concerns, were stealing grain from the farmers. Under the Canada Grain Act, as many hon. members in this House know, the operator of a terminal elevator has nothing whatever to do with the weighing of the grain either into or out of a public terminal elevator. A public weighmaster, a Government official, is charged with the duty of weighing the grain in and weighing it out. A Government grain inspector is stationed at Winnipeg; all grain coming through Winnipeg is inspected and the dockage fixed. If needs be, the grain is reinspected at the head of the Lakes while it is being unloaded, and if a wrong dockage has been fixed, that is corrected. Moreover, while the grain is in process of being cleaned in the terminal ele-

vator, that operation is carried on under the supervision of the inspector who puts the correct dockage on it. How then can any hon. member in this House state such a deliberate falsehood?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know that I altogether caught the full purport of the remark of the hon. member because I could not hear him very distinctly, but I hope he is not saying that a statement of an hon. member of this House is a falsehood.

Mr. J. F. REID: I withdraw the statement. I am sorry that the statement made by the hon. member caused me to make this break. I appreciate your ruling, Sir.

Moreover, the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) made a serious charge against the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster).

Speaking in this House on May 20, he said (Hansard 1920, page 2676):

> Not only that; they induced the Minister of Trade and Commerce to make an amendment to the Grain Act which legalized what had up to that time been an illegal act.

Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to complain of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I pass on.

In the western grain trade we have three farmers' organizations doing a very large business. One is the company that has been under fire here for the last few days, the United Grain Growers, Limited, another, which is purely a farmers' organization, is the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevators Limited, and the third, also a farmers' organization, but not of this country, is the Scottish Co-operative Wholesale Society. This latter organization buys millions of bushels of wheat from Canada every year and does business, not with a single eye to making a profit, but to give service to their people, and its policy is to narrow down the margin of profit as closely as is consistent with sound business. Now when these two farmers' organizations of which I have spoken belonging to Canada are doing business right alongside this Scottish Co-operative Wholesale Society, is it possible that we could be such a rotten, corrupt, profiteering company as was stated the other evening by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens)?

I also wish to refer to some statements made the other evening by my good friend from Fraser Valley (Mr. Stacey). He told the House that Washington apples of a low grade were being dumped on the prairies to feed the poor people. He said in effect that this extra duty of 30 cents a box, for it is an extra duty because there was already a tariff on apples, had saved the situation for the British Columbia fruit growers and for the farmers on the prairies, because it gave them a cheap and sure supply of good fruit and prevented the Yankees from flooding our country with apples, putting the British Columbia fruit grower out of business and then raising the price on us. But, Mr. Speaker, the people on the prairies have not found that cheap fruit which the hon. member for Fraser Valley speaks of. We have noticed no reduction in the price of apples, but we have noticed an increase. That is only natural, of course. The British Columbia fruit grower, like the rest of us, is only human, very human. My good friend told us further that he was not talking politics, and I am sure we all believed him. He was talking money. Every box of apples meant an extra 30 cents in his pocket. In speaking of his loyalty to his country and of the huge debt which this country has to bear and pay, he said in effect: I am an old man, but I am prepared to do my share. He took very good care, however, to say in the first place that he required his 30 cents extra a box on apples, and after he got that, he would do his bit and pay his share of the debt. But who pays the 30 cents duty on his box of apples. It is the poor people on the prairies that he speaks of who are being fed on cheap apples from Washington. As I said, his loyalty to his country is based on the condition of 30 cents extra duty on a box of apples. Now let me apply to that the recipe of my hon. friend from Fort William (Mr. Manion), who said the other evening that if a little free trade was good, why not have complete free trade, or as he very aptly put it, as a medical man, if a certain quantity of strychnine and a teaspoonful of brandy was good for the heart, why not a pound of strychnine and a keg of brandy? Then why is my hon. friend from Fraser Valley content with 30 cents a box on apples? Why not make it $5. If one is good, the other would be better. While my good friend was speaking of fruit growing in the Fraser River Valley and of the splendid success the growers were having under protection, I could not help thinking of the poor people who live on the prairies who have hard scratching to get an apple, and I was reminded of that little verse of Burns:

> O wad some power the giftie gie us,
> To see oursels as others see us!
> It wad frae monie a blunder free us,
> And foolish notion.

Now I come to the Budget itself, and I am glad to see the Minister of Finance right opposite me here. It is said that Scotchmen never throw bouquets, and I am not going to throw any. I am just going to talk plain facts. I believe, Sir, that when the present Minister of Finance took office as minister of his department he adopted, with that strong personality of his, an orphan child which nobody else wanted. I say with all due respect that I believe when he came into office he had to handle the most difficult financial situation confronting this country in the last five years, because when he took office the treasury was empty. It was useless to try and borrow money outside of Canada, and the enthusiasm of our own people had waned somewhat. As I heard many of them say "The war is over. We have won our objective. Surely the Government will not want to borrow any more money." So with the treasury empty and no market in which to borrow, the Minister of Finance had to tackle a pretty stiff job. I remember meeting him in Winnipeg last fall when he was starting on his campaign in the West. The building where the meeting was held was cold. Winter had set in very early in the West and snow had come earlier than ever recorded before. A great percentage of the root crop was frozen in, and thousands of acres of heavy crop was snowed in and could not be threshed until the following spring. The dried out areas has suffered a greater loss than ever before in the history of the West. Such a condition of affairs was not encouraging to a man starting out to borrow money. Not only that; the people had pronounced against issuing any more Government bonds exempt from taxation. Then my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was practically compelled to go to a people who, I was going to say were unwilling, but many of whom at any rate were unable, to lend any money. When I saw the hon. gentleman address that meeting in Winnipeg in a cold building in which people were sitting with their overcoats on, I said to a friend who was sitting next me: "What do you think of the prospects? What do you think of this, the first step of the new Finance Minister?" My friend replied: "Well, I wish him luck." After the meeting, as we were going to the hotel, my friend said to me: "Reid, what do you think of the new Minister of Finance?" I said to my brother Scot: "It seems to me that the man who had courage to tackle the job in the first place will come through with this Victory Loan drive." I say, all honour to our worthy Finance Minister; but the position could have been made much easier for him if, when the war was on and huge contracts were being made with excessively large profits accruing from them, and when money was in abundance, his predecessor had taken time by the forelock and secured some of that money. This was not done, however. Nevertheless, I will take off my hat to a man of such courage and of such frankness as I have seen the minister display.

Now, I come to the principle embodied in the Budget. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the principle of income taxation which was introduced by the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) is a principle which is embodied in the platform of the Progressives. I am glad also to observe that the Budget contains the principle of a direct tax on luxuries. I am in hearty accord with that principle of the Budget, Mr. Speaker, and speaking for myself, and I believe for the other members of this little group, this "contemptible little army," I shall be only too glad to see this or any other government embody in their programme every plank of the Farmers' platform. But while the principle is correct, in my opinion, I believe it is wrong in its application. I want the Minister of Finance to understand that I am putting forward my views on matters of finance as an amateur, but I believe that the principle is wrongly applied. I think that the scale of luxuries comes down a little too far, and perhaps it is not sharply enough graduated as it goes up. I think my hon. friend should have had courage enough to go a step further, and I wish he had read carefully the platform of the organized farmers. I should like to see every article which is made in Canada and which enjoys a protective tariff subject to an excise tax, and that excise tax should be graded according to the height of the tariff wall. Just let me read an extract from this little platform of ours:

> That all corporations engaged in the manufacture of products protected by the customs tariff be obliged to publish annually comprehensive and accurate statements of their earnings.
>
> That every claim for tariff protection by any industry should be heard publicly before a special committee of Parliament.

I claim that any corporation in the Dominion of Canada enjoying the benefits of a protective tariff should pay and should be willing to pay an excise duty to the Government, because it is our information—the organized farmers have delved rather carefully into this matter—that under the

protective tariff, before the treasury gets one dollar the manufacturer gets three dollars; and I certainly believe that the excise tax is at least one way of getting part of that three dollars which justly belongs to the Federal Treasury. Furthermore, I believe that all the necessities of life should be on the free list, and the application of that principle would touch the great mass of consumers. Surely no one will condemn a luxury tax if it is not levied on things that are not really luxuries. Those who are able to afford luxuries should be satisfied to pay their share out of the large riches which they have enjoyed freely for many years. We also have another little paragraph in our platform, and I trust hon. members will pardon me for referring so often to that platform. I have a word to say for the disabled soldiers. I have mentioned this matter on the floor of the House before, and if I remember correctly the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), when sitting as chairman of the committee considering the subject of further gratuities to soldiers, made the statement that the Government would employ insurance actuaries to make inquiry into the advisability of establishing a life insurance bureau for returned soldiers. Now, this is the paragraph which I have reference to:

> That provision should be made for insurance at the public expense of unpensioned men who have become undesirable insurance risks while in the service.

I find that a great many soldiers did not carry life insurance before they enlisted, and many of them to-day cannot obtain insurance at any price. Some of them may be able to obtain life insurance, but at rates that are altogether prohibitive. I am still of the opinion that this Government should establish a life insurance bureau for soldiers, and if it were run under proper management it would not involve very much expense to the country. I was told by an eminent physician who had examined many of the soldiers that had been turned down by straight life insurance companies, that a large percentage of these men were quite likely to live to a good old age, but some disability or other prevented them from getting life insurance. I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is the duty of the Government to take some action in this matter.

I come now to the question of railways. The people of Canada to-day own some 22,000 miles of railway, and we do not need to discuss the question whether or not the Government adopted public ownership on principle as being in the interests of the country. At any rate, the matter was thrust upon the Government; there was no other alternative. Now, some people to-day are advocating a sharp increase in railway rates, and I am going to state my position to-night so far as this question is concerned. I for one do not believe that the time is ripe for this Government to permit any increase in railway rates, for reasons which I shall state. All the people of Canada are to blame for the railway muddle which we find ourselves in to-day, and it is my opinion that we have paid too much for our whistle. We have paid too much for the railways which we have had thrust upon us. The next thing that this Government can do, and do as speedily as possible, is to make a physical valuation of the railways in their possession, such valuation to be made by competent railway men and to be made from the operating point of view. Then, depreciate the system to what it is worth and forget the balance. If it is under competent management—and I am not saying one word against the present management—and if that management is divorced from politics entirely you should say to the men in charge of the systems: "We will supply you with the rolling stock and necessary equipments and you must compete." Then, after a thorough trial, if we find that our roads cannot pay under existing rates, it will then be time to raise the rates. I am convinced that in a very few years' time, by a proper amalgamation of all the systems of roads which we now have under our management, they would show a profit and be able to pay their way. I make these remarks for what they may be worth, and I hope that the Minister of Finance will think over them at least.

Immigration must go hand in hand with our railway system. We have been bringing immigrants to Canada and putting them out West. It has been our experience that many of our immigrants had not money to buy land and therefore they had to go back from the railways a distance of twenty or thirty miles. Grain cannot be profitably raised at that distance from a railway. Railway branch lines must follow settlement, and if we are to bring immigrants to Canada and encourage men to go upon the land, we must follow them up with our branch lines of railways so as to put them in a position to ship their products to market. I am convinced that if a proper policy is followed out, if branch lines are built and living conditions are made pleasanter for those who settle upon the prairies

our surplus production of wheat will soon be swelled to the extent of many millions of bushels.

That brings to my mind the Hudson Bay railway. In 1882, when I came to the city of Winnipeg, I had my first experience in a federal election. Placards announced that Captain Scott "Is the man who will build the Hudson Bay railway." From 1882 down to the present time the building of the Hudson Bay railway has been made a political football. I wonder when this Government will finish the few hundred miles of steel that requires to be laid to the Bay. Our worthy Cabinet ministers tell us that the Government is committed to the project, but if they do not hurry up a good deal of the project will not be there when they come to look for it. It is rotting away. It is not finished, although it has been in course of construction now for ten years. Do not think for a minute that the people of the West have forgotten it. I hold in my hand a telegram from the Yorkton Board of Trade. In Yorkton to-day there is a large wholesale centre, and in the Board of Trade they have a good many farmer members. This is the wire they sent me:

March 29, 1920.

The Yorkton Board of Trade has passed the following resolution: Be it resolved that the Yorkton Board of Trade request the Federal Government to issue 20-year bonds to the extent of $5,000,000 for completion of Hudson Bay railroad, which shall include the amount required to complete the gap of sixty-eight miles between the towns of Sturgis and Hudson Bay Junction, to be known as the Hudson Bay main line completion issue, which bonds can be disposed of in Western Canada in a reasonable time after the issue is authorized on the basis of the Victory Loan.

Secretary, J. M. CLARK.

I read that telegram to show the House that the people of the West will not sit down quietly until this road is completed. It is a necessity to-day, and as the years go by the need will become stronger. I wish to give you a few figures on the last increase in freight as it affects the farmer. The recent 15 per cent increase in railway freight rates falls more heavily on the farmer and the rural population than upon any other section of the community. It takes the farmer living in Manitoba an extra $14.50 on every car of wheat—that is quite a chunk; on every car of oats $13.60 extra; on every car of barley $13.40 extra; on every car of flax the same amount. And it gets him again the other way when shipping in his machinery and other things that he must have on his farm. Therefore I claim that this proposed advance should not be made.

[Mr. J. F. Reid.]

With the indulgence of the House I will give a few figures to show how the tariff works out at the present time, and I will take for the purpose of my comparisons the years 1915 and 1920. I shall make my comparisons in dollars and cents, as that is a pretty sure way of knowing what one is doing, whereas percentages sometimes do not mean very much. On a 14-inch gang plough the customs tariff in 1915 was $11.20, to-day it is $13.97; on a disc harrow in 1915 it was $5.03, to-day it is $6.34; on a shoe drill in 1915 it was $17.75, to-day it is $19.40; on a gas engine of 1½ horse-power in 1915 it was $8.80, to-day it is $14.61; on a 5-foot mower in 1915 it was $5.60, to-day it is $9.50; on a wagon in 1915 it was $7, to-day it is $20.25. The percentage on the tariff works out very satisfactorily for the manufacturer, for as the price of the article increases so also does the protective tariff increase, and consequently the users of machinery have no option but to pay not only the increased price, but also the increased tariff.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make reference to an attempt which was recently made to muzzle the press of Canada, particularly the agricultural press. I am reading from the Grain Growers' Guide of March 17 of this year, the article being headed, "Moulding the moulders of public opinion." The originator of the scheme is Mr. G. M. Murray, former general manager of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. The article proceeds:

The plot is as follows: Mr. Murray has organized a bureau—presumably a Moulding Bureau—with himself as the Moulder-in-Chief. The Moulder and his staff are located on the ninth floor of the C.P.R. building in Toronto, close by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association headquarters. Just what is the relationship existing between the Moulding Bureau and the C.M.A. doth not yet appear. But at any rate Mr. Murray has quite a staff in his Moulding Bureau, and they are busy reading and clipping papers from all over Canada.

When the editorial articles have been clipped then they go presumably to the Moulder-in-Chief, himself, Mr. G. M. Murray. According to his contract he classifies them and makes up his "black list" and his "white list." He then sends out his "confidential" report to all the Divine Right protected manufacturers who have paid him $250 per year, or more, to become members of his Moulding Bureau. In his "black list" Mr. Murray, of course, names those newspapers and journals who have dared to lay unholy hands upon the sacred edifice of the Protective Tariff. He then, presumably, advises the manufacturers—who have each paid him $250, or more, to join his Moulding Bureau—that they should withdraw their advertisement from those offending journals.

Mr. Murray calls this scheme "shepherding advertising"—Mr. Murray, of course, being the

Shepherd, and the low tariff press being the lambs to be fleeced. The Grain Growers' Guide was, of course, the most unruly and wayward lamb on the Shepherd's list and was to be plucked without mercy. All these journalistic lambs were to be fleeced of their advertisements until they would eat out of Shepherd Murray's hand and "baa-aa-aa" plaintively to be restored again to favour in the eyes of the Moulder-in-Chief and his battalion of Divine Righter protectionists.

But the tables are turning. The lambs have refused to be docile and have declared unanimously for the freedom of the press. The readers of the Grain Growers' Guide are ready to accept the challenge and are prepared to meet an advertising boycott by refusing to purchase goods from those firms who seek to cripple The Guide. Mr. Murray's plot has failed. He cannot secure a "safe and sane press" by "shepherding advertising patronage." The pitiless white light of publicity has exposed the rottenness of the scheme of this would-be Napoleon of the press. Instead of a bunch of journalistic lambs eating out of his hand he has merely caught a bunch of protectionist manufacturer suckers who have paid him their good money for an utterly worthless service. The press of Canada can never be bludgeoned into submission by any such Prussian methods.

I desire to also put on Hansard the contract sent out by Mr. Murray. It is in this form:

The undersigned hereby employs G. M. Murray for a term of..... ..... commencing .. .. and ending.. .. .. ..

(a) To ascertain by careful and systematic review, and to determine as correctly as he can, the editorial policy of every daily newspaper published in Canada (foreign language papers and papers published in the Yukon territory excepted);

(b) To ascertain by careful and systematic review, and to determine as correctly as he can, the editorial policies of such other Canadian publications as the undersigned may hereafter specify, or as said G. M. Murray may deem it wise in the interest of the undersigned to embrace within the scope of his investigations;

(c) To furnish information on record in his office or obtained within the period covered by this agreement concerning the editorial policy of any Canadian publication upon which the undersigned makes demand in writing for a report;

(d) To furnish without the formality of a demand in writing reports upon the editorial policies of such Canadian publications as, in his judgment, it is in the interest of the undersigned to receive;

(e) To advise, with respect to any Canadian publication (except as aforesaid) carrying advertisements for the undersigned, as to the desirability of continuing, increasing, reducing or discontinuing the space used therein;

(f) To advise, with respect to any Canadian publication not patronized by the undersigned for advertising purposes but apparently suitable therefor, as to the desirability of contracting for space therein;

In consideration of the work to be performed and the service to be rendered the undersigned hereby agrees to pay G M. Murray the sum of.....dollars ($.....) at the commencement of the above-mentioned term.

It is further expressly agreed by the undersigned:

(1) That all information, whether printed, written or verbal, furnished voluntarily or upon demand by G. M. Murray to the undersigned, shall be held in strict confidence, and shall never be revealed to the owners or officers of any publication reported upon, except in such cases and under such restrictions as may be authorized in writing by the said G. M. Murray.

(2) That, while the said G. M. Murray undertakes to exercise good faith, due diligence and care in the performance of the duties herein specified, he does not guarantee the correctness of the information supplied, and shall not be liable in damages to the undersigned in respect thereof.

(3) That the said G. M. Murray reserves the right to terminate this agreement at any time, by refunding to the undersigned the unearned portion of the above-mentioned consideration.

(4) That upon the expiration of the term set forth herein, this agreement may be renewed for a like term by the undersigned again paying to G. M. Murray the above-mentioned consideration, in which event, even though no new agreement shall have been signed, all the conditions embodied herein shall be deemed as continuing in effect.

(5) That the duplicate of this agreement in the undersigned's possession shall be held in strict confidence, and that without the said G. M. Murray's consent, no third party shall either during the currency of this agreement or at any time thereafter be shown the agreement or made aware of its existence or informed directly or indirectly concerning any of its contents.

(6) That upon the termination of this agreement the duplicate of it shall forthwith be returned by the undersigned to the said G. M. Murray.

(7) That the reports and other printed matter or written advices referred to herein shall be deemed to have been satisfactorily delivered by the said G. M. Murray when mailed, postage prepaid, under personal and confidential cover to.. .. .. .

the valuable time of this House and I do not purpose doing so now. I have sat quietly here for the past three sessions, intent upon hearing and if possible absorbing the views of those who have had more experience in the public affairs of this country than it is at all likely I shall ever have. While the hearing has been comparatively easy even at this great distance from the place where the stage is set in this House, and while I have benefited very greatly from the privilege of being here, in distant association with these great men, the process of absorption has been slow and somewhat difficult along some lines. It may be that it is to my discredit, but the fact remains that I find at this time, after all the instruction I have received from prominent members on both sides of the House on the subject of the fiscal policy of this country, the convictions I brought in with me when I first took my seat still hold fast, and, indeed, in some instances have gained strength to such an extent that I feel it my duty—at this most propitious time—when the stress of war is over and the country is rapidly settling down to a normal peace basis—to place my position fairly and squarely before this House and before the people who have placed upon my shoulders the responsibility of representing them here.

In my opinion there have been many considerations in the past that needed careful weighing, and which were of much greater importance from a national standpoint than the possibility of being personally misunderstood, and I have not hesitated in meeting the criticism and even censure of those for whom I have as great respect, and with whom I have more in common, than any other section of the people of this country, for the course I have followed in the past, believing that my actions were in the best interests of the nation, and that I have paid in some slight proportion at least, the debt of gratitude that is due to those hon. gentlemen in the Government who have laboured earnestly and without consideration of self in carrying this country through the grave perils of the last few years. I am satisfied that the future will show that they have done much to make the name of Canada famous, and that their names will be regarded by future generations as monuments to the tenacity and determination of a people who can never in the future be regarded lightly, but always as a power amongst the nations of the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when sentiment must be relegated to the scrap heap, and we must get down to the serious consideration of the issues that face us in a more matter-of-fact manner.

Coming directly to the Budget, for I do not want to delay the House unnecessarily. There is much in the Budget that commends itself to me, and I think should commend itself to the country. The excise tax on luxuries and near luxuries is to be commended as a democratic measure which places the burden where it can easiest be borne. To that I have nothing but words of commendation with this one exception. Would it not have been better to have placed this tax solely upon goods manufactured in Canada in the case of essential articles such as boots and shoes. I am merely using boots and shoes as an illustration and in no way singling them out for special treatment. When you put an excise tax on all boots and shoes selling over a certain figure, the net result may be increased prices to the consumer and the same old condition is perpetuated.

The manufacturer collects his profits, which a great many people in this country believe are very materially enhanced by reason of the tariff, and the real evil of a protective tariff still exists. Only a portion of the money paid by reason of the tariff goes into the treasury and the balance into the pockets of those who manufacture and sell the goods.

On the other hand had the excise tax been placed upon goods of an essential nature having their origin in Canada only, we would have been able to collect the customs tariff on goods of foreign origin at the port of entry, and on Canadian goods by the excise tax. The price at which the foreign goods could be sold in Canada after paying the customs tariff would then have had a stabilizing effect upon the prices to the consumer. It is my opinion also that the application of a real excise tax to many other articles enjoying protection would yield a handsome revenue and would not work any real hardship on any one.

The system of taxation which is perpetuated by this Budget, I do not agree with, and I can tell the hon. minister that it is not satisfactory to the great majority of the people in the portion of the country from which I come no matter to what party they claim allegiance. I would rather have the excise tax as it is suggested than not at all, but I merely wish to point out that the system of levying this tax could be greatly improved upon. As it stands the old system is perpetuated as practised by both the old parties, and this does not

meet the approval of those whom I have the honour to represent.

It was a source of keen disappointment to me to find that no provision is made for placing such indispensible articles in the development of this country as farm machinery and building materials on the free list, or even the lowering of the duty thereon in a substantial manner. I have not heard any plausible argument put forward as to why this should not be done. The only hope we have is a promise of a tariff revision in the future. I remember very distinctly hearing just such a promise made last year, and when called upon to do so, in defending my support of last year's Budget I explained that a tariff revision had been promised and that I considered the Government was entitled to be given the opportunity of laying before the country their tariff policy. I do not wish to be unfair to the Government in this regard. It may be that owing to the necessity of holding an extra session there was not sufficient time to do this work. But there surely was time to start it. This has not been done. What am I to tell these good people now? The only thing I could say is that a new minister has made the promise this year and I am trying him out to see if he will keep his promise better than his predecessor. I have no intention of taking any such stand. It will take more than promises of future blessings to procure my support to Budgets in the future.

Even when the time comes and the tariff is revised. After listening to the discussion that has taken place during this debate, have we who do not believe in the principle of a protective tariff as practised in the past, any reason to suppose for one moment that there will be any downward revision or any change in the system of collecting the revenues accruing therefrom? I think not.

Never have I seen such an acrobatic display as we have witnessed here in the last few days, on any other stage in the country. Members on both sides of the House have apparently been vieing with each other in vaulting gracefully and otherwise from one side to the other of the lines of thought on the fiscal policy. I am not offering any criticism of these hon. members. They have a perfect right to align themselves with the forces they believe will further to the greatest extent the interests of those whom they represent, always keeping in mind the welfare of the country as a whole, and I accept their action as being sincere. I ask them to extend to me the same consideration.

An hon. member told us during the Budget debate of last session that we had at that time reached the parting of the ways. I did not agree with him then but I do believe that we have reached the cross-roads now, and I am sure that the changes of front that we have seen recently will prove that I am right in my conclusion.

I stated at the outset that I wanted to place my position fairly and squarely before this House. I stand four-square behind the tariff principles contained in the Farmers' platform.

To those who have seen fit to go to great pains to berate the farmers' activities, more particularly in the West, I have this to say: I am a farmer. I do not draw one cent of income from any other source except that eminating from the farm. I am a life member of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, a shareholder in the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company, and this may be of more interest to my hon. friends,—I am a subscriber to the Farmers' Political Campaign Fund and heartily support the principle of raising campaign funds in this manner.

If these hon. gentlemen think that they have brought a blush of shame to my face by their efforts to show that there is something nationally wrong with my position as I have stated it, they are far wide of the mark. I consider myself just as true and just as loyal a Canadian as there is in this House, and they have only convinced me the more thoroughly that there is still abundant reason for the farmers continuing their efforts which were commenced when conditions were perhaps, more objectionable than they are to-day.

I do not wish to pre-judge, but I cannot see how I can support the tariff policy that any person must see will eventually be adopted by this party. An hon. minister has told us that it is upon the fiscal policy that political thought divides. I accept this as a statement of fact. I was elected to support this Government during the period of the war and demobilization. I have fulfilled my contract to the fullest extent and must now choose my path for the future.

I therefore purpose voting for the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, not because I think there is anything material in the amendment, but because I understand according to the rules of the House no other amendment can be moved and I have no choice in the matter.

Mr. Best and Mr. Rinfret having risen at the same time:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: According to long-established custom the Speaker should give the preference alternately to members on opposite sides of the Chamber. I must therefore recognize the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret), but will see the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best) next, if he then rises and desires to speak.

Mr. FERNAND RINFRET (St. James): Mr. Speaker, there is always a certain sentiment of restraint in the mind of a new member who rises to address the House, especially on such an important matter as the Budget. But if I correctly understand the duties incumbent upon every one of us, whether still privileged by youth or already touched by the heavy hand of age, we do not speak as individuals; we speak for our constituents, and as such it is in a spirit of confidence and determination that I offer these few remarks. Moreover, I claim a privilege which but a few on either side of the House can claim, a privilege which the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) wanted to extend to all hon. members, but which the Government has so far refused with much persistency—I hold a fresh mandate from my people.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That means something.

Mr. RINFRET: Events have occurred so fast in the last decade that the mind of the people has been in a constant state of unrest and evolution, and I contend that there has been no real consultation of the people since 1911, nearly ten years ago, or twice the extreme limit that the constitution calls for. There was, it is true, a sham election in 1917, directed along certain lines and governed by an Act which, for the sake of decency, its authors are presently seeking to replace by another. I shall not recall the restrictions which made of the right to vote in that nefarious instance a privilege based on political favour. I shall not even remind you of the code facilities with which certain ministers could direct the vote through the proper channels of party utilization. The election in itself was based on such a flagrant prejudice that it alone demurred from it any authority. I shall not go over that period except to the extent of saying that the election gave no real indication of the popular sentiment of this country. The whole country was befogged by a dense, opaque mist of misunderstanding. I will admit that some of it may have developed in the fight, but I think it is about time that the dim veil was dissolved so that the country might appear again to our eyes in its true colours. I say this Government has no mandate to conduct the affairs of this country. It was formed out of the fragments of either party linked together by motives which, even if they were sincere, have long since disappeared. It was endorsed by a panic-stricken and prejudiced-fed people. It has since been deserted by some of its foremost members and it cannot find public endorsation for new ministers to take their place. Let us look at the Government as we find it to-day. We find the Minister of Railways and Canals, not satisfied with losing $50,000,000 a year in that capacity, entrusted with $30,000,000 more as Minister of Public Works. We find the Acting Solicitor General occasionally forgetting all about legal matters and invading the Department of Militia. We find the President of the Privy Council, in utter disregard of his own political health, entrusted with the public health of the country. We have the Postmaster General sitting in the Senate. I understand I am not allowed to make any comment on an honourable senator, and therefore I shall summarize my comment in a single phrase, which in itself is very eloquent. The Postmaster General sits in the Senate. And we know why. The Minister of Labour also sits in the Senate, and when the workingmen of this country want to have their claims heard they must voice them within the walls of the autocratic Chamber. This Government has no mandate, but it has received partial intimations which, even to the mind of the most erratic and illogical computer, could convey only one meaning. This Government has been forced to consult the people partially, and what has been the result in practically every case? I have here a list of the recent by-elections. The Liberals have won the counties of Prince, of Quebec East, of Kamouraska, and of St. James. These constituencies were won either by acclamation or by the largest majorities that have ever been recorded in these divisions. While we were doing that, the Government has only been able to win in Kingston and in Victoria. It has lost seats in Glengarry-Stormont, in Assiniboia, in Carleton, N.B., in North Ontario and in Timiskaming. Altogether, out of the eleven by-elections, this Government has only won two, and on that basis if they had to go before the people of this country to-day they would carry only 30 seats in the whole Dominion. One can hardly be surprised therefore to find in the ranks of the people that spirit of distrust

and unrest which is so apparent everywhere, and which no doubt my hon. friends who have been recently elected have found on their way here. It is no longer a choice between policies and party affiliations as in days of yore. In many parts of the country there is a general lack of faith in public men, which this coalition of 1917 has developed to its utmost limit. It has given rise to a new party, which has invaded even this House to a marked extent. We have to deal to-day with a class party, as we had to deal with race prejudice in 1917. This new party has won the Ontario provincial elections, where the Liberal party has been temporarily weakened through the capricious stunts and somersaults of some of its former leaders. This party has also won some federal by-elections and made strong efforts in other constituencies, such as my own, where a straight Government candidate would not have polled a hundred votes. What is the meaning of this new venture in the political field? It means only this: That wherever Unionism has flourished the people have lost confidence in both wings of the coalition, and if this Opposition is going strong and is full of life and promise, it is to the extent and in the measure that it has fought this Government from the very start.

As for my friends the farmers and labour men, I fully share what has been said about them by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). He expressed the opinion that they would best attain success, and at the same time ensure the welfare of the country, not by isolation, but by co-operation, and in full conformity with the very status of this Dominion I venture to say that the next government will not be a government for privileged classes, such as this one, or a government for any specified group, but it will be truly and simply a confederation of classes.

Mr. Speaker, the people do not suffer only from lack of faith in public men. They also feel in their purse, nay, in their very flesh, the sharp and burning sting of bad administration. So much has been said about the high cost of living that one shrinks from the prospect of hearing more. Yet it is a question ever present to the mind of every one, and like the spectre which followed the hero of the legend, it stares, flashes, and glares, at every corner of the household. It is felt most incisively at the very hour of rising, when the consumer is reminded by every bit of clothing he puts on of the heavy cost of linens and woollens, when his $12 pair of boots weight and rivet his feet like cannon balls. It is felt at the breakfast table, where under the eyes of the family every dish opens up like a book telling the sad story. It is told everywhere, in the street, behind the show windows, and in the office. And the worst feature of it is that the cost has increased not only during the war but has kept on increasing since the war is over. I have here a few figures compiled by the Department of Labour, which I shall have to trust, I suppose, giving an average family budget in sixty cities of the Dominion. Here are the figures: $15.98 in March 1920, $15.77 in February 1920, $13.07 in March 1919, $7.68 in March 1914. As you will see, Mr. Speaker, not only has the cost of living doubled during the war, which would not be abnormal, but it has increased since 1919, and it is increasing monthly. I do not wish to go into this question fully because it has already been dealt with pretty exhaustively, and I think it is up to the Government to stop the speeches and the evil at the same time.

There are many causes of the high cost of living. Some, like the war, are inevitable and need not be demonstrated. But I claim that the war has served as a pretext for much profiteering and speculation. When it comes to placing the blame, some people blame the farmer and some the labour man. Personally, I would not lay the blame at the door of either. I consider that the farmer who rises with the sun and who works all day is not a profiteer. He is a producer of wealth. He produces the very essentials to the life of the country and I consider that he derives a rather slim profit in view of the amount of beneficent work he accomplishes. He may be taught to contribute a little more to the public treasury, but he is inclined to leave the brunt of the burden to the city people. On the whole, Sir, I do not take much stock in the criticisms which are levelled at the farmer and the blame which is ascribed to him for the alleged fact that he receives too high prices for his products. Nor do I consider the labour man a profiteer. The labourer who has to face hard times and meet with a cheering smile the hungry members of his family is no profiteer. We hear sometimes the statement that we should pay the labourers higher wages and have them do more work. Well, Sir, I contend that eight hours a day on the part of the labourer is an ample contribution of work to the service of the community. It divides the day into three parts; eight hours for work, eight hours for sleep, and eight hours for meals, recreation and social inter-

course; and I think that a man who has worked consistently and with all his energy for eight hours of the day is entitled to spend a fair proportion of his time in the bosom of his family, so that he may be able to cheer them up and to enjoy a happy and comfortable life himself. The days are gone when a thousand men, slaves, have had to work for the pleasure and the extravagances of a single individual. I am a very strong believer in the eight-hour day policy. It has been adopted in most civilized countries, and I repeat that when a man has contributed eight hours of his day to the service of his fellowmen he is entitled to adequate remuneration and sufficient leisure time. Moreover, I do not think that the increase in wages counts very much in the general increase in the cost of living. I have before me a report of the American Railroad Brotherhood prepared by Mr. W. J. Lauck. I should like very much indeed, Mr. Speaker, to cite from the report of the Board of Commerce established by this Government, but so far we have had only one report from that board and that was in reference to the resignation of its chairman, Mr. Justice Robson.

Mr. BUREAU: Justifying the high cost of sugar?

Mr. RINFRET: As I have not that report I must be content with quoting from the report of the organization which I have just mentioned. I shall quote only a few lines, because I do not believe in the practice of reading long documents:

> Of the extraordinary increase in the price of sugar now amounting to 300 per cent, the study says, the increase in labour cost paid by the consumer was less than 15 per cent. . . .
>
> In the meat packing industry, where profits were said to have increased between 300 and 400 per cent, the labour item was shown so small that a wage increase of 100 per cent would add less than five per cent to the total cost of the meat. . . .
>
> Profits absorb approximately one-half the retail price of certain kinds of cloth, the report declared, while the labour item amounts to from one-fourteenth to one-twentieth of the price.

I shall not read any further. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers and the labour men are legitimate factors in the determination of prices, and the real profiteer is the man who stands between them, the middleman, the agent, the commission broker who produces nothing yet sells everything; who buys butter, eggs and vegetables from the farm and sells them back at exorbitant profits to the city people. In the transfer of produce from the place of production to the spot of consumption you have the whole process of profiteering. And the remedy must be applied at the source of the evil. In these days, from the moment when an egg is laid by a good-willing hen to the moment this highly essential and venerable product appears in the china cup before the consumer, it has travelled such a long way that it has increased as much in price as it has lost in freshness. It is brought from the farm in a state of innocence. It is put into a box and placed on board train; then from the train it is taken to a cold storage, where it lies in long confinement and meditation. Later on it pays a visit to a wholesale house and is handled by quite a number of agents. Then it spends a few days in the shop of the retailer at the street corner. Finally, after this extended tour, full of age and wisdom, it dies a natural death on the plate of the consumer. How many people, Mr. Speaker, from the poultry yard to the breakfast table, have handled this product and, thereby increased its cost? There, Mr. Speaker, you have the whole question, if I dare say, in an egg shell. The high cost of these articles is due to useless manipulation and criminal abuse of cold storages, and it is just there that the Government should intervene. Let me say a few words in regard to cold storages. It is a well known fact that cold storage owners prefer to allow thousands of pounds of meat to perish rather than have the market flooded for fear that poor people might be able to obtain food at reasonable prices. These institutions were designed pre-eminently to store goods so that in the bad season they could be sold at cheap prices, but they have served the very opposite purpose. They have not been utilized as refrigerators for the food of the people but they have been nothing but closed vaults to aid in speculation. This Government should see that these cold storages are properly controlled as has been done in other countries. The Liberal party in the convention of August last saw to that point and placed in its programme a resolution from which I beg to quote the following paragraph:

> With the object of reducing the high cost of living by eliminating as far as possible the waste and expense in handling food products between the producer and the consumer, it is expedient to extend the principle and system of Canadian Government elevators, and to provide interior and terminal cold storage warehouses equipped for the assembling, assorting, etc., of food.

I will quote no further. The Government says that the people should economize. I think, Sir, that by these new taxes they

are introducing it will be very hard for the people to economize, because they will have no money left. I think that economy is akin to charity in this respect, that it ought to begin at home, and I would therefore ask the Government to economize. The Government, however, have brought down a Budget that shows us a sum of $550,000,000 which, they admit, they have revenue to cover only to the extent of two-thirds of that amount. Yet in the opening of the session in the Speech from the Throne this House was informed:

> It is satisfactory to know that business in Canada has been well maintained, that production has been large, and that general conditions are on the whole satisfactory.

This is the kind of satisfaction that the Government has to offer the Canadian people. I do not wish to dwell at any length on the Budget, but I cannot but deplore the fact that the Government not only has been unable to relieve, but it has added very greatly, to the already heavy burden which the poor consumer such as the low salaried men, the clerks and labour men now have to bear. Not only does the Government not relieve that class of people, but they add to their burden. The Government say that they are going to tax luxuries. Well, that reminds me of the statement of an economist who claimed that there were only three things which were essential to human life, namely, a glass of water, a loaf of bread and a blanket. I think the Minister of Finance must have consulted that economist when framing his Budget, because he has taxed pretty nearly everything but water, bread and blankets.

An hon. MEMBER: He has taxed the blankets too.

Mr. RINFRET: Possibly he has; that only makes my argument the stronger.

Mr. BUREAU: And they are taxing the bread too through the Wheat Board.

Mr. RINFRET: As to these taxes, Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to visit my division during the holidays. That division happens to be an important one, and the fact that I am about to state may possibly not surprise the Government. Probably they expected it; if they did they have not been disappointed. These taxes are damned by every one, both by the merchants and by the purchasers. I could say much about these taxes but I will limit myself to a few words. It has been shown that these taxes will create a lot of confusion. I said a moment ago that the Government taxed pretty nearly everything. That was a mistake. There are some oddities in this new taxation that the Minister of Finance has brought in. For instance, I do not know why it is that the Minister of Finance is taxing umbrellas when he is not taxing canes. I suppose he would want to lay a burden on the man who is putting something aside for a rainy day. The Government is taxing glassware but it is not taxing china. You may not drink—I shall not say wine because wine is not to be touched these days—but you may not drink water in a piece of cut glassware because you will be taxed but if you choose to drink it in the highest grade of Dresden, Saxony and Limoges ware you will be beyond the reach of the tax. Why the minister has done that no one can possibly know.

Mr. BUREAU: For pink teas.

Mr. RINFRET: I will accept the word of my hon. friend. It has already been shown that this tax will lead to fraud. I know there are stores—I will not admit they are in my own division—where they have already started imposing a tax on every line of goods no matter what the price may be. I also predict that before many months it will be practically impossible to buy a hat below $5 or a pair of shoes below $9 or a suit of clothes below $45 because the inducement that is given by this system of taxation will be so great that merchants will increase even low grade merchandise to the prices fixed by the Government.

With regard to the luxury tax, I might quote the Montreal Gazette which stated not later than this morning that it considered that the Government had fixed the limit of price on clothes at too low an amount. The Gazette says:

> He draws the taxation on clothing at the line not of luxury, but of necessity. It is not extravagance to-day to pay $45 for a suit of clothes, or $9 for a pair of boots.

With that I thoroughly agree. But there is also a general feeling that these taxes are altogether unfair. I will give an example that was pointed out to me of how it will affect the druggists. It relates to patent medicines. These medicines will be subject to four different taxes if they contain alcohol. They will first have to pay $2 per gallon on alcohol; they will then have to pay one per cent on the wholesale price; they will then have to pay for the stamps which must be affixed to the bottles and finally they will have to pay for the 30 per cent tax on patent medicines. The

Ottawa Journal refers to this point. I shall not quote from my own paper or from Liberal papers but I am going to quote the Ottawa Journal. It says:

Further consideration might well be given by the Government to this heavy tax on what has become a necessity in many families unable to bear it. Doubtless a remedy for pain or discomfort is a luxury to the sick, but it is hardly the kind of luxury that the public treasury should profit from. Besides which, the proposed tax is unfair because it hits only the liquid medicines.

There is another point about this tax upon which merchants and the public at large feel very keenly and that is that the tax should be imposed not on the full amount but only on the excess of the amount over what the Government has determined. The other day, when my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) made a speech, he claimed that in the United States this tax on luxuries was charged only on the excess. He was contradicted by some hon. member on the other side of the House who wanted to wager a hat that he was wrong. I am afraid my hon. friend will have to pick up the hat and I will quote from the United States revenue law as approved on February 24, 1919. It reads thus:

Sec. 904 (a) That on and after May 1, 1919, there shall be levied, assessed, collected and paid a tax equivalent to 10 per centum of so much of the amount paid for any of the following articles, as in excess of the price hereinafter specified as to each such article, when such article is sold by or for a dealer or his estate on or after such date for consumption or use.

This makes the case very clear that the United States charge the tax only on the excess and not on the full amount; so that my hon. friend from Brome was altogether right and he is entitled to receive the hat from my hon. friend on the other side.

But there is something more to be said about this tax. The Minister of Finance himself has no idea what will be the result of the tax. Speaking to the Montreal Gazette on the 21st May he said:

"There will, no doubt, be some confusion for a time," Sir Henry Drayton, Minister of Finance, remarked to-day, "but that is inevitable with any new methods of taxation. When the system begins to operate it will be found to work smoothly."

Let us hope that it will prove true.

The luxury taxes will accomplish one of two things—either they will provide revenue or they will bring down prices. Revenue is needed, but if the cost of living is reduced, we shall feel that the luxury tax has equally accomplished its purpose.

[Mr. Rinfret.]

That is what the Minister of Finance says. Just imagine if you were to go to a physician and he were to give you a bottle and say: "This may be good for your appetite, or it may be good for your stomach, or it may clear your liver or possibly you may use it as an ointment; at least try it any way; it will do you no harm." That is exactly the stand taken by the Minister of Finance. But I will say to the Minister of Finance that there is another alternative that he has not foreseen in connection with this system. It may reduce the cost of living, it may produce revenue; but it may also lessen trade, as the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has said and it may put out of business quite a number of a certain class of retailers who will not be able to go on with their trade with this tax imposed on the special lines of goods which they are at present selling.

But the Government says that it needs revenue. It needs $50,000,000 a year for railways. But because it has seen fit to buy some railways, I think it is rather hard to impose taxes on everything our people wear because the Government blundered in that particular instance. The Government also needs revenue because at this time when we boast that we are done with militarism the Government is still spending $12,000,000 a year on the Militia, which is many millions more than we thought of spending before the war and when we were preparing for it. The Government also needs revenue because in previous years it offered war loans to the extent of $1,380,000,000 free of taxation. I do not wish to be personal, but I will give an illustration in a general way of how this tax exemption works out. Suppose that a multi-millionaire—and I think it actually took place—invested $1,000,000 in those war loans, bringing him an income of $55,000 a year, for which investment at the time he would be praised for his "patriotism"; that income of $55,000 should have been more than cut in half and I suppose at least $30,000 should have gone into the public treasury in the form of income tax, but as a result of exempting those war loans from taxation that patriotic gentleman has made an investment against the public interest to the extent of some $30,000 a year.

But there is this further feature to be considered, Mr. Speaker. We are paying interest on a huge war debt, and if we look at it closely we shall find that this war debt not only comprises the expenses of the war proper, but it also comprises the huge profits which were made by some friends of the

Government during the war; in other words, we are paying interest on the large profits made by the friends of this Government, and those profits have been stored away safely in those tax-free war loans. Which means that to-day we are paying the interest on a large portion of those war profits; and while those privileged beings, friends of the Government, are in full enjoyment of their revenue, the Government is forced to tax the common people and to maintain a high tariff.

Naturally during this debate much has been said about the tariff, and reference has been made to the division which I represent. Before I come to that point, I would like to answer a question put by hon. gentlemen opposite who have occasionally asked us: What would you do if you were in our place? Well, we would be placed in the position of a tenant who enters a house that has been badly kept for a number of years. We would probably have to spend some money in papering the walls, repairing the floors, and possibly in fumigating some of the rooms. But should we enter that house, we would see to the fullest extent possible that the damages were paid for by the people who had caused the damage before we proceeded to administer the affairs of the country.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne)—who is not in his seat now—said that the election of St. James was waged and won on protection. I have Hansard before me, and I will read a passage of his speech, because it sounds so new to me. He said:

> My genial and astute friend, the member for Beauce (Mr. Béland)—

whenever there is a compliment paid to some hon. member on this side of this House we may be sure of what is going to follow.

> —who was doing all he could to elect the hon. member—

that is myself, and I feel much obliged to the member for Beauce.

> —who now represents that great division in this House (Mr. Rinfret)—

you will notice, Sir, how my hon. friend was full of compliments before he reached his point.

> —also made a very strong protectionist speech.

I will not take issue with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has not been better informed on this election. As will be remembered, there was no straight Government candidate in the division, and therefore the information that my hon. friend was able to collect was naturally from a most indirect source. But if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is under the impression that the St. James election was won on a platform of protection, I must inform him that he is labouring under a delusion.

Last night the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) gave us a most spectacular performance; he was speaking behind heaps of books and documents, and during the course of his speech he culled extracts from those books and documents as a busy bee would gather honey from a bed of flowers. And he also was very free in putting questions to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) until the latter could stand it no longer and left the Chamber. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister was perfectly aware that we could not reply to his questions. He knows the rules of the House very well, and even if he had forgotten about them I know that the Chair would at once have recalled them. But he kept on putting questions to this side of the House and then looking to his supporters as if to pick applause from their very eyes, and again turning to us and saying, "The hon. gentlemen cannot answer my questions." But the hon. minister knew all the time that we were precluded from answering him. Unfortunately he is not in his seat now, but if he were I would have felt like putting a few questions to him in turn. Of course, possibly I would not care for a reply, possibly I would like to put to his very lips the same chalice that he wanted us to drink from last night. But just the same I might have asked him why, after spending two hours in the afternoon to demonstrate that free trade has been a failure in England, and that the people there are gradually coming back to protection, he found it necessary to spend two more hours in the evening—and to what purpose, Mr. Speaker?—to show that this Government has on some items lowered the tariff even below the reciprocity point! And yet the hon. minister would put questions to us and look at us staringly as if he had silenced us forever.

I would like to ask what the hon. gentleman was arguing about all yesterday afternoon and last night; was he arguing protection, or was he arguing for a lower tariff? I think he was arguing both, Sir. It seemed to me that he could cut his speech in two, and send the afternoon part about protection coming back into favour

in England to his friends at Toronto—if he has any left there; and the other part where he demonstrated that this Government has lowered the tariff even lower than reciprocity called for he might send to his western friends. And after the hon. minister had made those two demonstrations in one day, it will be remembered that he concluded by admonishing us always to be consistent when dealing with fiscal policy!

As to the St. James election, I desire to be very emphatic in stating that at every meeting we held we stood for a lowering of the tariff on food, we stood for the very principle that is embodied in the resolution of the Liberal party that was adopted in August last, and which was read on many occasions by various speagers during the campaign; and also for the principle embodied, for although less specific it is the same principle, in the amendment proposed the other day by my hon. friend for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding).

My hon. friends opposite say that we are receding from former policies; that we are not consistent in the matter of fiscal policies. If this were a free trade country, I could quite understand hon. members opposite saying that in such an amendment as we are now supporting we were drawing backwards. But for a number of years we have had to deal with a high protective tariff. Everybody knows, even those, I think, who argue to the contrary, that to step from that high tariff to plain, absolute free trade would be national suicide. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is indicated by the very processes of nature itself. When a man's limb has been bitten by frost and you wish to restore it to its natural warmth, you do not expose it at once to the heat of an oven or a fire; but, lest you would lose it, you friction it with snow so that life and blood will gradually return to the inert limb. That is what we are trying to do. We have to-day a cold and inert tariff. We all understand that, having regard to the welfare of the country, it would be a great mistake to expose it once to the open air. We wish to take a cautious, a prudent, a gradual step. The Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen) made a pathetic appeal to me yesterday to support the Budget because I had promised that to my electors. I am full aware of my responsibility, Mr. Speaker, as a public man, and I say that when I do vote for the amendment brought down by the member for Shelburne and Queen's I will fully meet the views of the whole electorate of St. James, because the labour man who opposed me also stood for a moderate tariff.

There are other points that one would feel like touching upon, but I do not wish to overburden this House with speech. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), speaking of customs valuations, complained that the Government were having the goods valued on the basis of the nominal value of foreign money and were not taking into consideration the current rate of exchange. This is a very special matter upon which I have some documentation, and I think it would be better to leave it over; probably there will be an opportunity later in the session, or when we take up these resolutions in committee, to deal with it.

But before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, there is a matter which I do not wish to treat at any length, but to which I would allude. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) said this afternoon that we should have in this country a little more team play, and, probably to illustrate the thought that he had in his mind, he began and ended his speech with a few words in French. Now, Mr. Speaker, I too think that we should have a little more team play, and I would like to allude to that as a conclusion.

As a newly-elected member, fresh from my constituents, I would like to voice their feelings in this House and to express most sincerely the intense desire of my province for a good understanding with the English-speaking citizens of our country. This may not be a matter exactly relevant to the Budget, but I think it is closely connected with the general welfare of the country. During the war the province of Quebec was lamentably misrepresented, because people failed to understand the mentality of the French Canadians; they attributed to enmity and to lack of loyalty and courage what was really a most normal and most explicable state of mind. This, of course, is a dead issue and I do not desire to revise it. But I may be permitted to rejoice in the fact that since the conclusion of the war a better account of my province is given in the press of the country, because in these times of stress and social strife the proper mentality of the French Canadian is better understood; the so-called "Quebec apathy" appears in its real significance and is properly branded as moderation, steadiness and love of the land. When the strikers in Winnipeg were hanging a thundering cloud over that western city; when Ontario cities—aye, Mr. Speaker, even the pure and holy Toronto—were threatening rebellion, the good old province of Quebec still re-

mained draped in its robe of quietness and peaceful stability. And the Montreal Star was well able to say:

> If a red wave of Bolshevism should sweep from overseas, as some people fear, it would shatter itself upon Quebec's stability as the Atlantic surges are shattered on the Gaspé cliffs.

I do say, Mr. Speaker—and I wish my hon. friends would well digest my words—that no province is more tolerant, more desirous for peace and harmony, than the province of Quebec. All that we demand—and it is treatment meted out to minorities within our borders—is a clear recognition of our rights; that is in full conformity with the British spirit all over the world. Wherever the true British spirit has prevailed it has preserved the essentials of the nationalities over which it has presided; and that is the spirit that we wish to see flourish in Canada. The Confederation pact conferred on the two great Canadian races certain rights as to their schools, their language and their institutions. I again say, let us live not according to the letter, but according to the spirit of that pact. The letter of the law is cold, lifeless, and leads to much misunderstanding. As the dramatist says:

> What damned error but some sober brow
> Will bless it and approve it with a text?

But the spirit of the law is warm, peace-breathing, life-giving; and whenever these questions arise as to school or language, let us stand not by the cold interpretation, or, rather, falsification of the text, but by that high spiritual motive which animates the words and gives them their true light.

Again I deplore that this Budget is bringing nothing in the way of relief to the consumer from the heavy burden that he is now bearing, and that it has to admit such a lamentable situation so far as the condition of our financial affairs is concerned. The Government say that the country as a whole is prosperous and that the people are satisfied. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the kind of prosperity and satisfaction that the Canadian people are asking for and that they are entitled to? The Canadian people want prosperity, not a prosperity locked up in vaults, bank safes and cold storages, but a prosperity that will flow like the rays of the sun on every humble citizen of this Dominion. The Canadian people want peace—not a peace written in books or laws, enclosed in cryptograms which only few can decipher, but a peace that will live, that will rise and blossom in the hearts of every one. That peace, that prosperity, the present Government have failed lamentably to bring about. They have had to face hard times and grave difficulties, but they have met them with a weak mind, an empty heart and a false purpose. And the Canadian people are longing for the time when it will be given them to elect new representatives and to choose a Government for this country more worthy of its great destiny and the gravity of the hour.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, if it is not out of place, might I be permitted to observe—and I think I am voicing the opinion of hon. members on this side of the House—that there has been a distinct addition to the debating talent of this House by reason of the election for the constituency of St. James, of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Rinfret). I do not think that I can say that everybody agrees with all that he has said, but I desire to make these remarks, because my hon. friend and myself have been companions in arms in the past and I have a very friendly feeling towards him and I knew that if he ever came into this House, he would be able to hold his own in debate. I desired to pay this tribute to-night before commencing to make the remarks I intend to offer on the Budget.

First of all, I am going to pay this tribute to the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), that he was at least heroic and courageous in the Budget which he introduced, and I am not going to offer any serious objections to his taxation proposals, because I am one who, I think, during the time I have been in this House, has consistently advocated the removal of certain forms of taxation. But I realized all along that if I advocated those things and they came about, we had to introduce another form of taxation, and that form of taxation had to be direct. I might criticise the expenditure that has been made by this Government and the previous Government. I might say that this Government is not practising economy as it should practise it; but I must realize this fact that Canada to-day has very heavy financial obligations, and it is the duty of Canada to meet those obligations, and the duty of this Parliament in some form or other to adopt means of taxtion that will raise the necessary money for that purpose.

During the war I think we should have imposed greater taxation upon the people, because I feel that many people, during that period, were better able to pay taxes to this country than some of them are at the present time. If we had done that, we

might have been able to face the period after the commencement of peace with a much smaller debt than we have now. At any rate these proposals have been made for the purpose of meeting our financial obligations, and as long as the money that is raised by this taxation goes toward that purpose, I am prepared to support that taxation, although I must confess that I agree with some of the criticisms which have been offered, that in some instances, at any rate, these proposals do not hit at luxuries but at actual necessities. But where these taxes hit at actual luxuries, I am in favour of them and am prepared to defend them.

All of us, I suppose, cry for economy in the administration of the affairs of the country, but I find that most of us contradict ourselves by frequently placing before the Government claims for the expenditure of money. It is our duty at this time to demand only absolutely necessary expenditure upon those things that will be helpful to the development of this Dominion, and we should refrain from expenditures upon what we can safely call unnecessary things.

It is not my intention to make a lengthy speech, but I feel it is my duty as a member of this House to state clearly and distinctly my views on the tariff proposals contained in the Budget. I am quite in accord with the attitude the Government have taken in removing the war taxes. The more of these taxes they remove, the more I shall be inclined to favour the Government; but at the same time I feel I am standing to-night at the parting of the ways as regards my views in connection with the tariff, and I want to give my reasons for my stand along that line. Ever since I came into this House I have been a supporter of a low tariff; I have never at any time advocated free trade; nor have I at any time advocated moderate protection; but I thought, and I still think, that the reasonable policy to advocate is a low tariff and a tariff directed primarily for the raising of revenue and not for the purpose of protecting industries in this country. That is still my view and I want to be consistent with my record in the past in directing the course I intend to take as regards the Budget at this time. I might be able to support the taxation proposals, but it has been made clear to me during this debate that whatever revision of the tariff is to come is to be a revision that is going to maintain protection; and I would be inclined to say that the moderate protection that is being advocated really means high protection, because I have here the words of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) in quoting the increased tariff in Australia. The minister made this observation, after quoting the items:

> That will serve to show what our sister Dominion is doing. Australia evidently believes in a policy of moderate protection.

And the items that the minister was quoting in regard to Australia showed that Australia was increasing its tariff. Consequently, if moderate protection means an increase in the tariff, I cannot be in sympathy with moderate protection. I do not think this Government looks to a man to support them through thick and thin on every policy they introduce. I was not elected to this House under any such consideration. When I appealed to the people of my constituency in 1917, I told them that I was standing for a war policy and a war Government; and when I was asked where I stood on the tariff, I told them that I stood where I had always stood, namely, in favour of a low tariff and I did not intend to vary my position in that regard, but that I did not think the tariff should be any consideration during the war and it was my intention to support Union Government And I did so during the period of war. But as I said in speaking on the Address at the opening of this session, I felt that as regards the tariff and other domestic policies, I was free to act in the way that I considered to be in the best interests of the country and in accord with the course I had always followed on this particular question.

Coming to a consideration of the Budget, I might say this, that the points the amendment aims at I am in sympathy with. Anything that will tend to reduce the cost of living or anything that will tend to encourage production in this country has my support and sympathy, and I feel that a reduction in the tariff aims in those directions. Why, I have the words of my good friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—and he is my good friend, although I cannot agree wth him in his views on the tariff—that the removal of the war tax of 7½ per cent will tend to reduce the cost of living. When he was speaking on the Budget he stated, that the accusation of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) that this Government had not done anything to reduce the cost of living was untrue, because the removal of the 7½ per cent war tax will lessen the cost of living, let us reduce the tariff still further on the necessaries of life, and thus further reduce the

cost of living. That is my stand on the tariff.

As to the whole question of protection, I do not want to see any industry in this country driven out of business. I have been told time and again, and I have heard it claimed on the floor of this House, that protection was primarily intended for the infant industries of this country. Now I might be influenced to support protection if it was for that purpose; but when I find that the industries of this country have been in the Infants' Home practically from 1878 until the present time, I reach the conclusion that the industries never pass the infantile stage, they are in that stage always. Now I do feel this, that our industries in this country should be well enough organized and should be able to put by sufficient reserves, after a period of protection, in order to face outside competition. They should not expect protection for all time to come, and I think the time is ripe now to cut away a great deal of that protection.

In regard to the question of the development of our natural resources and their connection with the tariff, I have urged this matter on previous occasions, and I urge it again now, that it by the removal of the tariff we can make the implements of production cheaper and thereby encourage the development of our natural resources we are doing something worth while for this country. It is the development of our natural resources that we desire at the present time because the development of those resources will enrich Canada and enable it to meet its pressing obligations. What do I find in the province of Alberta? Men are going out, individuals and companies, and spending thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars in an effort to find oil in that province. But practically everything they use in the operations to discover oil is taxed. Now I do not think in a case of that kind, where there is an attempt to develop our natural resources, and where if oil was found it would mean millions of dollars to this country, that those implements should be taxed any more than the implements used by the farmers who also are engaged in the development of our natural resources. I have a case in point, a local one, which I should like to give in this connection. In the section of Alberta from which I come many acres are devoted to the production of Alfalfa. Except for an exceptional year like last year when there was a shortage of feed throughout Western Canada I would say that there was a surplus of alfalfa produced in that section, and men who realize that with the development of irrigation there is going to be a large increase in the alfalfa area are looking for some other purpose to use that alfalfa. An enterprising gentleman in my constituency decided he would go into the alfalfa milling business in order to produce a meal that could be used for stock feeding. He wrote to me wanting to find out whether he could get a certain machine for that particular purpose into Canada free of duty. It was a machine that was not produced in Canada and was for the purpose of utilizing one of our own resources and making it profitable, and encouraging the development of the alfalfa area on irrigated land. This particular machine, an alfalfa grinder, valued at about $4,000, I found, was subject to a duty of 20 per cent, or nearly $800. That was a tax on what I would call a productive implement necessary for the development of our resources in Western Canada.

Briefly I feel, as I indicated before, that whatever revision of the tariff is contemplated is to be along the lines of protection. And when we speak of moderate protection I would say that it means sufficient protection at least to satisfy the industries of this country, and I have not yet been converted to the view that adequate protection or moderate protection for protection's sake only is desirable in this country. Consequently, under these circumstances, I cannot commit myself to a proposition inconsistent with the atttiude I have taken in this House from the beginning. I feel therefore it is my duty to go on record now as being in favour of a reduction of the tariff, and for that reason I intend to support the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding).

Before taking my seat I would like to point out to the Government a matter that I think is worthy of some attention, and again it is a case which comes from the section of the country which I represent, but I think it is important to the whole country. We are very anxious to develop our export trade and I think it should be the business of this Government—I am not complaining that they are not pursuing this policy—to widen our markets all over the world, and wherever we can get a footing in a new market we should get it, and get it as soon as possible. I feel that on the Pacific we have opportunities for the development of a great deal of trade with Canada if we only keep our eyes open and get after that trade. We did have a trade in flour

with Hong Kong, and I think it is worth mentioning that one mill alone in the city where I live exported in 1912 to Hong Kong and Shanghai 155,901 bags of flour, in 1913, 182,404 bags of flour and in 1914, 101,196 bags of flour. When the war broke out that market dropped until there was practically nothing shipped in the other years. I am told by millers at the present time it is practically impossible to get into that market, by reason of an order of the Wheat Board. The Wheat Board says it will only issue a permit to ship to Hong Kong on receipt of a regular application form, accompanied by a cheque for $2 a barrel refund to the board. The millers claim that the $2 a barrel refund demand practically keeps them out of that Oriental market. It may surprise the House to know how much flour has been shipped from Australia to Hong Kong and Shanghai. The importer who writes this letter in the correspondence that has been submitted to me says that practically all this market is open to Canada and could be used by Canada at the present time. He says:

> Yet in spite of all the difficulties, shipping and so forth, this market (the Hong Kong market) imported 1,200,000 bags of Australian flour last year and will probably continue importing large quantities.

What I want to point out is this: Seemingly from this order of our Wheat Board we are unable to ship flour to Hong Kong in competition with other countries and we are losing a market we formerly had. Now I am not in a position to condemn offhand the Wheat Board. There is a great difference of opinion as to the Wheat Board. I am not a farmer or a miller, but it seems to me that in this case that particular policy is not in the interests of the milling trade of Canada any more than it is in the interests of the export trade of Canada, and this situation should be remedied if we want to build up with the Pacific countries a large export trade.

I have attempted to outline as briefly as possible my views on the Budget. I might say again that I am merely attempting to be consistent with the course that I have always taken on the tariff. I have noticed during this debate that there has been some criticism of other hon. members for their lack of consistency. Well, I may be inconsistent on some other questions, but on the tariff I think I can claim I have always been consistent, and it is merely to be consistent, and to continue to be consistent until I am enlightened that I am wrong, that I am taking the course I have announced to-night.

[Mr. Buchanan.]

Mr. ROCH LANCTOT (Laprairie-Napierville) (translation): At such a late hour, Mr. Speaker, I thought the adjournment of this debate might have been obtained, but I understand from the whips of both parties that that is impossible to-night. I understand that if I were a big wig either of the Government or of the Opposition, there would perhaps not be so much objection, but when one represents the agricultural class he must be kept on the go, Mr. Speaker, and therefore I shall proceed. I will not stop considering the remarks made by the members opposite nor by those of the Third Party for, as far as I am concerned, I am always, as I have stated year after year, in a most particular position, and I must tell you from the start: I have not participated in that whirligig of millions since 1915, as have all the politicians in this House. The new taxes announced by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) do not surprise me, for my grandmother used to tell me, when I was very young, that whoever wages war must pay the costs, and I have always believed that Baptiste and John should have to pay them; and that is really what is happening now.

Before entering upon the question of this new taxation, I wish to congratulate just a little the Minister of Finance upon the displacing he as made—it is something new to me—of certain items appearing on the balance sheet as assets and which ought to be set down as liabilities. L refer to the $140,223,373.89 due by the Canadian Northern Railway Company, of the $96,345,469.19 owed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, and of the $1,148,533.33 due by the Grand Trunk Company; so that our net indebtedness, which appeared in the Official Gazette as being of $1,935,946,312.85, is really of $2,273,305,456.92. There are still, Mr. Speaker, some other amounts which, in my humble opinion, should not be set down as assets; among others, there is the sum of $171,710,168.19 due by the Imperial Government.

If I do remember right, the former Minister of Finance told us, a few years ago, that the Imperial Government was owing us some seven or eight hundred millions of dollars, and we have not yet received very much of that money. I am very much in doubt that the present Minister of Finance may collect those amounts he enters to our credit. There are still many other amounts, I think, that will have to be deducted next year, if the same Minister of Finance is still at his post—although I do not expect it.

In his speech of the 20th instant, the hon. member for Vancouver-Centre (Mr. Stevens) declared to the Minister of Finance that the country's debt was far higher than he had stated it. He even went further: he wanted to add to our indebtedness, not to have the Federal government pay it, but he wanted to add to it the whole debt of the Provincial governments and of 12 cities of Canada.

As far as I am concerned, I think that we should not worry about provincial indebtedness; I think that each province can see to its own affairs, so with the towns. It is enough to have to look after the Dominion debt. The hon. member for Vancouver-Centre, instead of discoursing over the provinces and towns of this country, should have told us of the railway debts—I believe that it is more important that the people should know what is the real debt of our railways—I mean the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk railways. We have not yet taken possession of the latter, but the papers give us to understand that we shall in the near future.

According to the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Reid) our National Railways gave us last year a deficit of $47,000,000 for the moving of the trains (salaries, coal, and perhaps oil, also), apart from the upkeep of the lines; only for the moving of the passenger and freight trains. We shall soon have the Grand Trunk on our hands, as I said before, so that next year our deficit will be still larger. I don't think I am putting the thing unfairly to the House in saying that these two roads will cost the country at least one billion dollars. If these roads were to be the property of a well organized company, what would be the first question this company would ask itself? Will they pay a sufficient interest on the capital invested in their purchase? Will they pay expenses? Shall we be able yearly to put by a certain sum for depreciation? That is one thing which I do not believe the Government will ever be able to do. I believe on the contrary, that the deficit shall be of $100,000,000 for several years to come, particularly with the administration of these railways in the hands of such a Government as we have at present.

Wherefore, this amount of one billion dollars, should be counted with those which the Minister of Finance brought down this year and should be counted in the net debt of the country; and instead of being $2,273,000,000, it would be at least three billion dollars. It would only be fair to have the people of Canada know this. What do we see in the Estimates? The Minister of Finance asks us for $140,000,000 to meet the interest on our debt. If we only owed two billions and something, we should not require $140,000,000 to pay the interest on our debt; therefore, we owe more than that, and that is admitted by every one. Why hide the fact, when it exists? Therefore, I say, Mr. Speaker that the people are greatly interested in knowing what we owe, and the Government should show things as they are. The people would be quite satisfied.

The hon. the Minister of Finance made comparisons. He told us the country was most properous, and the amount of business done last year was, according to him, an unprecedented success. He quoted the years 1910 and 1920. This success is easily explained, Mr. Speaker. Wheat sells $3 a bushel and more this year. The price of oats, rye, corn, barley, hay, every thing we sell in this country, has similarly increased, and in the same way, for every thing we buy we have to pay three, four and five times more than in 1910.

If I remember well, the Minister of Finance says in his statement of accounts that we sold in 1910, $665,000,000 worth, of agricultural products. If we sell, in 1920, $1,900,000,000 of such, I say that we have no more to sell than we had in 1910; one thing has changed, the loaves have decreased in weight since then; instead of weighing 6 lbs. they now weigh 3 lbs., and we pay more for these than we did for the 6 lbs. loaves. If takes now ten times more money than before to buy a bag of potatoes. Ten year ago we sold potatoes on the Montreal market for 50 cts. and 60 cts. a bag; now the man who wants a bag of potatoes for seed has to pay $7.50. So that if people want to consume as many potatoes as they used to, it will cost $98 to buy 14 bags of potatoes, which would at that time have cost $7.

I was speaking this afternoon with one of my colleagues from the West. He told me that in 1913 and 1914, in certain western provinces, wheat sold for 60 or 70 cts. a bushel, and sells now for $3 and $3.25. It is not surprising that our business should show higher figures in the Finance Minister's speech of the 18th instant. Now, we are always told of the balance of commerce. Are you to claim that munitions of war and all that was necessary for the carrying on of the war, were a regularly established trade of this country?

This is not the trade this country wants for future generations.

I hope we shall have no more such wars, and that we shall not be looking to the manufacture of war munitions for successfull business.

The Finance Minister told us also that his Budget will turn out $388,000,000 in the course of the current year. I have no objection to that, Mr. Speaker; on the contrary I am glad for him, but I would like very much to see a decrease in expenditures. If every year, the Minister of Finance, whoever he be, comes and asks us for $70,000,000 more taxes, and if it is only for the coterie, for the ministerial family, I object. I say the ministerial family because I find things going on in Ottawa which make me gasp. The Government for the last four years has been taxing the people at every turn, even compelling them to affix stamps on all articles of commerce, cheques, notes, contracts. I fear that our poor people will long remain in that state of misery. I was not a little scandalized last week; as I was going to leave this building, I saw four or five ministers, in company with some twenty members, who were waiting for automobiles to go and have a ride in town. There is no doubt but Johnny Canuck will have to pay for that.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): Oh, yes, indeed.

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): I object to that, especially in these hard times. Nowadays the ministers indulge in endless journeys.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): They are great travellers.

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): They are travellers. Some of them are always sick so as to travel about. I sincerely wish they would return to health so they would return to us and stay.

Now, let us see what took place at the Peace Conference, at Versailles. We had there four ministers and many other people, and all their expenses were paid by the country. Now, we are asked to send a messenger to Washington, at the expense of our poor people.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): A messenger?

Mr. LANCTOT: A messenger to the English ambassador, nothing else. I hope they will not send a sick man; for a messenger must needs be in good health, so as to be able to face rain or shine.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): I think the president of the Council is robust enough to fill the position.

The people are not aware of these things. If they were acquainted with what is going on in Ottawa, I often ask myself if they would go to the polls at the beck of a Government who, after making so many promises to our soldiers, to our veterans of the Great War, refuse to pay small pensions to them or their widows and orphans, while the Government's favorites, the privileged ones, receive large pensions. For the soldiers who made war for the Empire, no pensions. Perhaps before the end of the session we shall hear of our judges not being paid enough. A pension will be offered them. While on this subject I wish to say this: I want our judges to be well paid. I have no objection to see a judge being generously paid while he works; but I certainly object to seeing a judge receive more after he is superannuated than he did when he was on the bench.

Mr. CANNON: There are no such cases.

Mr. LANCTOT: We know of such cases. One such beneficiary died not a very long while ago. Give the judges salaries that will allow them to live; but if they want annuities let them buy them, let them pay for them.

You hear of manufacturers, magnates and lawyers. They seem to be favoured ones. There are two classes of favoured ones, lawyers and manufacturers.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): Shame!

M. MACKIE (Translation): What class do you belong to?

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): To the farmer class.

Mr. MACKIE (Translation): That of the opportunists.

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): I don't think so.

Now, Sir, the Government want money from right and left and it will be the same with them next year. Millions are wanted for the militia. There are $12,000,000 for it in the Estimates this year; but if they were to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), $50,000,000 would be the figure required. Happily I

have no idea that the hon. member's suggestion will be accepted by the House. However there is a scheme on foot which seems to be making its way. I don't know that it will reach realization this year. At any rate, it is said that the Mother Country is to make us a gift; it seems that it wants to present us with war ships.

So far as I am concerned I must say to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that I am a man of peace who wants peace; we have had enough warfare and I, for one, do not want the Government to accept the gift of a navy. Let me make a comparison. Take for instance a labourer in St. Constant where I reside. There are large brickyards in the neighbourhood, at Delson. Well supposing the Government or anybody else goes to one of my constituents working in one of these yards and said to him: "I am going to give you a Ford, or a Dodge or any other motor car". That man never drove an automobile before; he would require a chauffeur and he would have to buy gasoline. Do you think he would be in a better position than he is now? Not at all. The Government say: "We shall not buy the ships". Very well, because we have not the means to buy them; but if they are given to us, we shall have to get coal and men to get up steam and that will cost a lot of money. We do not want it.

I am told that some of our ministers will not be satisfied with the militia and a navy, and that we shall soon have an air force of about 150 aeroplanes. We do not want any such thing for our people to break their neck with and I protest against it.

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): These are airy notions.

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): Yes, airy indeed, as would say the hon. member for Quebec-East.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding, I wish to say a few words about war, although being a man of peace, I must revert to war. Quite recently I found in my room, the report of the special committee of the House on the Soldiers Civil Re-establishment of last year, and here is what I noticed in it: A government official was asked to make up a statement in order to know how much it would cost to meet the request of the soldiers, namely those who had fought in France, those who remained in England and the others who had served in Canada. The report says that the total number of men registered in our army was 590,000; 418,000 went overseas and 50,000 remained in England; therefore 368,000 men went over to France and the remaining 172,000 stayed at home, and if you add the 50,000 who remained in England you will see that 222,000 men never went to the front and never smelled powder.

It is on account of that foolish and ruinous policy of the Government that we have to pay the present taxes, and such policy was not worked out in the interest of the people of this country but with a view to winning the election of 1917. Mr. Speaker, in order to win the election in 1917, to get the present government into power, they have spent 500 or 600 millions of the people's money—

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): It is not worth it.

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation):— for we did not require conscription in 1916 and 1917, considering the number of soldiers we had in the country and also the fact that nobody in Europe ever expected that the government should send 500,000 or 600,000, men. It was a means of carrying the elections, and of aiming a blow at the province of Quebec, by shouting: The French Canadians will not enlist. We are going to poison the press and we are sure of beating Laurier and his Quebec supporters."

I notice, since a few months, that the feeling as regards Ontario is not what it was in 1917.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): The people open their eyes.

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): Why have we a third party to-day in this House? It is a result of conscription. The people of Ontario and of the English speaking provinces had been promised through their candidates that conscription was not directed against them but against Quebec. However, the Government took every body in and that displeased Ontario. A delegation came here, but the door was closed and they were told that they could not come in. That is how the farmers party was created.

A Toronto newspaper said that I was a party man.

I really have been one of them, I do believe; but if, however, in the future, the political party I have been a member of for a life-time should ever attempt to play the same pranks as are doing the party opposite in this House—

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): Impossible.

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation):—I would part from it, so much said, Mr. Speaker, it being late, for you as well as for myself, I do not wish to detain the House any longer; I am through with what I intended to say, taxation excepted, which I have not yet touched upon. Whoever breaks the glasses, must pay the cost; there is no geting out of it. But there is one matter I was forgetting to refer to, Mr. Speaker; we find the big wigs of this country are those who pay the least to the exchequer. I have noticed this evening in reading the newspapers, that the poorer classes would be affected by the new taxation, while the big fellows would get away much more easily. You can never get hold of a big wig; he always manages to pull through. When you lay taxes upon the manufacturer, the wholesale dealer, upon any retail merchant, he simply raises his prices in proportion and Baptiste pays the piper.

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): What about the hay dealers?

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): Well, the hay dealer—and I am one of them—has always to count on Providence, fair weather and showers, to ensure the growth of hay. The manufacturer, on the other hand, can do his business under cover; he is not dependent on Providence, all he needs is men and hands, while, we the farmers, we have to count on Providence; and there you have the main difference; we are the people dependent upon Providence, and for that fact we are rewarded.

Now, I have read in the Press that Germany will have to pay a total amount of thirty billions, 55 per cent to go to France, 25 per cent to Great Britain, and the other 20 per cent to Italy, Belgium and Italy, Canada is entirely out of it. I would have been inclined to think that the President of the Privy Council would have considered that point, as well as our plenipotentaries who spent months and months in Paris. They have not attended to it, for there is nothing coming to us. If the bill should ever be settled, John Bull's appetite will enable him, no doubt, to gobble up whatever is in sight and we shall never have a cent. For my part, I don't count on anything from that source.

In the course of the Budget debate, I heard many opinions so far expressed. I regret the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not in his seat, for I had a personal remark that might have interested him. Yesterday, the hon. Minister of the Interior wanted to know where we, the Liberals, stood on the tariff question.

On Tuesday, March 30, 1920, the hon. Minister of Marine, speaking in this House about shipbuilding, stated that everything was going as satisfactorily as could be expected and that Canada could build ships as cheaply as in Europe, as cheaply as in any other country in the whole world, I was rather astonished to hear such a statement from so good a protectionist as he is.

If merchantmen can be constructed in Canada as advantageously as they could be built in England or as in any other country in the world, why could not Canadian manufacturers and shipbuilders build them and sell them to the Canadian people or abroad under a 10 or 12½ per cent protective tariff, without telling us: "You must give us from 20 to 25 per cent, or, if not, we cannot go on and we shall close our doors."

Since I have been a member of this House, I have listened to so many such statements, often I am bored and I would like to see, just for once, the mass of the people, after being thoroughly skinned by the manufacturers of this and other countries, have at last their turn, as stated in 1896 by the hon. Mr. Tarte—I know that the hon. Minister of Justice can recall the statements then made by the hon. Mr. Tarte and the hon. Minister of Marine may probably remember them—he had then become a free trader, he did not remain such very long, he was just so during the electoral campaign. To my mind, a man should be in earnest and consistent. That is why I state, Mr. Speaker, that the minister of Marine has afforded me an opportunity for making a statement. I frankly declare that, had the Minister of the Interior been here to-night, I would not have had the least hesitation in telling him that I am in favour of a revenue tariff as low as possible, with a generous free list and a tariff not higher than 15 per cent all round. As a revenue tariff, that is what I should wish to have.

Now, why do you exempt the big wigs from the effects of the war tax for a period of from ten to fifteen years, according to cases, such people that have realized millions during the war? One of my good friends in this House gave me the case of one of his constituents who made at least $500,000 or $600,000 in profits on war munitions and who invested those $500,000 in Victory Bonds.

That gentleman has no more cause to be uneasy, he may spend the rest of his life riding automobiles, and he shall never have

a cent to pay to the country; but the poor farmer who has laboured sixteen hours a day to supply food to the people of this country, as well as to the Allies, during the war, if he happens to have a $2,000 income, is obliged to pay a tax. Had I any say in the Government of this country, I know what I would do with these gentlemen who have grown rich during the war. I have already stated it in this House and it can be found in Hansard, when these same parties were demanding the conscription of our boys: "You want to have conscription, but you shall pay for it; it is to your liking, pay for it; we do not need conscription, but if you want to have it, you shall pay $3 a day to the soldiers and $100 a month to these soldiers' wives so that they may live decently; we are discussing now Bill No. 75 and to-morrow it will be Bill No. 76, I shall draw a Bill in two lines, and say: every millionaire in this country shall pay 90 per cent on every million spent for the war". Mr. Speaker, I would have had a surplus of money; I would have had enough to pay the country's debt after the war. Do you think a single one of them would have accepted such a proposition? Not one. Now that the war is over, after they have sent our sons to the war against their own free will, I would still be in favour of taking from these people the 90 per cent. That is what I wished to state, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you.

Mr. Speaker, before I close my remarks, I desire to say a few words in English, so that my hon. friends in this House who are not conversant with the French language will understand my position on the tariff question. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) is not here to-night. If he were, I would tell him that I stand for a reduced tariff, and I should like to see many articles free. That is the stand I have taken all my life, and I am still of the same opinion. It is true that during my career in politics we did not always have such a low tariff, but I think the time has arrived when the tariff could be reduced to the advantage of the people.

Mr. J. E. PREVOST (Terrebonne) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the Budget Speech of this session of 1920 should have been made by the Finance Minister of a new Government created by the popular will on an economic platform, duly submitted to the Canadian people, for the purpose of purifying our finances and developing our country after the war. But such is not the case and the Government we have opposite is ever the same Government that juggled away the 1917 elections, through their ignominous Election Act and their cry of "Win the War."

Well, now the war is over, it has been won, and the Win-the-war Government still clings to power instead of going before the electorate to give an account of its war policy and obtaining from them a new mandate for a policy of peace and of national reconstruction.

The Union Government shuns the day of its rendering of accounts. The Minister of Finance has indeed produced his balance-sheet, but only in this House, where he is assured of a majority, the Government dare not go before the people and submit to it the deeds, or rather the misdeeds, of their administration, for they are well aware of the people's answer. The Government shun their responsibilities; it is one of the features of their character, or to state it in a better form, it is a sure indication of their lack of character.

Since 1914, the Government have appointed more than 100 commissioners to do what they should have performed themselves, and yet we had 26 different ministers, a figure that had never been reached previously; in spite of all that commissions have followed upon commissions, subcommissions upon subcommissions, without as a rule reaching any solution at all. Every time the Government entrusted any question to a special commission, the said question was sure of a first-class funeral. God knows how many serious questions the Unionist Government have thus solemnly buried! The Government shun their responsibilities. They have proved it by ever shifting to some other party the trouble of looking up matters they should have settled themselves, thereby leaving without any remedy all the evils which the Canadian people were then, and are still suffering.

I shall not undertake to enumerate the numberless commissions created by the Government since 1914 in order to shirk their responsibilities. The most important is, beyond a doubt, the Board of Commerce which should have assisted in the lowering of the cost of living. Well, since this Board has been appointed, the cost of living has daily increased. The cold storage plants—it has been stated many a time—are crammed with foodstuffs; the profits of numerous profiteers are scandalous, the profits of certain tradesmen are exorbitant,

and the people at large find their living conditions more and more difficult.

That state of affairs has been in existence several years without the Government lifting a straw; they have established a Board of Commerce; what more do you want them to do? Since 1914, the cost of living for a family has increased from $7 to $15 a week. And the Government is enjoying the sweets of office, while complacently casting its paternal eye over those who are responsible for the increased prices of commodities.

Meanwhile, the big corporations accumulate tremendous profits. I do not intend to bore this House with statistics, but I have right here the proof that a large number of concerns have seen their profits increase two-fold, three-fold or a hundred-fold since 1914, while the consumers pay higher prices than ever for their products. From the Steel Company of Canada down to the Dominion Foundries, and including the Dominion Steel, the Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, the Canada Cement, the Riordon Pulp and Paper Company, the Dominion Canners, Penman's Limited, the Ogilvie Milling Company, the Dominion Bridge Company, the Dominion Textile Company, the Ames-Holden Company, the Stanfield Limited, the Lake of the Woods Milling Company and a great many others, as also the Smart, Woods Company, the Maple Leaf Milling Company, the Belding Paul Corticelli, Limited, etc., etc., all those big corporations make profits of more than 50 to 100 per cent and pay to their shareholders higher dividends than in pre-war times.

A parliamentary inquiry concerning the high cost of living held last year brought to light some shocking facts. The représentatives of certain concerns admitted that they were realizing profits varying from 70 to 100 per cent, and then adding boldly, in the very face of Parliament, that such companies were proud of the fact and would continue to take advantage of the consumer. But this Government, whose prime duty it is to protect the interests of the people, did not interfere. Those big corporations keep on piling up tremendous profits.

By the fact that they established a Board of Commerce, this Government is under the impression of having discharged its full duty. But what is that commission doing? We are absolutely in the dark on this subject; however, we all know that the high cost of living is going up all the time.

[Mr. Prevost.]

The Board of Commerce is supposed to hold inquests in order to ascertain what prices are charged, to fix reasonable prices and to deal rigorously with the profiteers, if need be. As a matter of fact does it do so? The Commissioners so state, but it is utterly impossible for us to secure the proof. I read in the "Labour Gazette" of January 1920, that the Board of Commerce has given to the press during last December, several statements concerning its policy.

The first one of those statements was published in Winnipeg, the 9th of December last; it is a kind of review of the work performed by the Board since last August. Two other statements that were issued in Toronto, on the 27th of December last, have reference to the combines and the tariffs respectively.

In one of those statements we read the following words:

> There has been established at Ottawa under the direction of the Board certain investigation machinery by means of which the Board keeps itself continuously acquainted with the manufacturing and production costs of the commodities over which the Board exercises jurisdiction. By this means the Board may at any time inform itself without delay whether in any particular case there has or has not been excessive charging. . . . Supplementing the Board's inquiries there have been a few— a very few—reports or charges made by private individuals. All reports or charges made have been carefully followed up. In some cases the allegations made have not been established. In other cases the matters have been referred for criminal proceedings. In other cases restitution has been required and made to obviate further action on the part of the Board.

I would like to know when the Board did interpose itself between the public and the profiteers in the manner indicated in its report?

At this very session, I asked the Government the following questions:

> 1. Has the Board of Commerce taken charge of the accusations which were the object of criminal suits?
> 2. If so, what are those accusations, and what has happened to such suits?
> 3. Has the Board of Commerce taken charge of cases in which excess profits had to be given back?
> 4. If so, what are these cases, and has restitution been made?

Those questions were the aftermath of the report of which I have read some extracts a few moments ago. The 7th of April last, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) gave the following answer to those questions:

> The Government has no record in this matter.

And it is the way this Parliament and the country are informed about the activities of that famous Board of Commerce.

In every other country of the world, as you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the Government has taken stern steps against the profiteers. In the United States, in Great Britain, as well as in France, the Government has seen to it to protect the people against those vampires, which have been compelled to pay big fines; even some of those scoundrels have been sent to prison. However, here in Canada, one is at a loss to give one single instance where the Government or the Board of Commerce ever interfered in order to protect the interests of the Canadian consumer.

The Government are always trying to dodge responsibility. They have increased public expenditure to a tremendous extent, apart altogether from the cost of the war. At the very moment when they are preaching thrift, and practising extravagance, they are trying to throw the responsibility for their wastefulness on a new commission, as I intend to show later.

The Union Government is heir to the Borden administration. The public accounts show that between 1911 and 1919, ordinary expenditure was greater by $529,483,377 than during the last eight years of the Liberal regime. In the Department of Fisheries expenditure increased by 20 per cent; in the Department of Mines, 166 per cent; in the Department of Immigration, which would be more suitably styled the Department of Emigration for the last few years, expenditure increased 54 per cent; in the Department of Public Works, 100 per cent; in the Dominion Lands Branch, 372 per cent; Department of Inland Revenue, 60 per cent; in the Department of the Postmaster General, 162 per cent, and in the Department of Trade and Commerce, "last but not least," expenditure increased 1,534 per 100. Confronted with all this extravagance the Government is trying to avoid responsibility by appointing a purchasing board which will interfere with the absolute control of public expenditure which, under the constitution, this Parliament should have.

The Government are striving to dodge responsibility again in the matter of the tariff. For the last two years, pulled this way and that, bewildered, they have promised to appoint a board—still they come—to study tariff requirements; however they are in no hurry to appoint this last board; they keep putting it off.

The Government's policy is to favour one class at the expense of the rest of the people. Everything they do reveals this vicious principle. Study the tariff, Mr. Speaker; ascertain where the Government gets its revenue and you will find it is always the masses who pay.

The two essential sources of state revenues are: first, the customs duties which, in the long run, are paid by the consuming public; second, the taxes on income and business profits which affect the wealthy class of the population. In the United Kingdom the taxes on income and real estate account for 80 per cent of the exchequer receipts; customs duties account for a mere 20 per cent of the public revenue. In the United States income and property taxes bring in 69 per cent of the treasury receipts, while the tariff is responsible for only 31 per cent. In Canada we find that the State draws 94 per cent of its revenue from the tariff and only 6 per cent from income taxation. So we see that the burden is not fairly distributed. In other countries the rich pay more than the poor, while in Canada the poor bear a heavier burden than the rich, since 94 per cent of the treasury funds are drawn from the masses of the people through indirect levies which increase the cost of living.

So the Liberals have good reason to demand, through the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), substantial reductions in the tariff destined to lighten the burden of the high cost of living which bear so heavily on the masses of our people. No matter what may be said, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party is consistent. That party has always denounced extreme protection, though mindful of the needs of every class of the community. In 1893, as in 1919, the Liberals took their stand in favour of sane tariff legislation. From 1896 to 1911 they adhered to this policy; they brought about a general tariff reduction of nearly 20 per cent, and introduced a British preference of 33 per cent; moreover they wanted reciprocity in agricultural products between Canada and the United States. In his 1917 manifesto to the Canadian people Sir Wilfrid Laurier used the following words:

> No measure to reduce the cost of living can be effective unless and until the tariff is reformed and its pressure removed from those commodities in which there are "excessive profits," "hoardings" and "combinations for the increase of prices. . .
>
> . . . I would propose if entrusted with the administration of the country to immediately relieve agriculture from its disabilities in this regard.

In further mitigation of disadvantages to agricultural production, I would immediately remove the duties on agricultural implements and other essentials as demanded by the western farmers. A general well-considered reform of the tariff for the purpose of helping Canadian production and relieving the Canadian consumer would also be an object of my administration.

The amendment moved by the hon. member from (Shelburne and Queens) is entirely at one with the policy here set forth by Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

True, the Government, through the Minister of the Interior, the minister with the ascetic mien, the subtle, cunning mind, boasts to-day of being partial to a downward revision of the tariff. How times have changed, Mr. Speaker! In very truth, if the Government really do take this position to-day, it thus renders unwilling homage to the Liberal policy and justifies our opposition to immoderate protection.

It is still a far cry, however, from the intentions of the present Government to the reforms demanded by the welfare of our people. Canada still has the highest tariff wall of any country in the world. Why should this be so, since our industries are more prosperous than ever?

Taking the figures quoted by the hon. Minister of Finance in his Budget speech, I find that our manufacturing industries which, in 1881, represented an invested capital of 165 millions, have increased, in round figures, as follows:

In 1891 this invested capital had grown to $300,000,000; in 1901, it had reached $400,000,000; in 1906, $800,000,000; in 1911, $1,200,000,000; in 1915, $1,900,000,000, and in 1917, $2,786,000,000. In the same way our manufactured products which represented, in 1881, a value of $300,000,000 were valued at $400,000,000 in 1891; $700,000,000 in 1906; $1,165,000,000 in 1911; $1,400,000,000 in 1915 and $3,000,000,000 in 1917.

Is it not time that some measure of protection were afforded the consumer, Mr. Speaker? Our protective tariff might well be lowered without working any harm to our industries some of which are far too highly protected.

We should awaken to the fact that Canada has an average customs duty of $18.45 for every man, woman and child in the Dominion, while the United States, that model protectionist country which we are constantly being urged to follow, has a per capita customs duty of only $2.11. Hence the necessaries of life are sold much cheaper on the other side of the line; shoes, for instance, cost 30 per cent less than in this country.

What the Liberals want—and what Sir Wilfrid Laurier fought for and worked for during the fifteen years of his administration—is a policy that protects everybody; the manufacturer, the businessman and the consumer.

However, before all else, before revising the tariff, before devising new taxes to increase the cost of living, before spending $20,000,000 for a merchant marine, before establishing a navy (which is just beginning to show above the imperialist horizon) the Union Government is in duty bound to go before the people and receive their verdict, favourable or unfavourable, whichever it may be. Why has the Government failed to do this? Why do its supporters who know in their hearts that their war mandate has expired, why do these supporters, I say, persist in giving to the present Government the majority which keeps it in power? It is because they are all aware that the day when a general election is held in Canada will witness the end of their political career. The lust of power and the sweets of office hold them together.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. PREVOST: In one of his most amusing pages which at the same time is most pregnant with philosophy and creative imagination, Rabelais describes Master Gaster, the personification of the stomach and of those appetites which to many are the very centre of the universe.

"I assure you," he says, "that when Master Gaster gives a command the heavens tremble, the earth quakes. His command is uttered; it must be obeyed without delay, else death will ensue."

And Rabelais parades before us all Creation: men, animals of every description, the willing slaves of Master Gaster, eager to serve him. And the prodigious nomenclature of all these beings in bondage under the sway of the lower appetites, is interrupted, at regular intervals, by the words, ever recurrent, like a sort of refrain: "and all for the stomach."

You readily discern, Mr. Speaker, my reason for recalling this page of Rabelais'. The Gaster of our political life is the Union Government which holds out to its supporters the alluring promises of power and honour with, to boot, the gratification of their gluttonous appetites. The Ministry's partisans bow to the sceptre of this modern Gaster so as to remain in close proximity to the Pork Barrel; "and all for the stomach," say we with Rabelais.

Before our very eyes the Tory-Conservatives with their former opponents; lay aside their hoary grudges and conclude an alliance with the antagonists they have always hated and always fought, they wanted to get into power, and to-day they are striving to remain there. They are under the thumb of Master Gaster who loosens the reins on their appetites: "and all for the stomach."

We behold former Nationalists who only yesterday were widely denouncing all they worship to-day, take their place at the manger and bury their heads in the feast: "and all for the stomach."

We see Liberals, unfaithful to their pledge trampling on their principles, forgetting the past, deaf to the voice of conscience—"a famished stomach cannot hear"—enter a morganatic alliance with the Tories and bow to the rule of Master Gaster, viz., of their selfish appetites: "and all for the stomach."

And you see wealthy capitalists, trust magnates, profiteers of every description, kowtow to the Union Government to Master Gaster: "and all for the stomach."

Aye, "all for the stomach;" the Union Government exists for nothing else.

The present Government has become so discredited in the eyes of the people of this country that we are all at a loss to understand how it has managed to hold onto office thus far. Those who support it and help to keep it in power, in spite of the will of our people, harken only to the lust of power and to their appetites that crave satisfaction.

"All for the stomach." There in four words, you have the definition of the present Union Government. In those words, so full of Rabelaisian flavour, you have the origin and the end of this Government; Master Gaster surrounded by the Unionists, insatiable Gargantuas.

The stomach has its tragedy. "There is a heroism of the stomach, said Victor Hugo; and the Unionists believe they are heroes because they make their conscience and their principles subservient to their appetites.

Union Government is merely the representative of certain factions; hence it fears the judgment of the nation as a whole. The Government represents Imperialism more than Canadianism, the manufacturer rather than the consumer, the profiteer in preference to the victimized masses of the people. That is not what their country is asking for. In the words of Gambetta: "Ideas create parties; interests create factions."

The explanation of the dignity and smooth running regularity of the constitutional regime in England for generations is undoubtedly to be found in the fact that the popular representatives were divided into two great Parties, the Whigs and the Tories, each in turn being raised to power by the movements of public opinion under the moderating influence of the Crown. On the other hand if parliamentary government has often hung by only a hair's breadth in Spain and Italy the reason is to be found in this mania for change which split up the great historical parties into insignificant personal cliques thus paving the way for anarchy.

We must chose one or the other of these two systems. The Liberals prefer the method of government by powerful parties, parties not only in name, but founded on clearly set forth opinion and a well-defined policy, and whose members willingly submit to the iron hand of discipline which is essential to true freedom. The tenets of the Liberal party, Mr. Speaker, are far above all those factions whose policies are guided solely by their own private interests.

The Unionist group is something in the nature of a "crazy quilt"—I crave your indulgence for the expression, Mr. Speaker; it has none of the characteristics of a great political party. The Union Government is well aware of its own weakness and with good cause from the judgment of the people whom it has deceived and whom it is now trying to avoid.

The illustrious tutor of one the Dukes of Burgundy was wont to admonish his pupil in these words: "Remember, my child that a King is made for his people, not the people for their King."

Those responsible for the present maladministration of our suffering Canada's affairs have forgotten that governments are made for the people and not the people for governments. Perhaps these Unionist gentlemen believe that this principle was destroyed in the awful upheaval of which the world has not, even yet, seen the end. Let me tell them they are wrong. Like many other ephemeral leaders they are due to learn that the multitude knows its rights as well as its duties and that, in this new day the knell of absolutism in the conduct of affairs of state, has sounded.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Lemieux the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 12 05 a.m. (Thursday).

Thursday, May 27, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE COLONEL G. H. BAKER, M.P.

Hon. Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria) presented the first report of the special committee appointed to act with a like committee of the Senate in determining the form of a memorial to be erected in the Parliament Buildings to the late Colonel Baker, as follows:

The Special Committee appointed to confer and act with a like Committee of the Senate in determining the form of the memorial to be erected in the Parliament Buildings to the late Lieut-Colonel Baker, MP., beg leave to present the following as their first report:

At the request of the committees, made during the last session of Parliament, Major R. Tait MacKenzie, a noted Canadian artist and sculptor, prepared two alternative sketches of the proposed memorial, and at a recent meeting of the committees in joint session, the sketches were submitted and explained by Major Tait MacKenzie. Mr. John Pearson, architect of the Parliament Buildings, was present, and his views were also considered as to the merits of the suggested designs.

After several meetings and careful consideration, your committee beg to recommend that the site for the proposed memorial selected by your committee during the last session of Parliament and approved by both Houses be adhered to.

That the memorial be a figure in stone, about six feet six inches in height, in high relief, carved to a likeness of the late Lieut.-Colonel Baker in military uniform, and set in a shallow niche on a pedestal four feet in height; the figure itself and the background to be made out of a solid block of limestone, which would replace the part of the wall in the site chosen by your committee last session.

It is submitted that a figure in stone, in preference to a bronze figure, would fit in more harmoniously with the architecture of the building, and forming part of the building, would be a more fitting tribute to one who so gallantly laid down his life for the Empire.

With regard to the inscription on the proposed memorial, your committee recommend that the following be inscribed on the front of the pedestal:

"Lieutenant-Colonel George Harold Baker, M.P.,
Fifth Canadian Mounted Rifles,
Killed in action, June second, 1916,
At the battle of 'Sanctuary Wood.'
Erected by order of the Parliament of Canada."

and that the selection of suitable inscriptions for the right and left sides of the figure be submitted in a subsequent report of your committee, and for this purpose your committee further recommend that they be given leave to sit again, and to report from time to time.

A clay model in miniature of the memorial is on view in room No. 534.

Your committee have been informed by Major MacKenzie and the architect that the estimated cost of the proposed memorial will be in the neighbourhood of $12,000, and your committee beg to recommend that such an amount be placed in the Supplementary Estimates at the present session to defray the cost of the said memorial.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Sir SAM HUGHES moved:

That in accordance with the recommendation contained in the report of the Special Committee appointed to confer and act with a like Committee of the Senate in determining the form of the memorial to be erected in the Parliament Buildings to the late Lieut.-Colonel George Harold Baker, M.P., the said committee be authorized to sit again, and to report from time to time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not aware that this motion is required, inasmuch as the committee has not made its final report; but there can be no harm in its being adopted if the House approves.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

S.S. "VOYAGEUR"—INSURANCE.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Referring to page ZZ43 of the 4th volume of the Auditor General's Report, was the $65,515.59 paid to Johnston and Higgins, of New York, for insurance on the steamer "Voyageur"?
2. If so, what period did this insurance cover?
3. With what insurance companies was this insurance placed?
4. What rate was paid on the hull?
5. What was the amount of commission paid to Johnston and Higgins?
6. Were tenders asked for by public advertisement?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes.
2. January 20, 1919, to January 20, 1920.
3. A list of the companies with which the insurance was placed on the hull, etc., giving the rates charged and the amount placed with each company is attached.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. No commission was paid Johnson and Higgins by the department.
6. No.

List of Companies with which Insurance on the "Canadian Voyageur" was placed.

Hull, etc., January 20th, 1919, to January 20th, 1920.

Underwriters.	Amount.		Rate.	Gross Premium.	
	Foreign.	American.			
	£	$	%	£	$
Willis, Faber Co	84,795	411,250	160	6,783 12 0	
Phoenix Ins. Co	.....	4,200	8	.....	336 00
Prov. Washington	.....	4,200	8	.....	336 00
Security Ins. Co	.....	2,100	8	.....	168 00
Camden Ins. Co	.....	2,100	8	.....	168 00
Westchester	.....	2,100	8	.....	168 00
Massachusetts	.....	2,100	8	.....	168 00
Niagara Ins. Co	.....	2,100	8	.....	168 00
Great American	.....	2,100	8	.....	168 00
American Mercantile Marine	.....	35,000	8	.....	2,800 00
Importers & Exporters (Trans-Marine) Washington Marine.	.....	14,000	8	.....	1,120 00
Norske Lloyds	.....	21,000	8	.....	1,680 00
Yangtsze	.....	3,500	8	.....	280 00
Western	.....	3,500	8	.....	280 00
Union Canton	.....	7,000	8	.....	560 00
Second Russian	.....	10,50^	8	.....	840 00
Automobile of Hartford	.....	14,000	8	.....	1,120 00
Spanish American	.....	7,000	8	.....	560 00
Globe & R	.....	17,500	8	.....	1,400 00
National N.J	.....	3,500	8	.....	280 00
British American	.....	3,500	8	.....	280 00
National Union	.....	7,000	8	.....	560 00
National Fire	.....	10,500	8½	.....	892 00
American	.....	5,250	8½	.....	446 25
Hanover	.....	5,250	8½	.....	446 25
Firemens	.....	5,250	8½	.....	446 25
Glens Falls	.....	1,750	8½	.....	148 75
Union Marine	.....	7,000	8½	.....	595 00
Amer. Equitable	.....	7,000	9	.....	630 00
Boston Ins. Co	.....	28,000	9	.....	2,520 00
Northern Underwriting Agency	.....	28,000	9	.....	2,520 00
Federal Ins. Co	.....	8,750	9	.....	787 50
U.S. Lloyds	.....	4,200	9	.....	378 00
Indemnity	.....	1,400	9	.....	126 00
Royal Exchange	.....	1,400	9	.....	126 00
Tokio Ins. Co	.....	1,400	9	.....	126 00
Agricultural	.....	1,400	9	.....	126 00
United States Fire	.....	1,400	9	.....	126 00
Fire Association Milwaukee	.....	1,400	9	.....	126 00
Mechanics	.....	1,400	9	.....	126 00

ALBERTA PENITENTIARY.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria):

1. What was the total number of prisoners serving time in the Alberta penitentiary on January 1, 1920?

2. How many officials were employed and what was the cost of maintenance for the last fiscal year?

Rt. Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. 132.

2. Permanent officers employed March 31, 1920—38. Expenditure for maintenance of convicts for the year 1918-19 (last completed year), $12,961.14.

VESSELS UNDER RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton):

1. How many boats are under control of the Railway Commission as regards rates, tolls, tariff agreements and arrangements?

Hon. J. D. REID: The above question was answered on a previous occasion by the minister in the House of Commons on May 17, 1920. See Hansard No. 53, page 2491.

BRITISH EMPIRE STEEL CORPORATION.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton):

1. What companies operating in Canada or in other countries do the promoters of the British Empire Steel Corporation intend to include within the proposed merger?

2. Where are said companies located?

3. When and where were said companies incorporated?

4. What is the present capitalization of each of the companies which it is proposed to absorb?

5. What is the basis on which each company enters the amalgamation?

6. What is the total capital of the British Empire Steel Corporation and the division of the share capital of that corporation?

Rt. Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. No information.
2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Answered by No. 1.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MORNING AND SATURDAY SITTINGS.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved:

That on and after Saturday, the 29th instant, until the end of the present session the House shall sit on Saturdays, and that the order of business on Saturday shall be the same as on Friday; and also, that on and after Tuesday, the 1st June next, until the end of the present session, the House shall meet at 11 o'clock in the morning of each day except Sundays, and in addition to the usual intermission at six o'clock, p.m., there shall also be an intermission every day from one to three o'clock, p.m.

He said: We have now entered upon the fourth month of the session, and there is a good deal of business still on the Order Paper. Representations have been made to me from both sides of the House that we should sit longer hours and should sit on Saturdays. I hope that the House will be willing to accept the motion for these reasons. I have not yet had an opportunity of making to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King) the statement with regard to further business which I promised a day or two ago, but I am entirely in the hope that it will not be necessary for the Government to bring down any further measures of a controversial character.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Lost.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every hon. member of the House appreciates the Prime Minister's motive in desiring to have the proceedings of this session brought to a conclusion as speedily as possible to permit hon. members to return to their homes and give some attention to their private business. I feel it a public duty however, to point out that, with the Government's programme what it is, and the progress we have thus far made being what it is, it would appear to be very much against the public interest that we on this side should, at this stage of the proceedings of the House, acquiesce in the resolution which my right hon. friend has moved.

We are here for the purpose of giving attention to the public business of Canada. A certain amount of the country's business has been brought before us; but we have on the Order Paper notice of other legislation that is to be introduced, of which we have no particulars at the present time, and we have still before us for completion the main work of the session. May I point out that it is no fault of hon. gentlemen on this side, nor, indeed is it the fault of any hon. member of the House that we have reached this season of the year with so little accomplished in the transaction of the principal business of this session. If little has been accomplished thus far, it is certainly the fault of the Government, first of all in having called the session so late in the year, and secondly, in being so tardy in bringing down much of their important legislation.

May I point out what seems to me to be the effect of the motion of my right hon. friend? Only nine days ago, on May 18, the Budget was introduced, and it is recognized throughout the Dominion that it is one of the most important Budgets this Parliament has ever been called upon to consider. It is suggested that we shall sit morning, afternoon and night, six days in the week, Saturday being included. In addition to the Budget, we have still before us the Franchise Bill, which is another of the most important pieces of legislation ever introduced into this House. We have considered in committee a large part of the Franchise Bill, but the most contentious clauses still remain. Then there are the Estimates of the different departments of the Government, and thus far Parliament has had opportunity to consider little or nothing with respect to past public expenditures or appropriations for the ensuing year. I have made a summary of what has been passed thus far in the way of Estimates. On March 23, some Estimates in respect to shipbuilding were passed; on March 30, an item of the Estimates of the Railway Department; on April 15, the Civil Service bonus, (one-sixth of the amount); on April 23 and May 6, Estimates of the Department of Marine and Fisheries; on April 26, Soldiers' Land Settlement Estimates. That is practically all that this House has thus far considered of the Estimates. Yet, this Parliament is to be asked to expend for the public service in the ensuing year an amount running into many millions of dollars.

The Government's motion means this: that we are called on to deal with the most important matters before the country under conditions where each member will be obliged to give morning, afternoon and

night to the proceedings of the House. In other words, it looks as though the Government had sought to bring about what I would call "one big drive," whereby to jam through the House legislation of vital importance to the country under conditions which make impossible proper attention, consideration, or criticism. It is physically impossible for members to sit here morning, afternoon and night, six days in the week, and give to legislation of this importance the attention it ought to receive.

Let me direct the attention of the House to the Bills that you, Mr. Speaker, have called within the last few minutes. On the Order Paper, under the heading "Introduction of Bills," there is the following list of Bills still to be introduced by the Government:

An Act to amend The Insurance Act, 1917.
An Act to amend the Criminal Code.
An Act to amend the Penitentiary Act.
An Act to amend the Trade Mark and Design Act.
An Act to amend the Irrigation Act.
An Act to amend the Admiralty Act.
An Act to amend The Naturalization Act, 1919.
An Act to amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act.
An Act to amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act (Nova Scotia).

Either these are meaningless bits of legislation, or they are very important measures. If they are important measures, members of this House should have opportunity of studying them before they are called upon to register their votes for or against their several clauses. There will be no opportunity for any hon. member to get into communication with his constituents or other parties who are interested in the legislation; or to realize what public opinion as reflected in the press may be as regards these measures if they are pressed under such conditions.

We have yet to deal with practically all of the Estimates; we have the consideration of all the resolutions mentioned in the Budget; we have the contentious clauses of the Franchise Bill. My right hon. friend has just assured us that there will be nothing further of a controversial nature, which is a fortunate thing, but I shall be very much surprised if we do not have to consider further Supplementary Estimates or something other of a nature which should receive careful attention. In the public interest, therefore, it is desirable that at this stage we should ask ourselves just what is expected of members of Parliament who are sent here to transact the business of the country. I can well understand that every hon. member is feeling very keenly the sacrifice he is making in being absent from his home and not having an opportunity of attending to his private business. I can realize, particularly in the case of many members from the West where the seasonal nature of their callings requires their presence at this time of the year, that they would like to be at home attending to their work, and not be obliged to have someone else look after it or else leave it undone. These may be reasons for the Government considering what may be owing hon. members in the matter of indemnities to which they may be entitled under conditions as they now exist in the country, and as they have developed since the war. But I contend that the first duty of a member of Parliament is to give his time to public work, and that he should not seek to hurry through important legislation so that he can get back to his private business. I hope the Prime Minister will appreciate the force of these few remarks, which I make simply because I believe it is all-important in the public interest that the business of the House should not be rushed through with undue haste.

May I point out this to my hon. friends opposite? As the Prime Minister has mentioned, we have been in session for three months and are now entering upon the fourth month. The time of this Parliament has been taken up for the most part with amending legislation passed at previous sessions of this very Parliament, many of which amendments have been rendered necessary solely because of the undue haste with which this legislation had been rushed through at a previous session. I have a list of the legislation which has thus far been considered, and I will draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the extent to which the time of the House has been taken up, at the instance of the Government, with a lot of second rate measures—because that is all they amount to—to the exclusion of the important work of the session. We have had before is, for example, an Act respecting the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, to amend a section regarding pensions which had already been amended in 1919. We have had the Franchise Bill, which is in reality a re-enactment of an old measure with additional amendments. There was an Act to amend the Currency Act, 1910, which Act had been amended at the first session of 1919 and has come in for further amendment at this session. There was an Act to

amend and consolidate the Acts relating to patents of invention. This Act was amended in the first session of 1919, and again in the second session of 1919. There was an Act to amend the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, another Act that had been passed previous to the session of 1919 and which was amended in 1919. This session still further amendments are brought in. Other measures are the following: An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act, previously amended at several sessions, including the first and second sessions of 1919; an Act respecting Food and Drugs, also amended at both the first and second sessions of 1919; an Act respecting Commercial Feeding Stuffs, amended at the second session of 1919; an Act to amend the Dominion Lands Act, previously amended at the first and second sessions of 1919. An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act, previously amended at the first and second sessions of 1919; an Act to amend the Civil Service Act, 1918, and the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1919; an Act to confirm the agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway and His Majesty, which the Government admitted was presented to Parliament to correct certain errors that had been made, and made on account of the undue haste with which the measure had been rushed through at the last session of Parliament; an Act to amend the Technical Education Act, which had been amended at the first session of 1919; an Act to amend the Industrial Disputes Act, 1907, which had been previously amended in 1918 and was further amended this year, much, I think, to the disadvantage of the legislation; an Act to amend the Soldier Settlement Act, amended in 1919; an Act to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, previously amended in 1918; an Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act, previously amended in the first and second sessions, 1919; an Act to amend the Oleomargarine Act passed in 1919; and finally an Act to amend the Inspection and Sale Act, previous amendments to which were made in 1918.

There is a long legislative programme, but what does it amount to? It is simply bringing back to this Parliament, to occupy the time of members of this House, a lot of legislation to be amended, some of the amendments being wholly secondary and unimportant. On the face of it, it is a confession that in previous years the Government's legislation was so ill-digested that within a year they have had to come back to Parliament for further amendments. I fear that the way we shall be rushing through legislation in the next few weeks, if we have morning, afternoon, and evening sittings, will mean that the time of another session, a year hence, will be taken up again with a lot of further amendments of this sort.

I might also direct the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that we have not yet obtained from the Government a statement of the Civil Service classification. We shall be called upon to vote appropriations for the Civil Service. In the Estimates presented to Parliament this year, the explanatory details of Civil Government usually printed are omitted. I hardly think the country will expect Parliament to pass the appropriation necessary for Civil Government until we get these essential details.

There are also several important reports that have not yet been brought down. There has been no report, as far as I can see, of the Public Printing and Stationery, the Militia Council, the Geological Survey, Mines Branch, the Penitentiaries Branch, Department of Justice, and the Archives Branch. Then we have no Parliamentary documents from the Department of Trade and Commerce relating to Steamship Subsidies, the Trade of Canada, Grain Commissioners, Criminal Statistics, Weights and Measures, Dominion Statistics.

We have not yet had the railway statistics brought down. It was only seven days ago that the Minister of Railways presented to this House the report of the Department of Railways and Canals, and it was only thirteen days ago that the fourth volume of the Auditor-General's report was presented to the House. Yet hon. members of this House are supposed to have mastered the details of these different reports. The reports are supposed to have been presented to the people's representatives in this House, and we are supposed to have examined the legislation that is before Parliament in the light of these different documents. Mr. Speaker, it makes Parliamentary government a farce when legislation is proceeded with in that fashion. That is not the procedure that ought to be adopted or followed by a deliberative assembly. As I said, it may be a satisfactory method of conducting warfare. It may be one way of effecting a great drive so that there will be great confusion when millions of dollars of the people's money are about to be voted, but it is not the method which should be adopt-

ed in a deliberative assembly having the responsibility which this Parliament is called upon to exercise. I hope under the circumstances that my right hon. friend will consider, first, the public interest, and secondly, the private wishes of individual members.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I regret I was not in the Chamber when the Prime Minister made his statement regarding the resolution we are now discussing. I have listened with much interest to the speech of the leader of the Opposition—of the Opposition at that end of the Chamber. First, I would offer just one word of criticism of the Government in the most friendly way. I think they have been a little dilatory this session in bringing down the legislation which they had to present to Parliament. While absent through illness, I read the reports of the debates, and I feel that considerable time was lost in the first six or eight weeks of the session. Might I suggest that the Government in future get its legislation down before the House a little earlier in the session?

There is a good deal of force in the arguments advanced by the leader of the Opposition. We are here concerned with serious business. We have yet the greater part of the Estimates to consider and pass upon, and the expenditure of large sums of the public money at this time ought to be carefully scrutinized. Nevertheless, on the other hand, I feel that for the members from Western Canada and the Maritime Provinces there is a real hardship in sitting here a greater length of time than is absolutely necessary. Being a man of peace, and this little group around me being men of peace also, may I offer a suggestion to the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition? It is this, that we defer Saturday sittings until perhaps a week or two weeks, from next Saturday, and that instead of having mornings sittings we assemble at two o'clock in the afternoon from the beginning of next week, and continue to meet at that hour until the end of the session. I believe that in that way we could accomplish as much work as by morning sittings. The position of hon. members in regard to morning sittings is this: Some of the committees are still at work. All hon. members have correspondence to look after, they must study the legislation before the House, and have to attend to other matters that are coming up daily. With morning sittings we have no opportunity to attend to all this. With lunch at one o'clock, I see no reason why we could not assemble at two, sit till six, reassemble at eight and adjourn at the usual hour. I think that in that way we should make just as much progress as by having morning sittings. Being a humble individual I offer this suggestion to the Government and the leader of the Opposition for their consideration.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I have on more than one occasion voiced my feelings and opinions in connection with the work of the House. Living three thousand miles away, I have come here for the purpose of transacting the public business, as we all have, as has been stated by the leader of the Opposition. It has been my desire to attend to that work regularly, and I believe that I am one of the members who attend the sittings of the House as assiduously as possible. My grievance is this: that by arrangement between the two whips in this House hon. gentlemen across the aisle leave here on Friday afternoon and return on Monday night, as do hon. members on this side of the House from the province of Ontario, and the quorum in this House from Friday until Monday is maintained by the members from the West, until these other gentlemen have attended to the pleasure of their families and their business at home.

As to the accusation of the leader of the Opposition, that this Government was attempting to make a drive in the last days of the session, I would remind him of the fact that last session he was very desirous of going home at an early stage of the game. So far as the measures on the Order Paper are concerned, they have been on the Order Paper for the last two months and it is the fault of hon. members themselves if they are not familiar with the proposed legislation. My hon. friend has touched upon indemnities. Let him rise in his seat now and say he is in favour of increased indemnities.

Mr. BUREAU: Well, well.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to remaining here twelve months if it is necessary, and I am paid for it, but under the present schedule of pay I am not willing to remain here while the members from Quebec and Ontario enjoy themselves at the opening of jockey club meets or at home, or attend to their office and business three days in the week while the members from the West are left here to transact the public business. Those gentlemen take temporary rooms in

Ottawa, but we are required to sign leases for six months if we desire to have permanent quarters. Our friends opposite go home on Friday and save money by leaving the city, and in addition to this they enjoy the great advantage of spending considerable time with their families. We, on the other hand, are compelled to remain here continuously. We on this side are anxious to carry on the business of the country without interruption, but we have not the advantage of saving money, as hon. gentlemen from Ontario and Quebec who are objecting to this have by taking temporary rooms and going home at regular intervals. I think that the suggestions of the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) come with bad grace. We all regret, I am sure, his absence from the House recently through illness, but we have had to attend constantly to the business of the House; and if the hon. gentleman had devoted less time to the organizing of the Farmers' party in the East he would have been in a position to know more of the business of this session. There are no committees sitting that will embarrass the attendance of hon. gentlemen in the House. Within the last week no committees, except one, have been considering any business of the House, and yet I may point out the fact that the attendance on this side has been limited to three or four gentlemen, including the Minister of Finance—

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is the only truth in the hon. gentleman's speech.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton):—while last night there were but barely twenty hon. members opposite. Is not the hypocrisy of this matter apparent? Hon. gentlemen are putting forward the plea that they are eager to attend to the business of the House, while as a matter of fact, at one sitting, there are only three members on this side and twenty members opposite, the Farmers' party being represented by one. Those hon. gentlemen who make professions of anxiety to attend scrupulously to the business of the House, should see to it, through the medium of their Whip, that they are in their seats while legislation is being put through, instead of attending to their own business at home. I want to go on with the business of the House so that I may be able to go home and attend to my own within a reasonable time.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): This is the second occasion on which the hon. member has made the sweeping statement that all hon. gentlemen in this House coming from Quebec and Ontario go home on Friday and are absent on Monday. This general allegation on the part of my hon. friend opposite I do not want to go unchallenged. There are many hon. members from Quebec and Ontario who are present in this House on Fridays and on Mondays as well; and I desire to tell my hon. friend, further, that all, or practically all the members from Quebec on this side of the House remain in the House every day of the week, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays as well as the days on which he says they are absent. For the last two weeks we have sat in this House until twelve o'clock at night and sometimes one o'clock in the morning, and as the hon. gentleman has just truly remarked there have been occasions when there were only three or four hon. members present on the other side of the House. Sir, it is those gentlemen who remain here all the time, from three o'clock in the afternoon until twelve at night, that are entitled to some consideration in this matter. They give their full attention to the legislation that is brought before the House and study it with all the care it demands. They have to be here all the time, and it is unfair to ask those few—if there are only a few who so conscientiously attend to their parliamentary duties—to come back here at eleven o'clock in the morning after having spent a strenuous and trying day in this House until a late hour at night.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton): May I ask my hon. friend a question? Is it not a fact that you have attended to your own private practice during the session,—something I have not done myself?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No Sir; it is not a fact. Let me tell my hon. friend that I have been here all the time; and I think I may fairly claim, Mr. Speaker, that I have been diligent in my attendance. I have endeavoured to give to the consideration of the public questions that come before this House that zealous study and attention which all legislation should receive.

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am here promptly at three o'clock in the afternoon and I remain, not for a few moments and then go away; I stay, practically speaking, all the time. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that it is eminently unfair to ask me or any other hon. gentleman to come here at eleven

o'clock in the morning after spending a hard day in the House. There is no one in this House who would be more pleased to see the session over than myself.

Mr. BUREAU: Except me.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is all right for hon. gentlemen carelessly to say, "Let us go home;" but we have something else to do, Mr. Speaker. Our mandate demands something more than that we shall just come here and, when it suits our fancy, go home again irrespectively of what we may have done in the way of business. We must give to the legislation—to the Estimates and to all the business that comes before us—that consideration which the people expect us to give to our public duties. Business well considered is business well done; business rushed is business ill done; and it ill becomes hon. gentlemen who are seldom seen in their seats in this House to cheer their fellow members when they make the irresponsible suggestion that we should close up everything and go home.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I depreciate very much the practice of washing dirty linen in public and I also think that on the whole the proposition of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), being in accordance, as it is, with precedent of many years' standing, is a very good one. Personally I think we had better adapt ourselves as best we can to the common sense of the situation and let common sense guide us. For my part, I support the Prime Minister in this matter.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice): I think we have strayed somewhat from the question under consideration, and my hon. friend from East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) in his desire to make an argument vented a little grievance which evidently he thinks he has. If the hon. gentleman had stated that when members from Quebec and Ontario went home on Fridays and stayed away from the House they hampered the progress of the business of the House, he would have made some point. But that is not his contention. He simply says that some members can go home and spend time with their families, while he has to remain in Ottawa. Now, Sir, as the hon. gentleman from Red Deer has said, this question is one of common sense, and the point to be settled is this: how much can human nature endure, and to what extent can men be taxed physically if they are to perform their duties thoroughly? If we are going to come here at eleven o'clock in the morning and sit until one, and then come back at three and sit until six, returning at eight and sitting indefinitely to all hours of the night, and sometimes until one or two in the morning—for the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) in his zeal in putting through the Franchise Bill showed an unmistakable tendency to adopt late hours—then it will be utterly impossible for hon. gentlemen to give anything like serious consideration to the work that comes before them. There are still some very important matters to be dealt with, Sir. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) just now read the list of Bills which still appear on the Order Paper, and one of which is a Bill to amend the Insurance Act of 1917. The Minister of Finance, who is to promote that Bill, knows that it involves very important considerations; and from correspondence and despatches I have received in connection with the matter, I may state that every big industry, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, is interested in that Bill, which will affect their rates of insurance and will also affect their business to a large extent. Now, these people have a right to get their views put before Parliament, but we cannot help them. As my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has said, practically no Estimates have been brought down. The Budget is still under discussion, and we are told that the Government will require more money. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people are entitled to know what has been done with the money that has been already voted. When we voted one-sixth of the appropriations I registered my protest, because I thought the Estimates ought to have been brought down, and that, except as to salaries, it was unfair to ask any hon. member to commit himself to any appropriation without first having an opportunity to express his views thereon, for the discussion of these Estimates is the only way whereby we can get the information we require.

As my hon. leader has said, the latter part of the Auditor General's Report has been brought down only recently, and the report of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) has been on the Table only within the last six or seven days and contains very few details. Then, too, questions have remained on the Order Paper unanswered, or badly answered, and we have been unable to get further answers. When the Government do not want to answer a question, they just say: "Make it a motion for a return," and that question never sees the light of day again.

Although I am not as young as many hon. members, I have as much endurance as any of my hon. friends, and I say that I cannot rightly do my duty if I have to be here at eleven o'clock in the morning until midnight. We on this side of the House have to be in our places anyway, but conditions are different on the other side, and my hon. friend from East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) let the cat out of the bag. If the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) is in the House his colleagues need not be in attendance; and the same remark applies if any other minister is in his seat; but we have got to be here, anyway. Another circumstance that makes conditions easier for them than for us is that they know in advance by reports prepared by departmental officials what business is to be taken up, so their brief is prepared before they come to the House, and all they have to do is to put their case forward, and their work is done; but our work only then begins. And how are we going to do our work satisfactorily if we have to begin at eleven o'clock in the morning and continue until probably two o'clock next morning? I say it is a physical impossibility.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that we are all desirous of going home. I realize the hardship of my hon. friends from the West and I sympathize with them at being separated from their families for such a long time. But I dismiss the argument of the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie). We have to pay for our rooms the same as gentlemen from the West. I pay for my room by the week whether I am here or not, for I am not going to carry my rags home under my arm every Friday night.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): I wish to correct a statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau). I said "some" hon. members from Quebec and "some" hon. members from Ontario gave up their rooms.

Mr. BUREAU: Some members from Quebec go home on Friday and spend less money than other hon. members who remain here. I may tell my hon. friend that it is not a question whether he spends more money than I do, or vice versa; it is a question whether common sense justifies the proposition to sit mornings and Saturdays. If we are humanly able to stand that pressure and discharge our duties satisfactorily, no objection can be urged; but I feel that I cannot endure the strain nor get through my work satisfactorily under such conditions.

It is just as great a hardship to me as to other hon. members not to be able to get back to my office, perhaps more so, because I have not the means that some others have to render me independent of my profession; but in spite of that I am ready to do my duty and to sit here until September, if necessary. And every hon. member ought to be ready to do the same. As my hon. friend said, we are just at the crucial sections of the Franchise Act where we are certain of a conflict of opinion. We are only human, and the strain of long hours is bound to tell on us. During the war we watched anxiously the morale of our troops; and if our electors watch our morale during two weeks of hot weather while we are sitting from eleven o'clock in the morning until the early hours of the following morning, I think they will notice a decline in it, and that those sections of the Franchise Act will be put through without proper discussion, simply because hon. members will be unable to give proper attention to them by reason of being physically unfit owing to attempting what is physically impossible. Besides, hon. members will not be fit otherwise, because they will not have sufficient time between two o'clock in the morning and eleven o'clock next morning to study the questions that are to engage their attention at the next sitting.

I do not think sitting on Saturdays will advance business at all. The suggestion to open the day's business at two o'clock I think is reasonable, and I for one am willing to accept that proposal, or we might even commence work at a quarter to two, but certainly not at eleven o'clock in the morning. For that reason I shall oppose the motion made by the Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Prime Minister exercises his right of formally closing the debate hon. members will be precluded from further discussion of this motion. But as in such a case as this more or less latitude is usually allowed, I am sure the Prime Minister will have the unanimous consent of the House to speak without closing the debate.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, it has never been the practice in my experience of twenty-four years to press a motion of this kind when it is seriously opposed by the other side of the House. Therefore, I would not think of doing so now in view of what has been said by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

But my hon. friend made one or two observations which I think require a reply

from me. If he is under the illusion that this Parliament sitting from the first day of January until the thirty-first day of December would pass legislation in such perfect form that it would never require any amendment, I fear that my hon. friend will be sadly disillusioned. I venture this statement also; that if he will look over the legislation of the past, under whatever Government it may be, he will find that the major portion consists in amendments of Acts already passed; and for this very good reason,—that almost every conceivable subject under the sun has been dealt with at some time or other, and further legislation, necessitated by new developments and new conditions, is ordinarily made by amendment to legislation already existing. I do not think therefore that the list of amendments which my hon. friend has placed before the House has any real significance so far as this particular question is concerned.

It is, of course, highly desirable that we should get on with the business of the House. When hon. gentlemen on the other side speak of hardship and difficulty, I am ready to give every consideration to what they say, but I would like to point out to them that if there be any hardship in beginning the session at eleven o'clock in the morning and continuing until perhaps midnight, the hardship is as severe upon members of the Government as it is upon hon. members.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, no.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg your pardon.

Mr. BUREAU: Some one said "Oh, no." I think he is right, too, because the ministers stay here by turns.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Well, my hon. friend had at one time some experience in a government, and if he will refresh his memory I think he will withdraw the statement he has just made.

Mr. BUREAU: That is my recollection.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In reply to the statement by the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) that the ministers were absent from their seats both yesterday afternoon and evening, that is true, but they were not absent from this building. The mere putting through of the routine business day by day occupies very considerable time, and of course there are questions of policy regarding legislation to be brought down which demand conferences during a considerable portion of the day among the members of the Government. My hon. friends the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) will readily recognize the truth of what I say in that regard. However, that is perhaps enough of those matters.

Just one word as to the legislation that has been brought down. I am informed that the Franchise Bill was introduced on the 26th day of March, and that up to the present time no less than seventeen sittings of the Committee of the Whole House have been devoted to the measure. I would venture to think that such a degree of activity does not indicate any remissness on the part of the Government. I am also told by my colleagues, who were here when I unfortunately had to be absent, the Government legislation has been ready on every day on which Government business could proceed, and that there has been no delinquency on the part of the ministry in bringing forward such legislation for the consideration of the House.

If my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition recalls the history of legislation in this House—since I have been a member of Parliament at least—he will remark this: That measures of corresponding importance debated in the early part of the session necessarily receive very much more of discussion at all events than measures introduced in the latter part of the session. That is necessarily the case. It always has been the case; it always will be the case; and I do not think that in the future that lies before my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition he will ever be able to modify very seriously that condition of affairs so long as parliamentary institutions continue as they are. It is in the very nature of things. I admit that if it were believed possible that a remedy could be found it should be sought; but in my public experience I have never yet been able to devise any remedy for that condition. It unfortunately has proved in the case of all governments in the years that are behind us, that legislation introduced at a later stage of the session has sometimes gone through without the same attentive consideration that would be accorded to it in the early part of the session.

4 p.m.

I am content to let the motion stand for the present and to consider the proposal made by the hon. member for Marquette for which I think a good deal may be said. The only purpose the Government has in

mind is to get on with the business of the House as expeditiously as possible consistently with the public interest; and to impose no undue hardship upon any hon. member on either side. That is our purpose and our desire. I shall let the matter stand, and discuss it further with my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Since the right hon. gentleman has been good enough to say that the matter would stand over for the present, there is no particular reason why one should continue the discussion; I only rise to refer to one point. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) defended the motion of the Prime Minister on the ground that it was following precedent. In our parliamentary institutions precedent counts for a great deal, I acknowledge that. I cannot speak positively but my impression is that the motion which the right hon. gentleman has made is without a precedent. Speaking only from memory I do not think he will find an instance where in the first days, or in the middle of, a Budget debate a motion of this kind has been brought forward. There are times during a session when we can all agree that morning sittings, Saturday sittings and Wednesday evening sittings—a departure from the regular rule—become necessary and will be supported by all. Where the main business of a session has been brought down, where all the public documents have been submitted, where there is abundant time to consider everything, and all that remains is for the House to wind up the session, there is something to be said in favour of a motion of that kind; but when we are in the midst of the most important business of the session, when some of the public documents have not been brought down, when a great many matters have only been before the House for a few days, I think my right hon. friend will find no instance where, under such circumstances, such a motion as is now proposed is made. My attention is drawn to the fact that among the Bills on the Order Paper yet to be introduced is one which I take to be very important — a Bill respecting the Canadian National railways which is given notice of by the Minister of Railways. Well, we know that must be a Bill of great importance. The Canadian National Railway system is the largest branch of the public departments of Canada and even without knowing anything whatever about the measure it is fair to say, and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will admit, that it is of an important character. As to which side or the other is responsible for delay and remiss in attendance perhaps rocks could be thrown on both sides. I must, however, ask my right hon. friend to give credit to hon. gentlemen on this side for keeping a quorum on many a night when, if we had had to depend upon hon. gentlemen opposite, there would have been no quorum. Several times last evening I counted but nine or ten members on the Government side, and again and again during the session if hon. members on this side had wished to delay business they could have counted out the House, not, however, by reason of absentees on this side because here there is always a fair attendance. There is fault on both sides, but the main point I desire my right hon. friend to consider is whether or not he is right in saying there is precedent for the making of a motion of this kind in the circumstances in which we are now placed and when we are in the midst of the most important business of the session.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In reply to my hon. friend let me say that in the ordinary course I think this matter has always been one of agreement between both sides of the House. I think, however, this may be said—that usually forenoon sittings and Saturday sittings have not been commenced until the programme of the Government is fully before the House. I think that is a fair statement to make.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion stands.

THE BUDGET.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON THE ANNUAL STATEMENT PRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

The House resumed from Wednesday, May 26, the debate on the motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, in the few remarks I intend to offer I shall be as brief as possible so as not to delay the much desired prorogation of Parliament. Moreover, the debate on the Budget has well nigh been exhausted, and I do not suppose that I can add very much to the very brilliant addresses which have already been delivered. The Budget Speech of the Minister of Finance has at least Mr. Speaker, one great merit: It faith-

fully reflects the financial situation of Canada to-day. If my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) will permit me, I will compare his speech to a little piece of art which I saw in an old cathedral during my last visit to Europe. Visiting the cathedral of Rouen I noticed in the rear portion of the cathedral a little font—a real piece of art—designed I am told by an old monk who worked at it for years and years. The especial feature about that little font is that when the passing traveller looks within it he will find reflected there the whole of the magnificent proportions of the cathedral, but unfortunately is seen upside down and reduced to a miniature. The Budget Speech, Mr. Speaker, recalls to my mind that little font I saw in the Gothic cathedral at Rouen. It reflects the Canada of to-day but the picture is all topsy-turvy and how mighty small it is after being under the direction of hon. gentlemen opposite.

However, Mr. Speaker, the present Minister of Finance, as has been stated on several occasions during this debate, is not responsible for the awkward position in which he finds himself, and if on the present occasion I cannot give him my support I, at least, can offer him my sincere sympathy. We are told that there will be no revision of the tariff in spite of the many promises that have been made to Parliament from year to year within, at least, the last five years. But of course we must face a revision of taxation. I do not object to income tax; indeed, I have advocated it. Nor do I object to any tax or impost on the luxuries of life. But speaking on behalf of my constituents; on behalf of the man on the street, I do strenuously object to any tax on the necessities of life. One has not to be much versed on political economy to know that the basic wants of man are threefold: food, clothing and shelter. These necessities, in a cold country like Canada, should not be taxed. Any tax on the necessities of life are a handicap to the labourer, to the worker; they press more heavily on the poor man than they do on any other man in the community. They also handicap the producers and work in restraint of trade. I shall not quote at this moment the various opinions on this subject as expressed by the newspapers of Canada on both sides of politics, but I only wish to quote the opinion of the man on the street. Upon reading the tariff resolutions of the Finance Minister, one of my electors, a respected citizen of the county of Maisonneuve who has quite a large family and who has only small earnings to support it, wrote me the following:

> Automobiles for passengers; former duty, 10 per cent plus war tax 7½ per cent—17½ per cent; present duty, 15 per cent, plus one per cent excise on wholesalers only; in reality, a reduction on the greatest luxury of the age. The duties—

And I agree with my correspondent.

> The duties on automobiles should be at least 25 per cent; that much was expected by the importers. As regards clothing, boots and shoes, if the principle of taxing luxuries is to be adopted—and it seems to be generally accepted as necessary—let luxuries be taxed, not necessities. The minimum prices on all these commodities subject to taxation should be raised at least 50 per cent.

Take shoes. There are several large manufacturers of shoes in the constituency which I have the honour to represent.

> It is impossible to-day to buy a shoe such as everybody in towns and cities is obliged to wear for less than $10 to $12. What are generally called Oxford walking shoes for ladies cost from $12 to $16. Is it not absurd to fix the minimum price subject to taxation at $9? Take confectionery. Not long ago Laura Secord chocolates were selling at 70 cents a pound; they now ask 80 cents, making an additional profit of five per cent for the company. They do not give or issue any slip or check to the customer; how much of this will go to the Government? The cost of sugar at retail is 22 cents a pound. Is not the price of Page and Shaw's or Neilson's candies at $1.25 a pound high enough to warrant the imposition of the tax of ten per cent on the manufacturer and not on the common people, not on the consumer?

Take sporting goods. I have many young sturdy Canadians in my division of Maisonneuve. French-Canadian families as you are aware are large and the boys are all more or less sportsmen.

Mr. BELAND: Baseball champions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, we have carried the honours on many occasions in Maisonneuve. Well, there is a tax of 50 cents and upwards on sporting goods. My correspondent says:

> If there is one thing in which the young people of our towns and cities should be encouraged, it is the practice of sports for the maintenance of virility and health. The class in the community that is suffering most from the high cost of living is the salaried class, the wage-earning class, and this provision hits them almost exclusively. It is a provision that should be struck out.
>
> Now, I have this remark to make regarding gold ornaments. Why should the Government not expropriate for coinage purposes all the gold mined, with the exception, for our provinces at least, of a certain quantity required for wedding rings and dental purposes? The

use of gold should be absolutely prohibited except where no substitute can be found, until our coinage reserve again reaches the fine percentage which it had attained in 1914.

Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest confidence in Mr. Breadner's ability. But Mr. Breadner, able as he is, faithful watch-dog of the treasury that he is, is not ubiquitous. I tell my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that the administration of his new law will be nothing less than a premium on fraud.

My hon. friend did not, in his Budget Speech, dilate on the question of expenditure. He is new in the saddle as Finance Minister; he should read the speeches delivered many years ago by that grand old man of England, William Ewart Gladstone, on the question of economy. Mr. Gladstone was, perhaps, never more eloquent than when he delivered his Budget speeches as Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he was not ashamed to proclaim the following truths:

> A Chancellor of the Exchequer must be prepared to be unpopular; he must learn how to say no to many requests which are made to him; he must be cheeseparing.

If there ever was an occasion when the Minister of Finance should practise cheeseparing, that occasion is now. My hon. friend says—and I believe he is sincere—that he will check the expenditure, and he appeals to hon. members on both sides to do the same. With the combination around him, I am afraid that on that question, at all events, my hon. friend, to repeat a phrase well known in Canadian politics, will be "nothing but a fly on the wheel." Let me offer him another suggestion. I already made one the other day to the House; I said, for instance, that our rules should be so amended that ministers of the Crown should have a right to appear before both Houses of Parliament, whether they belonged to the one or to the other. I say to-day that you shall not check the tremendous expenditures of this country, unless at the beginning of the session a special committee is appointed to supervise the Estimates which are to be submitted to the House of Commons. That committee should have a right to send for books, to call for witnesses and experts in order to bring before the House only such items of expenditure as should be considered by Parliament. This seems to me a practical question, and though the reform may appear to be somewhat radical, circumstances justify its adoption.

Let my hon. friend pause and ponder after having read the startling figures which were given to this House the other day by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). In 1914, the expenditure per head was, in round figures, $24; in 1920, it has reached the enormous sum of $75 per head of the population. In 1914, the gross debt per head of the population was $71.75; in 1920, it is $334.90. In 1914, the net debt per head of the population was $43.49; in 1920, it is $215. These are stupendous figures, and my hon. friend should commence at once to eliminate from the Estimates any expenditures which might well be postponed until after Canada has resumed the proud position she occupied when she was financially led by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's.

My hon. friend will, I hope, think I am sincere in my advocacy of a reduction in military expenditure. The war is now over, and the Englishman, being a plausible man, having the sagacity we know he has, has disbanded all his troops, and he is now hard at work to recuperate the trade and commerce of old England. Let Canada do likewise. We should reduce to its minimum the military expenditure of this country.

There are vague rumours regarding a naval expenditure. Many years ago when the treasury was overflowing with surpluses, I strongly supported the expenditure of several millions for the creation of a Canadian navy, manned by Canadian officers and Canadian sailors and flying with the British ensign, the Canadian flag. But those days have gone by, and we are face to face with heavy commitments and huge deficits which will paralyse the financial possibilities of this country for many years to come. We have had a visit from Lord Jellicoe, and since that visit we have been favoured with only a vague general answer as to the intentions of the Government in regard to the proposed navy. I do not know the intention of the Government nor of the minister who is at the head of the Naval Department, but all I can say, in all sincerity, is this: This is a time for Canada to build, not warships, but friendships. How will you build friendships? By giving something to do to my good and genial friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). He requires some work in that department which was described many years ago, I think, by himself, as the fifth wheel of the Government coach. How will you build friendships? By letting the Minister of Trade and Commerce, instead of appointing semi-am-

bassadors to play at diplomacy at Washington and elsewhere, appoint alert trade commissioners who will capture wider markets for Canada and will meet the competition, not only of Americans, but of Australians, New Zealanders, yes, and Britons too.

On this subject, we might learn a lesson from old England, from her political economy and her commercial sagacity. I was amused the other day, listening to my good friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) lecturing old England. Poor old England, in the throes of bankruptcy! Poor old England, having been the dupe of free trade for half a century! In fact, my hon. friend said: "But new days have come, new times have arisen in England and Mr. Asquith himself—and he coupled with the name of Mr. Asquith that of Mr. Lloyd George—appointed a commission four years ago to study the question of key industries. I asked my hon. friend if recommendations had been made. My hon. friend answered in the affirmative, but he failed to tell me if the Parliament of Great Britain had put into concrete form on the Statute Book any of the recommendations of that commission. I thought my hon. friend knew more about England than I did. I have been only a few times in the Old Country, but I know this: John Bull is a practical and shrewed business man. There are, it is said, two great safety valves in England. There is a safety valve to protect England against the agitator, and you might see that safety valve at work every Sunday morning in Hyde Park, where you hear the long-haired agitator disclaiming against Royalty, against the House of Lords and generally against the institutions of the land.

Mr. BUREAU: Blowing off steam.

Mr. LEMIEUX: People pass by, they listen, they smile, and there is no revolution in England. Another safety valve is the appointment of commissions by the Government of His Majesty in order to give a few faddists the time and opportunity to reduce their vapourings to writing. This commission appointed with a view to present Great Britain with the fallacy of high protection is one of those safety valves.

He coupled the name of Mr. Asquith with that of Mr. Lloyd George. He might just as well have asked his good neighbour, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, if England will change her present fiscal system for the one which he propounded for the benefit of his Toronto admirers. Why, some years ago the Minister of Trade and Commerce, being for a while out of the House of Commons, and being known as one of the most, if not the most eloquent exponent of high protection in Canada, was invited to tour England on behalf of Mr. Chamberlain's party. He went across the water and spoke in all the large centres of England. He was applauded again and again as the great Canadian speaker, a gentleman who had been Finance Minister of Canada for many years, and much admired for his power of speech. But when the elections came off, poor Mr. Chamberlain's party was defeated horse, foot and artillery. My hon. friend came back and I have never heard him since proclaim to this House that England would ever adopt the policy of protection as against free trade,—the policy which has made England great and made the fortunes of the English merchants. Mr. Speaker, as I said, he coupled the name of Mr. Asquith with that of Mr. Lloyd George. Now just one word about Mr. Asquith. Defining the aims of Liberalism —and Mr. Asquith does not change his mind so often perhaps as others—he said:

> May I try, in two or three sentences to indicate to you what has been in the past and what, in my judgment, still remain its specific aims? As regards the Empire, to secure real unity by allowing the freest diversity and the fullest liberty of self-development in all its members. (Cheers). As regards property, to make it secure by divesting it of injustice. (Cheers). As regards political authority, to make it stable by resting it upon the broadest possible basis of popular responsibility. As regards religion, to remove from it the odium of an alliance with political disabilities. (Hear, hear). As regards trade, to make it world-wide by opening our own markets here at home to everybody.

Those are the views of Mr. Asquith, and though he appointed a commission to please a few faddists he remains as staunch and firm a free trader as ever.

As regards Mr. Llody George, the present Prime Minister of Great Britain, here is what he said not very long ago, and I am pleased to quote his remarks because, Mr. Speaker, he at least will surely not be classed as one of the disloyalists ever ready to sell his British birthright like my hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queen's in 1911. Here is what he said on the 17th of February, 1911:

> I rejoice that it (the Reciprocity Agreement) has been negotiated, and heartily trust it will carry to a successful conclusion. I regard it as a great triumph of common sense, and an immense stride in the cause of free trade, inculcating a step towards the fraternity and co-operation of the English-speaking family.

Mr. Speaker, those very sane words were also used in the message addressed to the Canadian people at the elections of 1911 by the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Enough of this subject.

From information I have, I wish to convey to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, the news that a change seems to be at hand in the government of this country. I have in my hand The Onlooker. I do not know who this Onlooker from Toronto is, nor at what window he perches, whether it is at the York Club, or the National Club of Toronto, or at the King Edward Hotel, or some other sanctuary, but this Onlooker seems to have been peeping into the affairs of the Unionist party pretty shrewdly, and I wish to give my right hon. friend some information he has gathered. Once more, it is the voice of Toronto speaking. This Onlooker states quite authoritatively:

It is possible that the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden may never again resume the reins of office. In that case a leader must be found who will inspire confidence and respect, if not enthusiasm.

Then he goes on to discard those who should not be the leaders, and it is all rather interesting. He says:

Sir Thomas White has absolutely no claim upon the premiership. To put it bluntly, he does not measure up to its requirements. For one thing, he has not had the necessary parliamentary experience, and for another, he is profoundly distrusted by the Conservatives; and the Conservative party will have to be considered in any question of the premiership.

We know that. I am glad to give this information to my Liberal-Unionist friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne). He goes on, speaking of Sir Thomas White:

He was invited to step into a financial aeroplane by a group of—shall we say disinterested and admiring friends?—and was wafted to Ottawa and placed in charge of the country's finances. The manner of his appointment was reprehensible and unprecedented. He left Toronto a Liberal and woke up in Ottawa a Conservative. Strange metamorphosis! He had never been in Parliament; outside of financial circles he was but little known; the country had made no wild demand for his services; yet, suddenly, overnight he is found in office It is safe to say that never again at the solicitation of any outside group will a Minister of Finance be appointed, or any other kind of a minister. The organ in question mistakes for the voice of the people "The wolf's long cry from Oonalaska's shore."

So much for my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance. Then he speaks of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) in this way:

His star is decidedly in the ascendant. . . In the hands of either of these strong men the country would be entirely safe, and, either in power, we could sleep safe in our beds o'night. Mr. Meighen, however, has his spurs to win.

Then he speaks of my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell):

He is not, and never can be, a politician. He is temperamentally unfitted for the game. The rough and tumble of the arena is not for him.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He is too good.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He goes on:

No doubt he is sick of the strife, and would be glad to return to those quiet walks of civic usefulness where his high and sincere character is known and valued.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He is a soul-saver.

Mr. LEMIEUX (reading):

Cromwell's utterance in respect of a certain type of public man is always bearing in mind, as a warning if nothing else—"A man never goes so far as when he doesn't know where he is going."

Then he turns to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce and offers him the palm, the crown, not of thorns, but of gold to adorn his brow:

Sir George Foster is incomparably the best debater in Parliament, and, although seventy-three, as lithe and limber as when, a mere stripling (as politicians go), he made his first speech to the delight and wonder of the House. His equipment as a parliamentarian is complete, and his profound knowledge of finance, not to be held in light esteem at this perilous juncture of affairs. It is not against him that he was once a professor of political economy, but very much to the good. His voice is music; his choice of English shows that rare quality—conscience of phrase; his logic is always germane to the subject under discussion, and his vision of Imperial greatness rises at times into the domain of poetry. When, years ago, the grand old Motherland stood practically alone with the wolves of Europe ready to spring at her throat, he thrilled the whole Empire with the phrase, "splendid isolation"—a phrase just re-echoed in the January 19th Century by Major Hurst. He deserves well of his country; and if faithful public service, complete loyalty to his party and passionate devotion to British connection count for anything, the premiership should be his for the asking. To him the words in Tennyson's immortal poem surely apply:—

"Old age hath yet his honour and his toil;
Death closes all; but something ere the end,
Some work of noble note, may yet be done
Not unbecoming men that strove with gods.
Come, my friends,
'Tis not too late to seek a newer world."

Yes, a change is surely at hand, as "The Onlooker" states. I am not against that change. At the present juncture a storm is raging and no one will deny that the ship of state is in danger. Indeed it has been on the rocks for many months. The crew

and the pilot, I am sorry to say, are not equal to the task of steering her course. Another crew and another captain are badly needed. It is true that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) said the other day that the old hull could still carry the crew, the pilot, and the unfortunate passengers until 1922 or 1923. My hon. friend, being the master pilot of this Government, and having many sailing masters surrounding him, he is I think a judge of the hull of the ship of state and of the sailors and pilots in connection with it. Indeed, he is the gentleman who signs all the certificates. But let me tell him that if he thinks that the hull of the ship, as well as the crew, the captain and the passengers are all safe, he is sadly mistaken, because a ship cannot be safe when there are so many false lights on the shore. The sailors of this ship—whom I should call buccaneers—were united to carry on in that tragic year 1917; but they were united on one point and one point only, and that was the moral iniquity of the elections. Mr. Speaker, new conditions require new methods and new men. There are dark days in the history of every nation, though the people may be blessed with popular institutions and responsible government. This has been the case in Canada during the last five years; it was the case in England at the beginning of the last century. Every one conversant with history will remember that at the dawn of the nineteenth century, when the French Revolution and its horrors were haunting the minds of men, England under even the great Pitt established a system of domestic tyranny and a reign of terror. Habeas Corpus was suspended, right of public meeting was attacked, freedom of speech was denied and repressed. But a little group of men stood four-square against the assailants of freedom. Fox, the generous Fox, espoused the cause of the oppressed; Daniel O'Connell claimed and obtained for Irishmen the right and privileges enjoyed by the Englishmen of his day and generation; Grey, Russell, Brougham, Jeffrey and Peel claimed and obtained in turn the abolition of the ruling oligarchy, the extension of the franchise, and the repeal of the Corn laws which established free trade. Sir, in England in those days they thought that no political democracy could be real that was not the reflection of economic democracy. A French writer has said "L'histoire est un perpétuel recommencement," which I might translate by the homely phrase that history repeats itself. Under the shadow of the great war, the winning of which can be ascribed only to the young men who with unfaltering steps went to the front and with brave hearts climbed over the top,—under the shadow of that great war, I say Sir, the Government installed in Canada, as was done in England a century ago, a system of domestic tyranny and a reign of terror. The historian of the last five years, Mr. Speaker, after having described how our young Canadians fought and died to save democracy, will have to draw up a terrible indictment against the Government of the day. He will have to say that in their lust of power, in their desire—in unworthy mimicry of our brave soldiers—to entrench themselves in office, they have been guilty of the worst possible crime against society, that of shaking public confidence in our democratic institutions. The historian of the days that have just passed, will have to tell how the Government reinstated an old form of bureaucracy with all its baneful influences and discredible methods. He will have to tell how the courts of the land, here in Ottawa, and in the province of Alberta, were silenced by the Minister of Justice at the point of the bayonet; and how regiments were seen tramping, in the law-abiding and God-fearing city of Quebec on Holy Friday to suppress supposed riots, staged, concocted and organized by "agents provocateurs." What a sorry spectacle, Sir! Parliament flouted, absentee oligarchy, unreliable information, distrust of the common people, everything done in secret behind closed doors, a group of vainglorious men squandering public money to maintain a retinue of sycophants, protecting privilege, securing vested rights against molestation, delivering the country to the grasp of profiteering, extravagant war borrowing coupled with the creation of a monied aristocracy,—all this the historian will cite in his indictment against the Government. But, worse, still worse, he will tell of the deliberate destruction of the unity of Canada, that unity which, as a priceless heirloom, had been handed down from generation to generation to the great Canadian family by the Lafontaines and the Baldwins, the Cartiers and the Macdonalds, the Lauriers, the Mowats and the Blakes. Oh, that I were a Macaulay to draw up that indictment! Never was there such an urgent need for a change of methods and a change of men. There is an old saying which is familiar to us all: "Government of the people for the people and by the people." This pregnant epigram is attributed to Abraham Lincoln, and I accept it as the

essence of Liberalism which the party on your left, Mr. Speaker, represents in Canada; and the application of the principles which it implies, to the problems of Canadian politics in relation to national, imperial and world-wide interest is the work of the Liberal party in Canada. The aims of Liberalism have been and are to-day to remove inequality. The main battlements of privilege and vested authority have been won by Liberalism through centuries of struggle. The fight of Democracy for freedom, for equality of opportunity and for substantial justice to all individuals of the Commonwealth, still goes on and will continue to go on. There are still inequalities of taxation to be righted, the oppression of vested interests in trade and in industry to be overcome, monopolies and trusts to be regulated; and in the sphere of economic legislation—a sphere with which the leader of the Liberal party is familiar—Liberalism still has its greatest work to do; the welfare of the common man at the common task is its first consideration.

Surprise has been expressed on both sides of the House, by some of my friends of the Conservative party and by some of my Progressive friends, at certain remarks made a few days ago by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). Yet, Sir, although I have differed on one or two important occasions with the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's—honourable men may differ at times—I have no hesitation in stating, and I believe I am voicing the sentiment of the country, that his speech taken from the beginning to the very end is that of a Canadian statesman. It is consistent with himself and with the traditions and the policy of the Reform party.

In 1896, Mr. Speaker, when the Liberal party, and I was one of them—yes, twenty-five years ago, I joined the House of Commons, and I am now one of the old members in years of service in this House, and my recollections are very vivid—as I say, when the Liberal party took office in 1896 it did so, not under the banner of free trade pure and undiluted, but it took office under the banner of tariff for revenue. The two landmarks of that fiscal policy are well-known and they were erected by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) who was the trusted Minister of Finance in those days. My hon. friend first gave the British preference in 1897—which the very loyal party had not dared to give to the Mother Country; and in 1911 he implemented that legislation by the reciprocity agreement, which was appreciated in the words I quoted a moment ago by the present Prime Minister of Great Britain.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, though surprise has been expressed at his remarks was consistent with the Liberal traditions as regards the fiscal policy of our party. No one, I suppose, will question the staunch Liberalism and the honest convictions of the late leader of the party, the Hon. Edward Blake. Sir, allow me to quote from the address of Mr. Blake delivered in West Durham in 1882. The National Policy had been inaugurated by the Conservative party in 1879, with the standing offer of reciprocity with the United States. In his address Mr. Blake used the following language:

> You know well that I do not approve—

I commend these words to my hon. friends of the Progressive party, to those who did not fight under the banner of Mr. Blake, to those who honestly ignore the traditions and policies of the Liberal party under Blake as they ignore them under Laurier and Fielding.

> "You know well that I do not approve of needless restrictions on our liberty of exchanging what we have for what we want, and do not see that any substantial application of the restrictive principle has been or can be made in favour of the great interests of the mechanic, the labourer, the farmer, the lumberman, the shipbuilder or the fisherman. But you know also that I have fully recognized the fact that we are obliged to raise yearly a great sum, made greater by the obligations imposed on us by this Government; and that we must continue to provide this yearly sum mainly by import duties, laid to a great extent on goods similar to those which can be manufactured here; and that it results as a necessary incident of our settled fiscal system that there must be a large, and, as I believe, in the view of moderate protectionists, an ample advantage to the home manufacturer."

And listen to these words, Mr. Speaker, because they tally with the words spoken the other evening by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's:

> "Our adversaries wish to present to you an issue as between the present tariff and absolute free trade."

It is an old game; it was known in 1882.

> That is not the true issue. Free trade is, as I have repeatedly explained, for us impossible; and the issue is whether the present tariff is perfect, or defective and unjust.
>
> "I believe it to be, in some important respects, defective and unjust."

So do we believe that with the colossal debt and with the enormous commitments

of this country we require a revenue, and we shall require it for many years to come. Therefore, free trade as a theory reduced to practice at the present moment and in the years to come is a sheer impossibility, and any child in this country would appreciate the stand taken by the Liberal party.

But, Sir, Liberals and many Conservatives and many independent citizens of this country also believe that the time has come when protection "as high as Haman's gallows" must be done away with, and that the tariff as it exists is defective and unjust, and that in the fixing of the tariff some regard must be had not only to the manufacturers, but also, as Mr. Blake said, to the consumers and the public generally. That is the position of the Liberal party.

I am quite free to speak on this subject, and I think I take the common sense view of it. I happen to represent the constituency of Gaspé, where, to please my electors and to secure their votes, I would have only to say, "Gentlemen, I am a pure and undiluted free trader; you shall have free trade." On the other hand, I could turn to the manufacturers of Maisonneuve and tell them, "Gentlemen, I stand for the protection of your interests; I am a protectionist." By so doing I could get at once a clearance, to use a shipping phrase, from both Gaspé and Maisonneuve. But, Sir, I represent intelligent people, sane people, reasonable people, and they know that on this question of the tariff there must be give and take as on every other big issue which confronts this country.

Many long years elapsed, Mr. Speaker, before the Liberal party could put into practice their fiscal policy as propounded by Sir Richard Cartwright, Alexander Mackenzie, and Edward Blake. In those days we were blocked by impediments of somewhat the same character that we find to-day—there was an iniquitous franchise, there was a gerrymander, which debarred many Liberal constituencies, especially in the province of Ontario from their rightful representation in Parliament. The Liberal party was defeated in 1882, in 1887 and in 1891; but remember, Mr. Speaker, that in 1891 in the great province of Ontario there was a majority in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. Finally in 1896 the Liberal party was triumphant. From ocean to ocean the party rolled up a majority and the reins of office were taken by new men. What was then the condition of the country? I do not wish to touch too vigorously the tender feelings of my hon. friend (Sir George Foster) who was the Minister of Finance in the Tupper Government, but it is only too well known, alas! that deficits were annually recorded, that our foreign trade was stationary, that our manufacturers—and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) knows it perhaps better than any one else in this House—were making no headway, the great Northwest was undeveloped, and immigrants—yes and even Canadians were drifting to the United States. But on the 23rd June, 1896, a great wave of sanity, of intelligence, of patriotism, brought the Liberals to the helm and soon after Sir Wilfrid Laurier took office. The first question which engrossed the attention of the Laurier Government was that of tariff reform, and I well remember the investigation which was held in one city after another, in farming district after farming district, indeed from ocean to ocean. That investigation was conducted by Hon. Mr. Fielding, the then Minister of Finance who was accompanied by the Minister of Inland Revenue, if I remember well and by the then Controller of Customs, the late William Paterson. I followed the investigation of the commission in the city of Montreal—no doubt my hon. friend (Mr. Ballantyne) was also present at those sittings—and not one interest was neglected. The farmers had their say as well as the manufacturers and the fishermen—indeed all classes of our community had a chance to be heard and to propound their theories before that tribunal. As a result, Mr. Speaker, the tariff of 1897 was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Fielding. It materially reduced the duties on many necessities and staple commodities used by the consumer; it placed on the free list certain articles of prime necessity used by the farmer, the miner, the fisherman and the manufacturer; it reduced the duties on iron and steel which constituted, and still constitute, the staple raw materials for many an industry; it gave a substantial preference to Great Britain, first of 12 per cent, then raised to 25 per cent and at last increased to 33⅓ per cent. Mr. Speaker, what was the result? A new Canada was born; the country found itself and for the first time realized its immense possibilities. It was under the influence of these compelling events that standing before the then Prince of Wales—who later became good King Edward—the Prime Minister of Canada, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, voicing the senti-

5 p.m.

ments of his country could exclaim "that as the nineteenth century had been the century of the United States, so the twentieth century would be the century of Canada." Every legitimate industry from the Atlantic to the Pacific, speaking in all truth, prospered. Manufacturing institutions were enlarged again and again to meet the demands of the industrial world. The farmers shared in the prosperity probably better than any other class. The price of farm products increased tenfold—the results being seen with the increase in the value of farm lands —and the much deplored exodus under the Tory regime was practically stopped. Four hundred thousand immigrants yearly invaded the plains of the West, and those plains were changed into smiling fields producing the best that any country under the canopy of heaven could yield. The total exports of agricultural products increased from $14,000,000 in round figures in 1896 to $82,601,000 in 1911, while the exports of manufactured goods were augmented from $9,365,384 in 1896 to $35,283,-118 in 1911. Such, Mr. Speaker, was the effect of the administration of a Liberal Government, with a sane tariff, with a give and take Fiscal policy, from 1896 to 1911. In the words of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) we can all say "That Administration gave Canada progress and prosperity, peace and plenty." Then Canada had a Government, not a coalition of appetites like the present. Then Canada had Laurier at the helm. Ah, Mr. Speaker, time is a great avenger. I was touched to a greater extent than I can express when I listened on Tuesday to the remarks of my hon. friend from Red Deer. I can forgive him everything else for which he might be criticised on account of the words he uttered in 1917 in this House. Let me repeat what he said the other day:

> I am going to give some quotations now, very brief, not for the purpose of recrimination; not to say whether the Liberal party did or did not do its duty, but to state the progressive fiscal policy that I have believed in all my life, and to give it as affirmed by a man who, being dead, still speaketh.

Then having quoted from a speech by Sir Wilfrid Laurier the hon. member went on to say:

> That was sound doctrine, Mr. Speaker, when those sentences were uttered by the voice that is stilled forever so far as this scene is concerned, and it is as profoundly true and more applicable to-day. I am here to claim for the little group by whom we are surrounded that we inherit that doctrine. We are the inheritors of that creed. We come by it honourably. We followed and believed Sir Wilfrid Laurier then, and we follow his teachings now.

Yes, I can forgive a great deal in the member for Red Deer, Mr. Speaker, for those eloquent words. Sir, truth and justice are sometimes tardy in arriving, but they are not unlike the glimmering lights of the dawn at break of day. Only a few weeks ago I visited one of the art galleries in Rome and there saw that beautiful painting of Guido's, in which he represents the dawn breaking through the clouds of the night. A magnificent chariot is shown; seated on it is a charioteer holding a sceptre representative of the sun from which the rays are emanating. In front are four horses preceded by a group of nymphs who scatter flowers. Quietly and gently the glimmering light of dawn breaks through the dense, opaque night, and afar you can see the horizon illuminated,—it is the break of a perfect day. Such is truth; such is justice. It is commonly said, Mr. Speaker that "murder will out"; so truth also will out and justice will out. Yes, though Sir Wilfrid Laurier passed away under the cloud of prejudice and fanaticism which had been cast over him by unscrupulous opponents, to-day, like the break of the day under the action of light, Sir Wilfrid Laurier is to us, as he ever was, "le chevalier sans peur et sans reproche", to whom Canada during many years could look for light and leading; whom the people could trust because he trusted the people; a real leader, not a political accident; an intellectuality, not a mediocrity; never stampeded by conspiracy or dominated by fear; a champion of the masses, a terror to the classes; never elated by success or dejected by disappointment; tried by both extremes of fortune, never disturbed by either; serene in adversity; insensible to ingratitude,—Sir, we can truly say in the words of the poet that he was:

> —made of unpurchasable stuff;
> He went the ways when ways were rough.

Let us pay to him, Mr. Speaker, a tribute similar to that which was extended by a Premier of France to a great French citizen: He bestowed on Canada the alms of glory.

But, Sir, I may be told that I am delving in past history. What of the future) I unhesitatingly proclaim that we should revert to a sane party system; it is the best devised under British institutions for the Government of men. Having thus wisely reverted to the party system, let us revert, for the

sake of heaven, to responsible government. I am a Liberal because I believe in responsible government, but responsible government has been sadly shattered during the last five years. May I say to the young members who have graced this House since 1917 that the struggle between the executive and the popular government is never ending. The tendency of the executive is to grasp always larger powers than are necessary for the administration of the affairs of the country. The rule I venture to lay down to them as young men, after reading what I could of the political history of other nations, after studying, as well as I could, the principles of popular government, is the rule which, I am thankful to say, I hold more firmly to-day than ever before, that we as Liberals ought to give to the executive and remove from the people's representatives just so much power as, and no more than, is necessary for the efficient management of the business of administration.

As regards party government, I say that it is not in our gospel that all Liberals should think alike on any question. There is in the Liberal party some independence, some freedom,—freedom of thought; freedom of speech. There is in the Liberal party the advance guard, the main body, and the rear guard. All three are essential to the triumph of a just and noble cause. In the words of Mr. Blake, the advance guard are those who see or think they see further than the rest; who project their minds into a more distant future, and look, long before the time when it can be garnered in, for the harvest to be reaped some other day; who sow the seeds that are to produce that harvest. Then you find the main body, going steadily onward, dealing mainly with those things which after due ripening have become questions of the day—problems in practical politics. Then, you find the rear guard—and possibly because of the number of years that I have spent in this House and of the number of years that I have served in the ranks of the Liberal party, I might declare that I belong to the rear guard. The rear guard is an efficient and important part of the army, well alive to the true principles of Liberalism, yet rather emphasizing the importance of making haste slowly; in whom caution is often the prominent element; who steady us in our course, put on the brakes and prevent us from going too fast or getting at loose ends.

Mr. Speaker, I shall conclude, and I regret that I have occupied so long the attention of the House. I said a moment ago that new conditions required new methods and new men. I have pointed out the methods; where are the men? Where is the man, the leader of that rear guard, that main body and that advance guard of the Liberal party? Sir, I have the honour to sit beside that leader. A son of Ontario, the great province which gave us William Lyon Mackenzie, Robert Baldwin, George Brown, Alexander Mackenzie, Oliver Mowat, Edward Blake, he is by tradition, by nature, in all faith and conviction, in policy and in practice a Liberal, without qualification and without reserve. He brought to the work of leadership the most priceless of all assets in a public man, the asset of character, and to use the language of the stock market, the asset of character is yet quoted in the markets of the world. His road may be steep, his path may be strewn with difficulties, but he will remember that:

> In the race, not in the prize,
> Glory's true distinction lies.

He may take comfort in the words once spoken by the greatest of all Liberals, William Ewart Gladstone, when engaged in that fierce campaign know as the Midlothian campaign, when his party had been defeated at the polls, when at each election more Liberals went down to defeat. When the grand old man took the banner and proudly planted it in the Midlothians, he used this language:

> We cannot reckon on the wealth of the country, nor upon the rank of the country, nor upon the influence which rank and wealth usually bring. In the main these powers are against us, for wherever there is a close corportation, wherever there is a spirit of organized monopoly, wherever there is a narrow and sectional interest apart from that of the country, and desiring to be set up above the interest of the public, there, gentlemen, we, the Liberal party, have no friendship and no tolerance to expect.
>
> Above all these, and behind all these, there is something greater than these—there is the nation itself. . . . . The nation is a power hard to rouse, but when roused, harder still and more hopeless to resist.

Above all, the duty of the Liberal leader and the work of the Reform party in the coming campaign,—and it cannot fail to come because the Government is crumbling to pieces; we have that evidence before us every day—will be to restore that national unity which has been so criminally shattered by the Tory-Unionist party during the last five years. Yesterday evening, the young and eloquent hon. member for St. James (M. Rinfret) who, in his first speech, contributed a most admirable exposition of Liberal principles which gives him at once a front rank in the

Liberal party in in this House, spoke words of wisdom when he appealed to both sides of the House to restore harmony in Canada. Mr. Blake, who was our great leader before Sir Wilfrid Laurier was elected in 1887, often spoke about the relations which should exist between French and English and also between Protestants and Catholics in Canada. I well remember his words. They ought to be repeated; they ought to be learned in the schools of this country, not only in Ontario, but in Quebec as well. He said:

> I hold those men false to the principles of religious freedom who would sow discord between Protestants and Roman Catholics on this subject. I freely render to my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, first, full religious freedom, and next their stipulated rights! but more, I say that being strong, we ought to be what the strong should always be—generous to the weak.
>
> Measure full, heaped up and running over, is the measure to be given by the strong to the weak.

John Morley, honest John Morley, speaking on compromise, uses this language:

> You have not converted a man, because you have silenced him—opinion and force belong to different elements. To think that you are able by social disapproval or other coercive means to crush a man's opinion, is as one who should fire a blunderbus to put out a star.

The great Lincoln once quoted Scripture to his purpose when he said at Springfield in 1858—and he understood human nature:

> 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect that it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other.

Advocating, as I do, Canadian unity and restoration of public confidence between the two great races which compose this vast Dominion, I echo the words of Lincoln and say that 'a house divided against itself cannot stand'; a nation cannot endure half loyal and half disloyal; I do not expect the nation to continue divided; but trusting in Divine Providence, I do expect and believe that, under the leadership of my hon friend and the guidance of the Liberal party, our country will at no distant date become all-Canadian.

Mr. GEORGE BRECKEN NICHOLSON (Algoma East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a word or two on the subject of the Budget Speech and the amendment moved to the Budget by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), it is not my intention to endeavour to follow the literary effort of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), who gave the House one of those rare treats that we always expect when the hon. member rises to speak, but who avoided the subject of the Budget and the subject of the amendment to the Budget as much as he possibly could. There fell, however, from the lips of my hon. friend one or two observations, to which if I refer just briefly, I may be pardoned. My hon. friend stated that the Liberal party did not come into office in 1896 on a free trade policy. He also stated that it took the Liberal party a long time to reach the goal of Cartwright and Mackenzie on fiscal matters in this country. If we can understand the language of Cartwright and Mackenzie on fiscal matters and if we can understand the language laid down in the Liberal platform of 1893 and in the declaration of the leaders of the Liberal party at that time, I cannot agree with my hon. friend's statement that the Liberal party did not come into office in 1896, at least professing the principles of free trade. Every declaration that the country was able to get from the leaders of the Liberal party prior to the election of 1896 was condemnatory of everything that tended towards protection. In the words of the great leader, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself, whose memory every member in this House reveres, "Protection was to be killed out and out, and its body was to be trampled in the dust." In the platform itself laid down at the Liberal convention of 1893 we find this:

> We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burden under which the country labours. This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

I do, however, fully agree with my hon. friend when he stated that it took the Liberal party a long time to reach the goal in fiscal matters aimed at by Cartwright and Mackenzie. When the Liberal party came into office in 1896, the average tariff against imports into Canada was, in round figures, 29 per cent. When the Liberal party went out of office in 1911, after being fifteen years in power, the average tariff against imports into Canada was between 27½ and 28 per cent. Giving them credit for reducing the customs tariff from 1 to 1½ per cent, we still can accept at its face value the statement of my hon. friend that

it took the Liberal party a long time to reach the goal of Cartwright and Mackenzie. We might go further and give him credit for having used these words, and I will put them into his mouth if he does not object: At the rate of a reduction of 1½ per cent in fifteen years, it would take the Liberal party 359 years to reach the goal Cartwright and Mackenzie aimed at, namely, free trade as they have it in England. There were one or two other observations made by the hon. member that I shall perhaps take the liberty of referring to a little later on.

I now pass to the consideration of the Budget itself. May I join with those who have preceded me in offering to the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) my humble congratulations on the resolute and fearless way in which he has not only dealt with the financial position in which this country finds itself at the conclusion of the war, but has set about to find the money with which this country can discharge its obligations. I venture to say it would be difficult to find a man anywhere who would agree with his neighbour as to every feature we should find in the taxation proposals in order that Canada may discharge its obligations. Some of us, to a greater degree than others, may find some of the obligations that we have to meet burdensome. Some men in this country looked forward to the Budget Speech of this year in the hope that the business profits' tax would be eliminated, and that there would be substituted for it an income tax that would treat all types of income, whether earned or unearned, on an equal basis. Those of us who looked forward to that, however, were disappointed, but we accept the situation. We realize, as has been already stated on the floor of this House, that the Finance Minister was face to face perhaps with the most difficult situation that any Finance Minister in the history of this country has ever been called on to face, notwithstanding the problems his predecessor had to meet in financing the war. Having passed out of the war period, and being brought face to face with what we are pleased to term the reconstruction period, being called upon to develop a system of finance that would take care of the tremendous obligations we are carrying, we must all admit that the present Minister of Finance had to face a very grave responsibility and very great difficulties indeed, and it would be more than human to expect that he should develop a system of taxation or deliver a Budget Speech that would meet with universal approval on either side of this House or by the people of the country generally.

There are just one or two points I would like to refer to briefly in connection with the taxation proposals. With regard to what is termed the luxury tax, I believe that the Finance Minister would be well advised, when these resolutions go into committee, to consider these two points: First, eliminating from the application of the luxury tax some of the articles that are now taxed. There are articles of consumption such, for instance, as dried fruits, canned fruits, in fact, canned goods of all kinds, that might perhaps in the strict sense of the term be called luxuries, but which in many parts of the country to-day are absolute necessities and cannot properly be treated as luxuries. Therefore, they should not come under the incidence of a luxury tax. That, however, is only my own personal view.

There is another thought, and that is that the price limit beyond which the luxury tax starts might be raised. I merely offer that as a suggestion. We must not lose sight of the fact that the general use of goods that four or five years ago may have been looked upon as luxuries, make them absolute necessities to-day, and the tax on these goods therefore could not be avoided by any class of people in the community.

There is one other point. In order to make a luxury tax more specifically a luxury tax, the percentage tax might be applied simply on the overplus until the price of the article reached the point where it became a positive luxury. For example, on a $10 pair of boots, simply tax the overplus above $9, but when it comes to a pair at $12 or $15, compute, as a luxury tax on the more wealthy people of this country, the percentage on the full price of the goods. I believe these suggestions are worthy at least of some consideration when the Budget resolutions go into committee.

Turning to the amendment of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), and considering that amendment in the light of the declaration made by the leader of the Opposition during the speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the effect that the policy of the Liberal party of this country on the tariff was embodied in the platform laid down at the Liberal convention of 1919, and considering that amendment also in the light of the declaration of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) to the effect that the amendment and the speech introducing it was simply the expression of a personal opinion, and that any hon. member who wished to remain a member of the

Liberal party must subscribe in toto to the platform of 1919, I submit that I am not taking an unfair position when I say that the amendment evidently was not intended to be taken any too seriously. We have the declarations already cited of the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe, as well as vague intimations from other hon. members opposite that the platform laid down at the Liberal convention of 1919 was a virile thing, that it meant what it said, and that it does embody the policy of the Liberal party in this country so far as fiscal matters are concerned. We have also the speech of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), every sentence of which contained eulogies of free trade and denunciations of everything in the nature of a protective tariff,—a speech that must have caused the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) to entertain some misgivings as to his laurels and to ask himself seriously whether there was not some danger that he might be superseded as the chief denunciator of everything protective in this country. Set off against that we have the speech of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Baldwin), stating, as the policy which he advocated, his adherence to protection in its purest form. Everything that would tend in the slightest degree to develop the industries of the country—it mattered not whether it was a protective tariff or direct bonuses to industries which required that kind of encouragement—he defended. Then we have the speech of the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) stating that the policy of the Liberal party on fiscal matters was to be found in the record of that party from the year 1896 to the year 1911, during which time, as I have already said, the Liberal party succeeded, under the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) as Minister of Finance, in reducing the customs duties on goods coming into Canada by 1½ per cent. Then again we have the speech of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon), once more breathing the pure principles of free trade. And I might go on citing the declarations of other hon. members. For instance, we saw the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee), who I regret is not in his seat, treating us yesterday to an acrobatic performance, metaphorically speaking, in which he told us that when he went to the industrial city of Montreal and said there that he was in favour of a 25 per cent tariff, with an 8 per cent excise, bringing it to a level

[Mr. Nicholson.]

17 per cent, he was only using a figure of speech. The hon. member said that he might as well have said 40 per cent or 30 per cent or 10 per cent or any other figure. Well, Mr. Speaker, all I have to say with regard to that point is that if the hon. member wanted to be consistent with his own record as a supporter of the tariff policy of the party to which he adheres, he could have quoted any figure in the world and he could have taken any position whatever. He could have put any interpretation that he desired upon his own words and have been perfectly consistent, if his statement which I have just quoted means anything at all.

Am I stating the case unfairly, Mr. Speaker, when I say that if hon. gentlemen opposite have any policy on the tariff, if they have any policy at all on fiscal matters, their varying statements are a revelation of the time-honoured policy of being all things to all men, that by all means they may deceive some people? In the application of this remark I intend to include hon. members who follow the leadership of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar), and I make this statement for a definite reason. I agree fully with the statement of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) made to the electors of the county of Glengarry that so far as it relates to the fiscal policy of this country the platform of the Liberal party laid down at the convention of 1919 and the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture are identically the same. In my conclusion that the hon. members who follow the leadership of the hon. member for Marquette are in the same position as those hon. gentlemen who follow the recognized leader of the Opposition, I am fortified by the interpretations placed on these platforms by the advocates of the platforms themselves. It is unnecessary that I should cite further declarations of hon. members directly opposite to justify the statements I have made. I would ask hon. members to study the actions of the hon. member for Marquette. If we go out to Western Canada where the hon. member appears before an audience of grain growers, an audience of western farmers in the city of Saskatoon, for instance, or in the city of Regina, we find that hon. gentleman sadly exhausting his vocabulary in an effort to find language with which sufficiently to denounce everything savouring of a protective tariff, and doing so in a manner that must apparently intensely please his own heart. He is a Simon Pure

free trader out there; everything in the nature of protective tariffs must be wiped out so long as the hon. member is addressing audiences of grain growers or farmers in Western Canada. But once in a while the hon. member does Eastern Canada the honour of paying it a visit. On his way across the country on one occasion he stopped off in the metropolitan city of Winnipeg, that beautiful city of the plains, where East meets West and West meets East, and where the people see something of the conditions of organized and established industry. There we find the hon. gentleman putting on the soft pedal. He deals with this question of protective tariffs in a more or less pianissimo fashion and is not so vigorous in his denunciations of protection. He says: "What we want to do is to relieve the western farmer of the burden that is imposed upon him by the tax on agricultural implements. We are not in favour of free trade; we know there must be a tariff; but we want a moderate tariff. We don't want to be severe in either direction." The hon. gentleman proceeds further East and comes before an industrial audience in the city of Toronto, and what do we find? Why, Sir, the rabid free trader of the West has utterly disappeared. My hon. friend says there: "I am not in favour of free trade. We are not advocating the abolition of customs duties; what we want is the gradual reduction of the duty, a lessening here and a lessening there; something that will relieve the situation just a little and reduce the cost of living." You know, Mr. Speaker, if you put a man with his back up against the wall in this country in this present day of unrest, and leave him nothing else to talk about, he can always fall back on the cost of living, and the cost of living means something to every one of us. That is the attitude of my hon. friend when speaking to an industrial audience in Toronto. He is not a free trader; no! He does not intend to abolish the tariff. No! Then we have the hon. gentleman's colleague, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) coming into this House and in one sentence denouncing everything in the nature of a protective tariff. He denounces anything and everything that might be regarded as a tariff in any form; and the tariff, he points out, is a system of bond slavery. Yet in the next breath the hon. gentleman says: We followed the leadership of Sir Wilfrid Laurier during the fifteen years that he was in office, and we claim to be the official legatees of the fiscal policy in existence from 1896 to 1911. And under that fiscal policy, let me repeat, my hon. friend from Red Deer,—and I am sorry to see that he is not in his seat—acknowledges that the Liberal party reduced the tariff only one and one-half per cent in fifteen years. I do not think that after making these statements—and I challenge satisfactory contradiction of them—the House will say that I am unfair when I assert that if either group in the Opposition have any fiscal policy, that policy, as I stated a moment ago, is: "To be all things to all men, so that by any means we may be able to deceive the people."

But, Mr. Speaker, our fiscal policy is a serious thing, notwithstanding the liberties that those hon. gentlemen are prepared to take with it. For over forty years we have had a tariff under which the major portion of our Federal revenue has been raised, and by means of which necessary protection has been afforded to legitimate Canadian industry. As our nearest neighbour we have the greatest competitor in the world,—a country with a population twelve or thirteen times as great as our own, a country with almost unlimited wealth and natural resources, and with an economic and industrial system developed to the highest degree of competitive efficiency, and fostered and carried to the position that it has attained to-day under a tariff deliberately designed to absolutely exclude from their home market anything that enters into the nature of competition with established United States industries.

During the forty years, from 1879 down to the present time, that we have had our tariff, Canada has progressed in every element that tends towards national stability, national independence, and national greatness, until to-day, I submit, there is not a country under the sun that affords so great an opportunity as does Canada for the man who is willing to work. I do not say that that condition is the result of a protective tariff. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) or Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) or Brome (Mr. McMaster) might say that that condition was brought about in spite of a protective tariff. But I say, without the slightest fear of successful contradiction, that the only time in that forty-year period when there was doubt in this country as to our industrial future, when men were timid about investing money, when things came to an apparent standstill, was during that period in the early nineties when hon. gentlemen opposite and their predecessors went up and down this country proclaiming the doc-

trines of free trade, proclaiming that if they came into office they would bring into existence a tariff policy based o the British principle of absolute free trade. But when the right hon. the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier came into office in 1896, and my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) in 1897 brought down his Budget, and it was found that the professing free trader had become the practising protectionist, industry settled down, realizing that having been brought face to face with the responsibilities of office, these hon. gentlemen who had proclaimed from one end of the country to the other the doctrines of free trade, had at last realized the utter futility of their theory and had reached the conclusion that if Canada was to develop as she should Canadian industry must be protected.

And, Mr. Speaker, in the speech of my hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) introducing his amendment we have ample evidence of the fact that nine years' release from the responsibilities of office have not changed his opinion, but that to-day he realizes the position that Canada is in, faced as she is with the undue and tremendous competition of her wealthy neighbour to the south, and that Canadian industry, if it is to continue to develop, must be protected by a protective tariff.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma), (resuming): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I had just stated that the fiscal policy of this country was a serious matter notwithstanding the liberties that hon. gentlemen opposite appeared to take with it: That for more than forty years we have had in Canada a tariff by means of which a major portion of the Federal revenue has been raised; that we have as our nearest neighbour a most intensive competitor, a country with a population twelve or thirteen times as great as that of Canada, with almost unlimited wealth and natural resources, and with an economic machine developed to the highest state of competitive efficiency—that development having been fostered and maintained by the most scientifically applied protective tariff that any country in the civilized world has ever had applied. I pointed out that during the period in which our present fiscal policy has been in existence Canada has continued to progress in every element that tended to develop national stability, national greatness and national independence. But, Mr. Speaker, we have now before us the united platform of the Liberal Convention of 1919 and of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, and I submit to you, Sir, and to the House, that the time has come when we are entitled to a clear cut definition of just what this united platform means, expressed in terms of its relation to specific commodities either produced in or imported into this country. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that there should be no mystery with regard to a matter of this kind. The commodities that are produced in and that are imported into, Canada are not of the indefinite character that they cannot be defined and it should not be a difficult matter, therefore, for hon. gentlemen who are interested in these things to say just exactly what they mean. I submit that if this united platform means what it says it means, it involves the elimination of all customs duties, the loss of all the revenue that it derives under the tariff as it at present exists, and the virtual adoption of free trade in this country. Perhaps I am wrong in my interpretation of the meaning of that united platform. If so I hope that the leader of the Opposition, or the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), when they speak in this debate will point out in what respect I am at fault. In order that they may be the better able to do so I am going to ask the liberty of reading a list of specific staple commodities that, after a consultation with experts, I conclude will come into this country free of duty under a tariff based on the platform of either the Liberal Convention of 1919, or of the Canadian Council of Agriculture as put before this House by the hon. member for Marquette and his followers. Mr. Speaker, the list is as follows:

Steam engines, stationary; steam boilers, stationary; steam engines and boilers, combined; traction engines, steam; locomotives; gas engines of all kinds; motors and motor trucks; boiler plates; rivets; cast hand hole covers and bridges; cast man hole covers and bridges; safety valves; gate valves; globe valves; water mountings for boilers, all kinds; cast and wrought iron pipes; cast and wrought iron couplings, elbows and flanges; T-reducers, bushes and flanges; injectors; steam gauges; steam whistles; copper, rubber and asbestos and vulcanized gaskets; washers and liners; blow-off valves; grate bars and hangers; wire netting of all kinds; boiler cleaning components of all kinds; feed water heaters; steam separators; steam pumps; water pipes; hydrants; rubber and canvas water hose and couplings; rubber steam hose; brass, copper and cast iron

nozzles; oil cups; lubricators; governors for stationary engine; rubber, palmetto and metallic packing; sheet rubbers; sheet asbestos; asbestos fibre; magnesia packing; magnesia compound; flake and ground graphite; castings of all kinds; bolts and nuts, all sizes and kinds; studs; cap screws; screw nails; set screws; pillow blocks; flat boxes; shafting; couplings, plain and flanged; gears and pinions, all kinds; endless chain, wrought; enlless chain, malleable cast; endless chain, cast steel; sprocket wheels; cost iron pulleys, solid; cast iron pulleys, split; wrought iron and steel pulleys, solid and split; wood pulleys; frictions; clutch frictions and pulleys; rubber belting; leather belting; balata belting; belt lacing; belt glue; belt dressing; belt rivets; rope; tar band oakum and lath yarn; tar and pitch; lubricating oils; lubricating grease; compounds; red lead; resin; copper wire; copper plate; copper washers; oil cans of all kinds; wool waste; cotton waste; felt; bar iron; bar steel; flat iron; iron plate; flat steel; steel plates; planished iron; Canada plate; galvanizel iron, plain; corrugated roofing; iron rods; wire rods; wire nails, all kinds; cut nails; ship spikes; plain spikes; anvils; vices; hand drills; hand taps and dies; tongues; pincers; cold chisels; blacksmiths' hammers; hardies; sledges; drill hammers; drifts; strappers; horseshoeing hammers; horseshoeing pincers; clinch cutters; farrier knives; hoof parers; horse shoes; horse shoe caulks; horse shoe nails; callipers; dividers; carpenters' squares; spirit levels; hammers; planes, all kinds; brace and bitts; augurs, plain; augurs, ship; chisels; gauges; clamps; hand axes; adzes; rip saws; hand saws, cross cut; files and rasps, all kinds; saw setts; saw gauges; all miscellaneous blacksmith, mechanical and carpenters' tools; circular saws, all kinds; band saws, all kinds; automatic saw grinders; saw swedges; saw anvils; saw vices; saw trimmers; face plates; brazing forges; clamps; emery wheels; ground emery; emery paper; sand paper; grindstones; planers and matchers; surfacers; stickers; morticing machine; shiner heads and cutters; planer heads; planer knives; knife grinders, hand; knife grinders, power; re-saws and splitters; automatic, glue presses; glue; power fans; power drills; lathes; thread cutting machines, iron; thread cutting machines, pipe; pipe cutters; pipe vices; shaping machine; slot cutting machine; power presses; steam hammers; air lifts; air cylinders, compressors; self oiling bearings; babbit metals; air hoists; dynamos; motors; transformers; electric motors; conduits; wire, copper and iron; insulators; water meters; chain blocks; plain blocks for cable; plain blocks for rope; wire rope; steel cable; cable clamps and fasteners; chain of all kinds; chopping axes; broad axes; pickeroons; cross-cut saws; saw wedges; portable forges; peavies; pike poles; cant hooks; skidding tongues; loading blocks; barringer brakes; log loaders; snow ploughs; dump carts; wagons; sleighs; harness of all kinds; harness leather; leather of all kinds; harness rings and buckles; snaps and loops; whipple trees single and double; neck yokes; axe handles; peavy handles; cross-cut saw handles; steam hoists and hoisting; machinery; steam drills; drill steel; overhead carriers with cable and cable attachment; ore buckets; steel dump lorries; lorry wheels; lorry axes and boxes; steam cranes; hand power cranes; overhead travelling cranes, and parts thereof; structural steel; fire brick; fire clay; burned brick, all kinds; pressed brick; roofing tile; tile pipe; wall tile; lime; cement; plaster of paris; doors and door frames; windows and window frames; factory finished building material of all kinds; window and other glass; shingles, wood and metallic; furniture of all kinds; woollen goods; cotton goods; clothing; hats and caps; mitts and gloves; boots and shoes; blankets, wool, cotton and combination; hosiery; horse blankets; steel rails and fastenings; railways, box, flat, stock and dump cars; bituminous coal; wheel barrows; hand cars; velocipides; wheel scrapers; slush scrapers; picks, all kinds; mattocks, all kinds; shovels, all kinds; well points and pumps, hand; wind mills; silo stock; feed choppers and grinders; flour and feed mill machinery of all kinds; agricultural implements, all kinds including; ploughs, harrows, cultivators, seed-drills, mowers, reapers, loading machines, hay forks, hand rales, hoes, potatoe diggers, threshing machines and grain; separators; cream separators; churns, power and hand; cheese making machinery; butter making machinery; sewing machines; carpet sweepers; lamps, lamp burners and chimneys; lanterns; curry combs; food stuffs of all kinds including wheat, oats, corn, barley, rye, maize, buckwheat and all products thereof manufactured; vegetables of all kinds, fresh and cured; dried fruits and preserved fruits; canned goods of all kinds; preserved milk; milk powder; yeast cakes: hops; vinegar; pickles; catsup; ginger; pepper; salt; mustard and all preparations thereof; rice flour; potato flour; macaroni; vermicelli; beans, fresh and dried; peas, whole and split; tea, sugar, coffee and cocoa; chocolate; tobaccos of all kinds.

Admittedly, that is but a partial list of the staple commodities that would come into this country free of duty under a tariff based on the resolution of the Canadian Council of Agriculture and the tariff platform of the Liberal party as laid down in 1919, because there is not one single commodity in that list that does not come under the category of things necessary to life and implements or commodities necessary to production. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if it is in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, in the mind of either my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) or the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), that part of this list of articles is to come in duty free and that some other part is to bear a tariff tax, it is their duty to take the House and the country into their confidence and say just which is to come in free and which is to bear that tariff tax. Let me put it this way, Mr. Speaker. Should it happen by any chance that the aspirations of our friend the editor of the Toronto Globe would be achieved and there should come into power what he is pleased to term a King-Crerar Government—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): I note that my hon. friends behind the member for Marquette cheer vociferously at the thought of a King-Crerar Government. But let me repeat: Should it happen by any chance that that combination should form a government in this country, I submit that it is only fair that the leader of the Opposition, who would head that government, should say to this House and to the country just which particular class of business indicated in that list of staple commodities he intends to put out of business and which he intends to allow to continue to exist. Or let me put it in another way. Assuming that the aspirations of our friend Joseph E. Atkinson of the Toronto Star will be realized and that Liberals of the type of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb), the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), and the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) are thrown into the discard and that the new line-up is to be based on a Crerar-King combination, will the chief executioner in that case say just where he intends to wield the axe and where it is his intention to have mercy? I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing mysterious in regard to this; every single one of the articles that I have mentioned are articles of everyday use, necessities of life, implements and commodities necessary to production, falling absolutely within the range of the resolution of the Canadian Council of Agriculture and the united platform of the two bodies.

But to pass from that aspect of the case, and assuming that hon. gentlemen are sincere when they say that they are going to implement this platform; that they are going to have virtual free trade in this country and that it will become necessary for us to adopt some other means of providing the country's revenues, let us for a moment look at the merits of the question of free trade versus a moderate tariff—because in the final analysis that is the issue that is before this House; that is the issue that is before this country; that is the issue that the Canadian people must settle before industry will settle down as it should settle down and before this country will go forward as it should go forward in the reconstruction period that we are all talking so much about.

Mr. CRERAR: May I ask my hon. friend a question? Will he tell us what is his conception of a moderate tariff?

[Mr. G. B. Nicholson.]

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): I will come to that in a moment; I anticipated that. I think I shall be able to satisfy my hon. friend that there is nothing at all drastic in my conception of a moderate tariff. But let me proceed. I want to make my own position clear before the House and the country. Looking at the matter from a purely selfish standpoint, if I could make myself believe that the theories of hon. gentlemen opposite, the theories preached to western grain growers by the member for Marquette and the theories preached to this House by the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), were practical theories and would work out as they profess to believe they would work out—on selfish grounds, I say, I would be compelled to be a free trader. Why do I say that? Because if their theories would work out as hon. gentlemen profess to believe they would, no business in this country would profit so much by their application as the business in which I am engaged. Let me repeat that there is no business in this country that would profit so much by what my hon. friends profess to believe would happen in the event of free trade coming into existence as the lumber business, because in connection with no other product put on the market in this country does the cost of machinery, implements of production and staple commodities bear so great a relation to the total cost of the product as lumber. In no other industry in this or any other country that I know anything about is the percentage of total cost of production represented to so great a degree by the cost of machinery, implements of production and staple commodities. But, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that, as I say, on selfish grounds I would be compelled to be a free trader could I bring myself to believe that the theories preached would work out in practice, I am not a free trader. I do not believe that these theories would work out. What would happen is that the manufacturers of the commodities that I purchase in Canada would be forced out of business by the unfair competition of the combines and trusts in the United States and I would then be at the mercy of those combines and trusts, as Canada has been in every single instance where we have tried that out. Let me refer to one or two. Away back in 1896 or 1897 we took the duty off coal-oil and we turned the whole trade of Canada over to the Standard Oil Company, and from that day to this the price of coal-oil has constantly been sky-rocketing. We tried the same thing in connection with binder twine, and the same thing applies; every

manufacturing industry in Canada that was manufacturing binder twine, with the possible exception of one, was driven out of business. Barbed wire has been taking the same route. Every single Canadian manufacturer of barbed wire has had his factory doors closed, and in the past five years the price of barbed wire has increased to a greater degree than that of any other commodity that I can think of. Let me give one illustration. The price of binders and agricultural implements generally has increased by about 100 per cent in conformity with the general increase in the price of commodities of that character; while the price of barbed wire has increased 300 per cent, because it is controlled absolutely by the United States Trust.

Let me now turn to another aspect of this question of the tariff. Our free trade friends say that the tariff is responsible for the high cost of living, the general unrest and all other ills, imaginary and real, from which we seem to be suffering during the aftermath of the war. Let us examine that briefly, and in order to do so, let us consider the condition of things in the United Kingdom, or free-trade England, as our hon friends opposite are pleased to term it. Will any hon. member say seriously that he believes the cost of living is less in the United Kingdom than it is in Canada, or that there is less unrest in the United Kingdom than there is in Canada? Why, Mr. Speaker, the cost of living in Canada, or the unrest in Canada, is a mere bagatelle in comparison with what it is in every European country, the United Kingdom included. As regards the United States, the most self-contained country in the world, a country that provides practically everything its people require, is the cost of living or the general unrest in the United States any less than it is in Canada? If we consider what has happened in the steel strike, the coal strike and the recent railway strike, every hon. member who is honest with himself and who has examined the situation, knows that the unrest in Canada is less than it is in the country to the south of us. But let us come right home and see what the effect of free trade has been on the cost of living in Canada. There is no duty on wheat; wheat can be imported into this country absolutely free of duty. Can the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) or the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), if he were in his seat, or the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), point to any other staple commodity the price of which has advanced to as great a degree as it has in the case of wheat on which there is no duty, and wheat bears the same relation to the cost of living that gold does to the value of the notes that we have in circulation?

Mr. McMASTER: Is the hon. member not aware that as Canada has a large exportable surplus of wheat, the tariff never can and never has had anything to do with the price of wheat in Canada?

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): I accept absolutely my hon. friend's statement and as the quantity of the general commodities produced throughout the world and particularly in the United States is so much greater than the quantity of the same commodities produced in Canada, the quantity of commodities produced in Canada has very little to do with the high cost of living generally. But let us take meats, butter, milk, vegetables, all of those things which are produced in Canada and upon which we pay no duty, the things that enter into the cost of living. The cost of these commodities to the consumer is regulated by the cost to the producer, and to take specific articles, the price paid to the farmer regulates the price paid to the consumer, notwithstanding the fantastic imagery of the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret), who undertook to trace that illustrious egg from its nest away back in the farmer's barnyard on to his kitchen table. But my free trader friends will say: Here is where we have you up a tree; you just take off the tariff, and you will see the cost of production coming down so fast that you will not be able to change your money into small coin fast enough to keep pace with the decline. Just let us examine that statement from the free trader's standpoint. Will taking off the duty on implements of production, for instance, mean a reduction in production costs as my hon. friends contend it will? We shall call, as our first witness in this case, not a producer, not an advocate of high or low or moderate tariff, but an out-and-out free trader in the person of the present Premier of Ontario, the Hon. E. C. Drury, who came before a committee of this House as the accredited representative of the United Farmers of Ontario and gave evidence under oath as to the cost of producing foodstuffs in this country. Mr. Drury did not come at the request of the Parliamentary committee; he was sent by the United Farmers of Ontario as their expert witness. After going over the whole question in detail, pointing out just the effect that one item had

on another, and assuming, for the sake of argument, that the Canadian manufacturer added the full amount of the tariff plus the cost of production and a reasonable profit to his sale price, the Hon. Mr. Drury stated under oath that the effect of the tariff on implements of production would mean an increase of four-fifths of one per cent in the cost of producing foodstuffs on Ontario farms. Mr. Drury further pointed out to that Parliamentary committee that, if you took clothing, boots and shoes, cooking utensils, every article that comes into daily use in an average Ontario household, and again assuming that the Canadian producer or manufacturer as the case may be, added the full amount of the tariff, plus the cost of production and a reasonable profit, the gross effect of that on the cost of producing foodstuffs on an Ontario farm would be 2½ per cent. If hon. gentlemen want to look that matter up for themselves, they will find it on pages 197 and 198 of the evidence taken before the Cost of Living Committee just about one year ago.

Let us carry this a step further. There also came before that committee a representative of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers, in the person of Mr. Hugh Thompson, and again under oath that gentleman gave the Parliamentary Committee figures to show that, again assuming that the Canadian manufacturer added the full amount of duty plus the cost of production and a reasonable profit to the sale price, the effect of that on the production of wheat in the province of Saskatchewan would be, on the basis of a ten-year period of depreciation, .9 of 1 per cent, and if you base your calculation on a five-year period of depreciation, the effect would be 1.8 per cent. On the basis of the prices prevailing in 1919, the cost per bushel would be about .2 or .3 of one per cent. I need not say that no hon. member will contend for a moment that the assumption on which these figures are based bears any relation to what actually takes place. No hon. member will contend that the producer of any class of goods in this country adds the full amount of the tariff to the cost of production, plus a reasonable profit. Every man who knows anything about business and who buys these commodities—and I think I buy as many of them as the average man—knows that competition regulates the price of every single one of these articles in this country.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) asked me what my interpretation of a moderate tariff was. In the first place, I am not, and never have been, a high tariff man. I am not supporting a high tariff to-day. There has been in existence in this country during the past year the lowest tariff that Canada has had for forty years, and there is coming into existence under the Budget that has just been brought down a still lower tariff—a tariff 3½ to 4 per cent lower than the tariff in existence during the whole period from 1896 to 1911, a tariff between 3 and 4 per cent lower than would have come into existence under the reciprocity agreement negotiated by my hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queen's. I say this with regard to my position on the tariff: I believe we must have a tariff for revenue. I believe we must have a tariff just high enough, and no higher than is sufficient to protect legitimate Canadian industry against unfair competition and dumping by the highly specialized combines in the United States and Germany and against the cheap labour of Asia and South Africa. I say further, if I had the privilege of being a member of this House when any Government brought in a tariff that bore any relation to what economists would call a high tariff, I would vote against it. Let me go a step further. I agree absolutely with the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Baldwin) that what this country needs above all other things is the development of all our natural resources. What this country needs is stability in industry, and the development of her natural resources, and if I may be permitted to digress for a moment I should like to refer particularly to one natural resource, namely, iron. Beginning in 1904—I speak subject to correction as to the date—we began a system of business on iron and steel, and by the payment of a comparatively small sum of money in relation to the value of the industry established we brought into existence the iron and steel industry in this country. That meant that when we came face to face with the war period, we were in a position not only to furnish munitions for our own army, the Mother Country and our Allies, but also to weather the industrial storm that would otherwise have broken over this country and which would have made it exceedingly difficult for us to do our part in the war. By the application of a similar policy to the great iron beds in Northern Quebec and Northern Ontario, I claim that we would bring into existence in this country a pig-iron industry that would furnish raw material for every blast furnace in Canada and produce a large exportable

surplus that would help to pay our national obligations.

Reverting for one moment to the effect of free trade on the cost of living, free traders are wont continually to refer to free trade England, so I may be pardoned if I make a reference to what is actually taking place and has taken place in free trade England. During the months, I think, of August, September and October, 1919, the British Government paid out over $6,000,000 a week in unemployment gratuities, while at the same time the United States Steel Corporation sold under the very nose of the British manufacturers to British buyers 100,000 tons of steel rails at prices $12.50 to $15 more than steel rails were being sold for in the United States and Canada. Let me give one other illustration. During the same year, 1919, the British Government paid in bonuses or bounties to British millers or purchasers of wheat $360,000,000 in an effort to bring down the cost of living. Let us see how successful they have been. I have here a despatch to The Toronto Globe from England dated May 20, 1920, wherein I find the following statement "The High Cost of Living Baffles Labour Leaders." The article goes on to say:

> The Labour party is calling another conference to study the question of prices, and a new campaign against profiteering is promised. The Governmental machinery erected to stop profiteering was a lamentable failure, and little hope is expressed that any fresh legislation will be more successful in "squaring the vicious circle."
>
> It is said that the Labour leaders who have been going into details of a plan for forcing down prices during the last few days have been forced to admit that the problem is a much more difficult one than they had expected, and their hopes of grappling with it successfully are marred by the fact that the trade unions generally are now starting a fresh series of wage demands, which will make the position worse than ever.
>
> Not long ago the Labour leaders had a cut-and-dried scheme for dealing with high prices, but they are now forced to admit that this stands in need of modification, in the light of fresh facts that have come under their notice.

May I now refer for a moment to what is being done by free trade England to protect her industries. I have here a clipping from a newspaper, of which unfortunately I neglected to note the name and date, but I give the House my word that the quotation is just exactly as I clipped it from a despatch from England:

> Under regulations at present in force the Government takes the power to exclude articles from foreign countries, wherever their price is shown to be lower than that of the home product. All the British producer has to do to secure protection absolute for his product is to raise the price of his goods a little higher than his foreign competitor, when the Government steps in and prohibits the importation of the article desired to be excluded.

That is one of the methods followed by free trade England to protect her industries.

I want to refer to one or two other matters that seem to me to be of vital importance to this country at the present moment. We hear a great deal about unrest throughout this country and a great deal about the high cost of living and all that sort of thing. My judgment, as I stated in the House last year, is that hon. members of this House and men in public and business life in this country are very largely responsible for some of the unrest that now prevails. Statements are made without any apparent appreciation of the effect they will have on the public mind, simply for the purpose, apparently, of gaining some political advantage. Let me give one illustration. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee), who I regret is not now in his place, speaking in this House yesterday, in the absence of logic with which to reinforce the argument he was endeavouring to make, and in an apparent effort to draw some applause from the hon. gentlemen sitting around him, took his customary fling at the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). Now I hold no brief for the hon. member for Brantford. He is perfectly able to take care of himself, but I say this, and I believe that if the hon. member for Lambton was brought face to face with his subject he would admit I am right, that the hon. member for Brantford is just as decent, just as honest, and just as ready to play the game, as the hon. member for Lambton. There is one other hon. member of this House to whom I wish to refer and I regret that he is not now in his place. I am speaking of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the position in which that hon. gentleman finds himself to-day is the most wholly indefensible—I use that word with no unkind implication—of that of any public man in the history of this country with whom it has ever been—I was just about to say my privilege, but I am afraid I cannot use that word—with whom, let me say instead, it has been my misfortune to come in contact. Knowing the hon. member for Marquette as I do, and knowing his kindness of heart, I cannot understand how he has allowed himself to take the position which he has taken from one end

of the country to the other with regard to men who are engaged in practically identical business with his own. The hon. member is the head of the largest commercial organization in this country, the greatest combine that has ever been brought into existence in Canada, without a single exception. When the United States courts undertook to unscramble what they termed the omelette of the United States meat packers they had a child's job compared to what any one would have if he undertook to unscramble the omelette of the combine brought into existence by my hon. friend from Marquette and his associates. I do not wish to be misunderstood, Mr. Speaker. Those gentlemen had a legitimate right to bring this organization into existence, and so far as I am able to learn, they are conducting their affairs on sound and strictly business principles. No one therefore has any right to find fault with them. But let us consider the situation. Here is the head of this great commercial organization doing business which, according to the sworn statement of the secretary or general manager of the company—I forget which—made before a committee of this House, amounted to almost $200,000,000 in one year, and doing it at a profit that makes profits of the Dominion Textile Company or the Patent Manufacturing Company look like the proverbial two cents. Yet the head of this organization and his associates can go up and down the country denouncing other business men who are endeavouring to build up industries of a like character in this country and describing them as grafters, profiteers, and men who altogether are exercising an utterly immoral influence not only on the business but on the political life of the country. I repeat, Sir, that the position of the hon. member and his associates is absolutely indefensible, and is the most unfortunate position which I have ever witnessed on the part of any group of business men in this country. No one has any reason to question the right of these gentlemen to do what they are doing in a business way; neither have they the right, Mr. Speaker, to cast aspersions on other business men who are conducting their business with equal honesty and integrity and are making an honest effort to be of service to their country. Hon. members who sit behind the hon. member for Marquette are wont to refer to the milling industries, to Ogilvie's, the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, the Western Canada Flour Mills Company, the Maple Leaf Milling Company, and all these organizations as grafters on the body politic and parasites that are eating out the vitals of the Canadian people. But what do we find? The four largest milling companies of Canada conducted their business in the year, 1918, on a margin of profit of less than 11 cents per barrel of flour, while the commercial organization with which my hon. friends are connected handled a very large part of that flour and took as their profit 85 to 90 cents a barrel. One might go through the whole range of commodities, Mr. Speaker. Sir Joseph Flavelle has been held up to this House by hon. members as the embodiment of everything that is iniquitous.

Mr. CANNON: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): My hon. friend says "Hear, hear." Well, the business with which Sir Joseph Flavelle is associated conducted its operations in 1919 on a margin of seven-tenths of one per cent; and the commercial organization with which my hon. friends are associated handled a lot of these products and did it on a margin of 11 per cent. Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I am finding no fault with these hon. gentlemen. They are conducting a legitimate business. They have developed their business along sound economic lines and they deserve all credit for the manner in which they carry on their affairs. But let me also emphasize again the fact that they have no right to travel up and down the country casting aspersions on other business men who are endeavouring to do business along exactly the same lines.

Now, I want to refer to one other matter. Something has been said from time to time in this debate with regard to by-elections that have taken place in this country, and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), who I am sorry is not here, said that he rejoiced in the development of the spirit that resulted in the return of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. McDonald) as an evidence of what was taking place in the country. Well, let me say that when my hon. friend's leader, the member for Marquette, entrusted the campaign in Timiskaming to Mrs. Rose Henderson, of Montreal he took good care to see that even his apparent desire to stir up class prejudice in this country would not be frustrated. Any one who went through the Timiskaming campaign and knew anything about it, and also knew something of the ideals that were put before the people of the district of Timiskaming, will believe with me that the hon. member for Red

Deer, if he values at all highly the ideals which he frequently expresses in this House, was not aware of what took place in that district when he made the statement that he rejoiced in the development of the spirit manifested in the return of the hon. member for Timiskaming. I say this, Mr. Speaker, and I say it without the slightest fear of satisfactory contradiction, and with due regard for my responsibility as a member of this Parliament, that hon. gentlemen opposite went the length of associating themselves with an organization, the professed object of which is to destroy even this institution itself and all other forms of organized governments in this and other countries.

Mr. CANNON: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Do I hear some hon. member say, "Hear, hear?"

Mr. CANNON: Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mr. Speaker, I state my position in regard to that question very emphatically and I have nothing to take back, and before I sit down I think I shall be able to satisfy the House that my position is absolutely correct. I say that hon. gentlemen entrusted the conduct of the campaign to Mistress Rose Henderson, of Montreal. Now, who is Mistress Rose Henderson?

Mr. McMASTER: A very estimable lady.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: He is not much of a judge.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): Does my hon. friend agree with the ideals that Mistress Henderson preaches?

Mr. McMASTER: Not with all of them. Nevertheless she is a most estimable lady.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): In 1919, Mr. Speaker, a definite, well-planned and carefully worked out scheme was put into operation in the city of Winnipeg to destroy civil government in that city and in the province of Manitoba as a preliminary to destroying civil government all over this country. During that period Mistress Rose Henderson directed to the leader of the movement in the city of Winnipeg a letter couched in these terms:

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the constitution of Soviets approved by Lenine and Trotsky. You can trust me implicitly, because you know that I was an advanced Socialist before I became a Bolshevist.

That was the ideal that Mrs. Rose Henderson held out before the people of the district of Timiskaming, and it was the organization known in this country as the One Big Union, whose principles she espouses, which supported the candidature of the hon. member for Timiskaming. I know that he is not a member of the One Big Union, and I say here again, with, I think, a full appreciation of my responsibility as a member of this House, that I do not believe the hon. member for Timiskaming himself appreciated the kind of campaign that was carried on to return him to this House. That is my opinion with regard to the hon. member. But I say that the One Big Union was the organization behind the campaign that elected him to this House, and that the ideals of that Union were preached in every mining camp in that constituency. And let me repeat, now that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) is in his seat, that when the time comes that hon. members professing the ideals of the hon. member for Marquette and his associates find it necessary to make use of the One Big Union in order to propagate their campaign of class hatred in this country, they have reached a fairly desperate condition.

In order that the House may know something about the ideals of the One Big Union—because I believe it is my duty to put this information before the House and the country—let me read the declaration of the chief organizer of the One Big Union, Mr. Fred G. Biedenkapp. I want the House to note the name B-i-e-d-e-n-k-a-p-p. The statement I am about to read is taken from the Chicago Times and is as follows:

Fred G. Biedenkapp, General Organizer of the One Big Union, says the true communist and labour leader rejoices more over one unsuccessful strike than over ten strikes that succeed. What the O.B.U., and smaller organizations aim to create is not asking better working conditions for the average man but worse conditions. The workingman, or organization of workingmen, who strikes for higher wages and gets them, or for better working conditions and fewer hours of labour, and gets them, is not the material from which revolutionists are made. He is likely to be contented and take a conservative so-called sane view of a world in which the conditions have been easier and better for him. On the other hand, the striker, or group of strikers, who fails, are likely to be more embittered against the employers, the whole employing class and society generally and after repeated failures of this kind they will come to the conclusion that striking and voting are alike useless to improve the workingmen's lot, and they will listen to the Red who talks intelligently of direct action and the overthrow of society and

forms of Government as at present constituted. We have already two million workers, members of the O.B.U., and our numbers continue to grow as one unsuccessful strike follows another. Therefore, we, of the new vision, encourage strikes not because we desire to better the workingman's conditions but in order that they may fail—

Let me say right here, Mr. Speaker, that every regularly constituted body of organized labour in this country knows that the aim of the One Big Union is not to better the conditions of the workingmen; its aim is to destroy organized labour. Why? Because the men directing the One Big Union know that they cannot destroy organized society and organized forms of government as we now have them so long as legitimate organized labour continues to exist. I will go one step further, because I want to make my position absolutely clear. I assert that the One Big Union, whose principles I have just read, was the organization behind the election of the hon. member for Timiskaming, who sits behind the hon. member for Marquette, and who is one of the latter's loyal supporters in this House.

The headquarters of the Independent Labour party in the town of Cobalt are in the One Big Union hall, because the organization of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers has absolutely ceased to exist as an organized entity in the town of Cobalt, or in any other mining town in Northern Ontario, except one small branch in South Porcupine. As I say, the headquarters of the Independent Labour party, associated with the United Farmers of Ontario, are in the One Big Union hall. At the present time a suit is pending in the Ontario courts for possession of that particular property. The parties to that suit are, on the one hand, H. J. Everett, an officer of the Independent Labour party, and, on the other hand, an executive officer of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, Patrick James Redmond, and Charles H. Moyer, the president of the union. Why is that suit pending? Because an effort has been made to take the physical property of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers and to transfer it to the One Big Union organization, brought into this country to destroy legitimate organized labour. And let me repeat, that when hon. members find it necessary in their efforts to create class prejudice in this country to use an organization such as the One Big Union, in my opinion they have gone to pretty desperate lengths.

A few nights ago the hon. member for Red Deer said that 60,000 sons of Canada were sleeping in France and Flanders, and that they had died to release Canada from economic bondage. I know perfectly well that 60,000 of our sons are sleeping in France and Flanders, and that undoubtedly they died to save Canada.

But if my hon. friend from Red Deer were in the House to-night I would like to ask him this Question: Does he think that when his gallant boy stood beside my boy in the trenches in France and Flanders holding back the German line in those awful hours in 1918 when his heart strings and my heart strings were strained to the breaking point in the anxiety that the German forces would break through to the channel ports or take Paris, does he think that those boys had before their eyes the ideals of class prejudice and suspicion that he and his colleagues are preaching up and down the length of this country to-day? Mr. Speaker, if all the sacrifices of that awful war is for no other purpose than to bring about the condition suggested then I say that it is in the Providence of God, that those boys were taken to their rest before they were forced to live to see the awful futility of all that sacrifice. I say this further, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen may say what they will, they may preach their doctrine as long as they wish, but here is one man that will fight the hydraheaded monster of class prejudice and Bolshevism as long as the breath remains in his body.

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, before I begin the few remarks I wish to utter to-night I think it would be appropriate for a moment or two to join issue with my hon. friend (Mr. Nicholson, Algoma), who has just resumed his seat with respect to certain assertions which he made. The hon. gentleman has informed us that he sees in the near future a lowering of the tariff to a greater extent than has taken place previously in the last forty years. Well, Mr. Speaker, like St. Thomas of old, I will wait and see before I accept the hon. gentleman's prediction in that regard.

The hon. gentleman has stated that the Grain Growers' Association is an organization that has been formed for the purpose of protecting its own interests. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that other associations are taking just as active a part in public affairs as the one to which he has alluded, the efforts of which may help to counterbalance whatever effects the hon. gentleman fears the Grain Growers' Association may produce. I refer particularly to an association to which reference was made

in the Montreal Gazette of 13th May last, as follows:

> Million Dollar Fund for C.M.A.
> Time to slam back at interests unfriendly to manufacturers.

So it would seem that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association is trying at the present time to raise a fund in order to protect its own interests against those of the rest of the community. Further, if we look at the end of the report to which the headings I have quoted relate we will see who are the members of the Manufacturers' Association. We shall see in that list some gentlemen who are the greatest supporters of the present Government and their policy. We see, for instance, Colonel Grant Morden, Sir James McKechnie, J. W. Norcross, W. F. Foster, B. W. Coughlin, Lieutenant-Colonel Sadler, and E. Bristol, M.P. In view of these facts I would ask my hon. friend whether the Government are likely to reduce the tariff to a greater extent than has been witnessed in the past when the association referred to is prepared to spend an enormous sum of money for organization purposes.

Another point to which the hon. gentleman alluded was that of the One Big Union. I do not know much of that body and what we hear of it has come to our notice recently, but if it is spoken of as likely to develop socialism in this country, let me tell the hon. gentleman that the policy of the Government is developing another kind of socialism in the shape of the nationalization of all the railways in Canada that they can lay their hands on.

My hon. friend stated that in the years which preceded the advent of the Liberal party to power in 1896 they advocated a policy of free trade, and that as a consequence there was great unrest in the country. The hon. gentleman stated that for forty years previous to that time there had been great progress in industry and in manufactures in Canada and that this was due to the National Policy adopted in 1878. As to that, one thing I can certainly affirm. It is that if industrial development in Canada failed to keep pace with the times it was not due to any policy propounded by the Liberal party, but was due—and nobody can deny it—to the bad administration of the Conservative Government which preceded the advent of the Liberal party to power in 1896. So much dissatisfaction was there with that administration that the lower tariff policy propounded by the Liberals carried the country in 1896 by a great majority.

My hon. friend has asserted that when the Liberals came into power they made but a slight tariff reduction, and that in the course of fifteen years the reductions only amounted to one and a half per cent. Well, to reduce the tariff at all was a step in the right direction. But the public must have been satisfied with what was done along that line, because when the Liberal Government proposed to go further in 1911, who asked them to move slowly and not go too fast? Who raised the slogan at that time throughout the country, "Let well enough alone?" It was the party of hon. gentlemen opposite.

My hon. friend also says that the policy of the Liberal party on the tariff issue has been one of vote catching and deception. That, Mr. Speaker, has not been the policy of the Liberal party in the years that have passed. Our record is exposed to view for all to see. It is a splendid record and one of which the Liberal party may well be proud. I can assure my hon. friend that if there was a policy of vote catching and deception adopted by anybody it was adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite. It was, to a large extent, by means of such a policy that they carried the country in 1911. The same policy was followed by them in 1917, and as a result they are in office today. What did they do in 1911? In the province of Ontario they raised the cry that the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier was too much of a Roman Catholic and a Frenchman, whereas in the province of Quebec they went round saying he was too much of an Imperialist. At that time also the Conservatives made an alliance with the Nationalists; they preached a certain policy in Quebec, and they advocated an entirely different policy in Ontario. Was not that in very truth a policy of vote catching and deception?

I wish now to make a few remarks with regard to the subject particularly under discussion, the Budget.

When the Minister of Finance presented his Budget to the House the other day he looked to me like a person who was very much worried; as a man would look who had taken charge of a beautiful estate that had just been ransacked by robbers or struck by a tornado. A frenzied and feverish attempt is made to tax every possible source of wealth in a supreme effort to make both ends meet and to repair the damages made by the storm. The Budget, Mr. Speaker, when we look at it, seems to me to be something conceived on the impulse of the moment, not thoroughly thought out as to

detail, its practicability, or its ultimate effect. The Budget is open to serious objection; in many ways it will increase the cost of living at a time when every person should be trying to reduce it. There is one thing that the Government seems to forget: that the struggle to obtain an adequate share of the necessities of life, even in this country, is becoming, in the case of a vast number of people, a tragedy more than anything else; and it seems to me that the new taxation will increase the struggle rather than diminish it. The Government seem to have taken as their maxim: "We will tax luxuries in order to check extravagance." That might be a laudable object except for the fact that the only authority the Government have for imposing taxation at all requires them to assess the burden equally upon the whole body of taxpayers and for the exclusive purpose of raising the necessary revenue to carry on the country's affairs. The people, I believe, will resent keenly their being taxed into submission to whatever the party in office thinks they should do or should buy, or can afford to pay, and so on.

There are anomalies in the Budget. A suit of clothes is taxed at the rate of 10 per cent if it costs $45 or over. Well, I would ask any hon. gentleman if to-day any person can get a decent suit of clothes for $45? It is in very many instances good policy and economy to buy the best clothes, for they last longer. But in view of the new taxation proposals, how many people will be able to afford to do that? Not many. The same thing applies to shoes and other articles which everybody must buy, which nobody can do without. As was said last night by the member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) the tax on patent medicine is one which will surely bear heavily on the great masses of the people, because they rely upon these medicines, having not the means to consult a physician or doctor. I am afraid that in many instances the people will have to do without these medicines. Mr. Speaker, calling a tax "luxury tax" and applying it to staple articles of everyday necessity on the basis of certain prices —the lowest prices at which such articles, of fair quality, can be bought—is simply a bit of camouflage. That is what is involved in this feature of the Budget proposals.

There are other anomalies, Mr. Speaker, in the taxation proposals of the Finance Minister. For instance, pianos, which are purchased chiefly by rich people, are taxed at 10 per cent, while phonographs, which are commonly used by people of smaller means, are subjected to a tax twice as large. Different opinions have been expressed as to the probable result of the new taxation. The majority of people see in it great disadvantage, increase of cost in operation and a source of trouble to all traders. The method of collecting the taxes on retail transactions is objectionable. It makes the retail merchant an involuntary tax collector and adds to the cost of carrying on his business. It leaves the door open to unscrupulous dealers to ignore the tax or to decline to collect it and make dishonest returns, and it also invites certain non-bona fide dealers to sell at supposedly reduced prices articles of inferior quality, —and in the end it will be the consumer who will once more have to pay and bear the burden.

According to the Minister of Finance, our own income tax has not been well applied; the machinery for its collection is imperfect. Well, I submit with all due respect that the Minister of Finance should have perfected the machinery for collecting the income tax and should have tried to collect as much under it as possible without resorting to the great majority of the taxes which he has put on to-day and which certainly will bear heavily on the people.

While speaking of income tax, I should like to direct the attention of the minister and of the House generally to another feature of the matter. Why not have the income tax returns made public? Everybody in this country knows what any citizen pays to the municipality, to the school commission, to other public institutions, for taxes; why not make the same thing apply to federal income taxation? Why not make it public that Mr. So-and-so pays $200, $300, $1,000 or $2,000 by way of income tax, in order that the people may know who have made the big money and who ought to be made to pay more?

The country is facing very serious conditions to-day. Canada, like many other countries, is suffering from the effects of post-bellum conditions, although not so acutely as some other countries. In Canada, as in other places—in some instances I would say that the condition is worse in Canada than elsewhere—there has been developing a certain disease which we may call acute profiteering. The amount of wealth in this country has not, I am sure, increased very much during the last decade, but the number of millionaires, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, has increased im-

mensely. The unrest throughout Canada is more pronounced on account of the increased number of millionaires and the amount of wealth that has been concentrated in the hands of few, while other people who are not making enough to support themselves find the conditions of living absolutely hard to bear.

Among the new taxes brought down by the Minister of Finance I would like to have seen a tax on land values. Everybody will admit that during the war vacant lands escaped taxation much more than anything else. By the taxing of vacant lands, the country would secure a large income and, in my opinion, the cost of living would be reduced by more adequate facilities being given for building houses, thus relieving housing conditions in different parts of Canada.

I should like to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to the question of earned and unearned incomes. The income tax, as it stands at present, ought to be modified in such a way that an income, based on sound securities such as real estate, from which the owner will derive great benefit all his life and from which the people who come after him will have an opportunity of being able to live without working, ought to be taxed much higher than an income such as that of a professional man, an industrial expert, an engineer, or any other salaried individual, because that income ceases with the death of the one who earns it; and on account of having to pay the enormous taxes that at present fall on such incomes, a man of this class runs the risk of having no capital at all at the time of his death. The man who has a steady income derived from bonds and real estate and who will be able to leave that real estate and those securities to the people who come after him ought to be taxed twice as much as the salaried man. In England, this is done, and it would be well for the Minister of Finance to bear this in mind, and when we get into committee on the resolution, I hope this suggestion will be adopted as part of the legislation.

The Minister of Finance has seen fit to retain for another year the excess business profits tax. I do not agree with him in that regard. He cited a number of reasons why this tax should be abolished, and yet he has retained it. The excess business profits tax has given as much as we can expect from it, because people have got on to it and companies have devised ways and means of hiding their income by expending it in many ways such as advertising or different kinds of improvements, thus making it, in certain cases, impossible for the Government to reach the big institution which make such huge profits.

I desire to take objection to the removal of the tax of 15 per cent on films which are exhibited in moving picture houses. Like most hon. members, I am an amateur at moving picture shows; but I contend that this tax should have been retained for this year, and there is no good reason for its removal. The Minister of Finance gave as a reason for the removal of this tax the statement that it was bearing heavily upon some small institutions, making them pay about 6 or 7 per cent of their receipts, whereas big moving picture houses were paying one or two per cent. I have nothing to say against moving picture houses; but I have not yet seen, in any of these theatres, any picture shown that did not in a certain way reflect on morality or come very near to immorality. In many cases, a picture invites luxurious habits and extravagance in expenditure, and this Budget is especially devised to prevent luxury and extravagant expenditure, to curb all these evils. Another point I want to make against these moving picture institutions is that they are responsible, in Montreal, Quebec and other large cities for a great deal of evil that is being committed. In many cases a moving picture show is a common rendezvous for a certain class of people who want to hide themselves. The other day a Montreal judge told me that he had to pass upon a case of separation, and what happened? The beginning of the case was in a moving picture house. The pictures that are exhibited are suggestive, and in some cases they lead to very bad results. They are an invitation to the people of the poorer classes to revolt, and they bring disorder in the country. Thank God, there is not a moving picture show in any town or village in my constituency, and I hope there will not be any for a long time.

I should like to make a few remarks in regard to the tariff, to which a number of hon. gentlemen have referred in this debate. For a long time every person who bestows any thought on our national life has been of the opinion that a change ought to be made in the tariff. Although the Minister of Finance has given us a promise and a declaration of principle as to the commission that is to investigate what the future tariff should be, I am sorry to say that I cannot put much stock in what he has said to us; and for this rea-

son. Last year, for instance, we had a similar promise and nothing has thus far been done in the matter. I am afraid, with the big million-dollar organization of which I spoke at the beginning of my remarks, the Government will have a very hard time to convince its friends, the manufacturers, to make any reduction at all. The tariff is a pressing question in all parts of Canada. It is a question that the Government cannot put aside much longer, because if it is put aside by any party in power and that party refuses to deal with it, I am afraid that in the near future that party itself will be put aside. As regards the commission that is to investigate the different circumstances which might lead to new conditions when the tariff is revised, I have this suggestion to offer. It is all very well to have commissions go throughout the country and take opinions from different classes of the community as to what ought to be done and what ought not to be done. This has been done in the past, but I am afraid, with the different kinds of organizations and class movements there are to-day in this country, politics might creep into the affairs of this commission, and the good results which one would expect of such a commission might not be brought about. I would suggest that in years to come the best thing to do would be this. The Minister of Finance, whoever he may be in the future, would be surrounded by an advisory board, say of seven or nine persons, one of whom would be a manufacturer, another a farmer, another an economist and the others representative of the different classes of the community, who would, year in and year out, study the economic policies of the different countries of the world and who would at the proper time give the minister suggestions which they thought it proper for him to follow. Then, if the minister was a sound business man, like the present Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), or the hon. gentleman who preceded him (Sir Thomas White), or the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), who held the position of Minister of Finance in the administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, this minister would be able to make good use of the information collected from different sources and would be able to give to Canada a progressive administration and a good tariff which would tend towards building up this country. In that event, we would not have, as we have to-day, a Budget that might be hurting certain individuals without striking at those who ought to pay more.

[Mr. Casgrain.]

The Minister of Finance stated that we ought to economise; that we ought to curtail expenditures on public works and to assist him in adjusting the finances of Canada. I am heartily in accord with what the minister has said, but I have this to point out to him. He should begin by himself setting an example to the people of this country. I would say to him as others who have preceded me, have said: Stop nationalizing the railways of this country; stop building a merchant marine; stop building a militia force and a navy in Canada; stop building the Hudson Bay railway and the Welland canal; stop expending money on the parliamentary secretaries we have to-day who do not do much work; stop the expenditure on the Board of Commerce, which has given us no results. I am astonished to find in the Estimates this year that it is proposed to vote the sum of $324,000 for the maintenance and operation of the Board of Commerce, and $26,000 for salaries. This is for the work the Board of Commerce is supposed to have done last year. Ever since this session began I have been asking for a statement of the investigations and prosecutions made by the Board of Commerce, but I have not yet received any statement. Ministers have told me that the statement would be forthcoming later, but no statement has come yet. As one hon. gentleman said yesterday, the only official statement we have had in connection with the board is that Judge Robson has resigned.

With respect to the Board of Commerce I might say that it was created last year in a very hurried manner to curb profiteering and reduce the high cost of living, but it seems to have achieved nothing along that line. Have we seen any really serious action brought by the board to make traders comply with the law? What has been done in that respect in other countries? I was reading a newspaper the other day which gives an account of what has been done in Paris. This is what it said:

French Profiteers Get Just Deserts.

Paris, March 13.—A few of the many profiteers are meeting their deserts. The manager for a wholesale dealer in butter and eggs was sentenced to a year's imprisonment and to pay a fine of 1,000 francs ($200 normally). He had sold eggs for 715 and 710 francs a thousand instead of at the normal price, 695 francs. The wholesale dealer was fined 2,000 francs for complicity.

Other profiteers in foodstuffs have been imprisoned until their cases can come before the courts. Not only does the new law deal with profiteers in provisions, for a salesman at Chalon-sur-Saone has been sentenced to six

months' imprisonment and 5,000 francs fine for speculation in boots and shoes.

Then to-day I read in the Montreal Gazette the following:

Profiteering Charge.

Grand Jury's Bill Against American Woollen Co.

New York, May 26.—The American Woollen Company was charged with profiteering in an indictment returned here late to-day by the federal grand jury, with the American Woollen Company of Boston and William M. Wood, president of both companies. The indictment, charging violation of the Lever Act, contained 12 counts, alleging that the campany had sold cloth at unreasonable and unjust rates. One count charges that on January 2 the company sold 74⅛ yards of material that cost $1.62 a yard for $3.25 and that on January 19, 85½ yards that cost $1.90 was sold for $3.90.

Many examples of profiteering were given when the Board of Commerce held its sittings in Ottawa last year, and the offenders should have met with just such punishment as was meted out in the cases I have cited.

When I urge the Government to tax people who have made big money and got rich quick through the war, I think I am supported by sane people everywhere. This is what a French newspaper, L'Echo de Paris, of April 21, 1920, says on this subject:

THE WAR CONTRACTS TO BE REVISED.

A maximum profit of 10 per cent to be Allowed.

The Government is soon to bring down a bill countersigned by Mr. Lhopiteau, keeper of the seals, and Mr. François Marsal, minister of Finance, by which shall be instituted a relief tax upon the war contracts with the State, the departments, the communes and public establishments.

The amount of the tax is calculated so as to leave to the purveyors and the middlemen, after deduction of charges of all sorts, a maximum profit of 10 per cent for the former and, for the latter, of 2 per cent or even of ½ per cent, according to the importance of the contract.

The tax will be collected through the process in use in the matter of direct taxation.

The examination of the contracts and the assessment of the tax to be collected are the work of a district commission, the members of which are chosen by reason of their fiscal, industrial, commercial or agricultural qualifications.

The decisions of the commission are not subject to appeal.

Appeal to the State council is allowed only in case of violation of the law or abuse of power.

That is what the countries of Europe and the United States are doing, and it is what this Government ought to have done, but which we find to our great regret it has not done.

The Minister of Finance in the course of his remarks also stated that he has stopped borrowing. Well, we might congratulate him on that, but he cannot take all the credit for it, because if he has stopped borrowing, it is for the good reason that there is no more money to borrow. The people have given just as much as they could, and I do not think the Government could float another popular loan to-day.

The Minister of Finance also said that the road of the administration had been made very hard for him to travel on account of sectional differences and the lack of unity in this country. He said that if there was such unity of sentiment and feeling as prevailed during the war it would be a very easy task for him to put the finances of this country in proper shape. I would ask him how he expects there can be unity of feeling throughout this country when the additional taxes he is imposing to-day are going to bear more heavily on certain classes of the community than on others? How can he expect unity when the people of this country find out that those who ought to have been made to pay are exempt under this Budget, and that the so-called luxury tax affects the working classes and those less able to bear it more than any others? Let me remind the hon. gentleman that if he wants to have unity in this country he must follow the traditions which have been handed down by our ancestors in years past. He must follow the traditions of Baldwin, Lafontaine, Laurier and others who preceded us, and fill vacancies in important posts in different parts of the country in accordance with tradition. When the President of the Harbour Commission in the District of Quebec resigns a man of the same nationality should be appointed to replace him. He should also see, when there is a vacancy on the International Joint Waterways Commission which had been filled for years past by a Frenchman from the province of Quebec, that tradition should be followed in filling that vacancy, so that unity of sentiment might exist throughout the country. I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that if he wants to promote unity of feeling and sentiment in this country he should try to put into practice the admirable words uttered by no less an authority than His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, in Montreal, last October. That Royal personage pleaded for freedom of speech and mutual respect between different peoples for the feelings of each other. It was only by recognizing the

importance of these things, he said, that a country could make substantial progress; and let me say, Sir, that it was by a full recognition of the principles so well laid down by His Royal Highness that Canada made such great strides during the fifteen years of the late Liberal administration.

Mr. J. D. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): In common with other hon. members who have spoken, I wish to congratulate the Minister of Finance on the comprehensive and straightforward statement which he has given to the House in regard to our liabilities, and also on the courage which he has displayed in going after sufficient revenue to take care of our responsibilities without resorting to further borrowing. I do not intend to take up a great deal of the time of the House, but whatever time I do spend in addressing hon. members I shall devote to a discussion of tariff matters alone. I believe that the tariff is to be the one feature of the next election, and I think it is an important subject at the present moment. Before dealing with this subject, however, I want to refer to a statement made by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy) a few days ago. I am sorry that that hon. gentleman is not in his seat, but I observe that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) is present, and the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee), who was here a moment ago is, I regret, absent for the moment. These three hon. gentlemen appear to me to be a sort of co-operative triumvirate from the western part of the province of Ontario. The hon. member for North Essex a few days ago made an attack on the dry dock proposition in the city of St. John, and I must say that he goes a long way from home to make his attack. The hon. member for Kent makes a vicious onslaught on the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) regarding Massey-Harris and the International Harvester Company, also going far afield; while the other member of the triumvirate attacks the automobile industry. It is interesting to note that there is not an automobile industry in that hon. gentleman's riding, but there is such an industry in the riding of the hon. member for Kent and in the riding of the hon. member for North Essex. He makes his attack upon something that is not a home industry; he takes good care to see to that. Now, I desire to read a statement made by the hon. member for North Essex the other day in his speech. It will be found at page 2730 of unrevised Hansard:

[Mr. Casgrain.]

There seems to be an organized plan to raid the public treasury. Now, Canada has done pretty well for the shipbuilding industry, at all events so far as helping them to get started is concerned. I have here a prospectus issued by a bond house dealing with the St. John Drydock and Shipbuilding Company, Limited, showing that the Government of Canada have agreed under certain conditions to assist this company to the extent of $247,500 per annum for a period of thirty-five years.

That is going a long way from home to make an attack. I might say, Sir, that this dry dock proposition was inaugurated by a measure passed through this House, and I may read a couple of clauses from the Act incorporating the company. I happen to know something about the establishment of dry docks because I come from a partly maritime county where we have a dry dock and where, when the Welland Canal is completed, there is likely to be necessity for another dry dock to take care of the larger boats; and when I saw the statement of the hon. member I felt pretty sure that he had either been very much mistaken or that he was misleading the House or trying—to use a vernacular expression—to put something over. Let me read a couple of clauses from the Act:

The Governor in Council may, as an aid to the construction of any dry dock, authorize the payment out of any unappropriated money forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada of a subsidy, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, to any incorporated company, approved by the Governor in Council, as having the ability to perform the work, which shall enter into an agreement with His Majesty to construct a dry dock under the provisions of this Act, with all necessary equipment, machinery and plant, for the reception and repairing of vessels.

No such aid shall be granted unless the Governor in Council is satisfied, upon a report of the minister, based upon a report of the Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works,—

Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be irritated by this expression "Governor in Council"; we are always hearing something about it, and so on. This dry dock company, under this law, was established as a public work, and it will be interesting to hon. members to know that the measure establishing it was passed in the year 1910 under the Laurier Government. Hon. members will also see that there were Orders in Council then as well as now, and we are just carrying out the law that was made by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not say that the law is a bad one. I think it is good, and those hon. gentlemen are entitled to credit for putting it on the statute book. But I do not see any reason why my hon. friend should have made the

attack which he made, especially when this law was established by his own party. Now the hon. member for Lambton made an attack upon the automobile industry. I do not know that it is my business to defend that particular industry, Mr. Speaker. If there is any one who should defend the automobile industry it would be the hon. member for Kent, in whose city there is a large automobile industry, and the hon. member for North Essex. But they allowed the hon. member for Lambton to come forward and attack this industry by a supposititious case that has no application whatever and no truth at all. That hon. gentleman gives us a supposititious case of an automobile that cost a thousand dollars. Why did not the hon. gentleman get some information from the hon. member for North Essex or the hon. member for Kent as to the automobile industry if he did not know anything about it? He could have gotten that information if he had sought it.

He could have given it to the House instead of putting on Hansard the statement he did. I wish to correct that statement and to put on Hansard accurate information regarding the automobile industry. I may say for the particular benefit of my hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton (N. B.) (Mr. Caldwell) and other hon. gentlemen who talk about the Ford automobile, that the information I am about to furnish is in reference to that particular car, so that he and his friends may not in future make the same error that they are making now. My figures are based upon prices in effect on the 4th of this month. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) told us that any change in price did not amount to a hill of beans, that it was just taking a shirt and collar or a petticoat off some one, so it cannot very much affect my figures.

The Canadian price of the Ford touring car, as far as the Ford Company is concerned—because they have nothing to do with the inland revenue tax that is collected on sales—is $740; the United States price is $575, a difference of $165, or 28 per cent. Now, what I am about to state is not generally known in this country, and although I am not giving this information on the direct authority of the Ford Company, it came to me from an authentic source and I see no reason why it should not be published. It is not generally known that in regard to equipment the car that is put on the United States market by the Ford Company is not on all fours with the car that is put on the Canadian market. The Ford Company in this country equip their cars with 3½-inch tires, with non-skid treads on the rear wheels, and with demountable rims. The larger-size tires alone are worth $10 more, and the non-skids and demountable rims are worth another $25. In addition, they use a one-man top, finer upholstery, leather door grips, and other accessories that make a difference of $50 more. So that the Canadian Ford car has an equipment costing $85 more than that of the American Ford car. Then there is another factor to be noted. Of course, it is well known that the Ford Company import certain component parts from their American factories, and the duty on those parts amounts to $23.12. I might say that until quite recently none of the automobile companies in this country made all their parts, and even to-day they import a certain proportion of them. There is also a duty on what are termed the unproductive materials that enter into the manufacture of these cars, such as coal, oil, and other articles which do not appear on a car. There is also the item of exchange on the products imported from the other side, and that exchange in the case of the materials that enter into the Ford car amounts to $10.40. Those items total $118.52, leaving a difference between the Canadian Ford car and the United States Ford car of only $48.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in a business of the proportions of the Ford Company we are very fortunate to have it established in this country even under these circumstances. The reason for that difference of $48 is due to the fact that in the United States the Ford Company turn out 1,000,000 cars as against only 60,000 turned out by the Canadian plant. Therefore the difference in the cost of making the various parts, and in furnishing dies, and other equipment must be plain to every one conversant with modern factory practice. As a matter of fact the Canadian Ford Company have no hesitation in saying that if their business grows—and at present they are exporting 25,000 of the 60,000 cars they manufacture—if their business grows a little more so they can overtake the unit cost of manufacture they will eventually be able to market the Ford car in Canada just as cheaply as in the United States.

It seems to me that it should not be up to me to defend an industry in the county of Kent; certainly I would not want to have another member jump up and do it in respect to an industry in my own constitu-

ency. But what does this industry mean to Canada in general and to the county in particular in which the hon. member for North Essex lives? His county is benefiting to the extent of a payroll of $4,350,000 a year; the Government of this country is benefiting in customs paid to the extent of $696,000 a year, without including the duties paid by other corporations that supply the Ford Company with goods used in the manufacture of its car.

Now, having performed the duties of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) and of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy)——

Mr. McCOIG: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question? He has referred to the hon. member for Kent not defending the automobile business. Would it make any difference if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Chaplin) read what the hon. member for West Lambton said in relation to the automobile business? I cannot see that he criticised that business to any extent.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That may be the opinion of the hon. member (Mr. McCoig). At any rate, I do not wish to repeat the speech he refers to, but I certainly looked upon it in that light. The hon. member for West Lambton made out a suppositious case in an attempt to show that the Government was taking a tremendous tax out of the people, and that the people were getting no particular benfit in return; but I think I have shown by figures that cannot be refuted that such is not the case—that as a matter of fact the reverse holds good.

Mr. McCOIG: From your standpoint only.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Now I want to refer to a book that I have under my hand entitled "The Farmers' Platform." This book was published a year or two ago, but although its colour has not changed, the name, I understand, has, and the Farmers party is now known as the Progressive or the Agrarian party. A year or two ago the old name was good enough, but they were afraid that possibly the class call that was raised against them would be prejudicial to their prospects so they changed their name. I want to refer to several quotations in this book and I wish to do so in a kindly and gentlemanly spirit. I hope that what I shall have to say will be taken in the spirit in which it is inetnded; I do not want to be harsh and I will not accuse those concerned of profiteering or anything of the kind. The book in question has been prepared by the Canadian Council of Agriculture and adopted by the United Farmers of Alberta, the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association and the United Farmers of Ontario. It is issued by the Canadian Council of Agriculture and published by the Grain Growers' Guide, so that it is fairly well revised or edited and fairly well, I should think, recommended. The first quotation I shall make is headed, "What the tariff costs," and reads as follows:

> As already explained, under a system of protection, the consumer is compelled to pay a tax upon all imported goods that come under the tariff schedule. Upon all goods of domestic origin, produced under a protective system, the consumer must likewise pay a tax—although in this case the revenue finds its way to the bank account of private individuals alone. Now it has been estimated that the domestic trade of Canada alone is at least four times as great as the country's foreign trade, and in the United States seven times as great. It follows that for every dollar collected by way of customs dues, at least $4 are paid to private individuals. When one considers that the customs revenue for the year ending March 31, 1916, was $133,000,000, and that four times that sum was paid in addition to the protected interests, it will be seen what a crushing weight is laid upon the country's consumers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to avoid all posisibility of a mistake, but this book has been so well edited and revised and so well prepared, that I would not think it posible for a clerical error of any consequence to have crept within its covers. Consequently I am very much surprised to find that the customs revenue for the year ending March 31, 1916, is given as $133,000,000. I now have under my hand the customs returns for that year and they amount to $103,000,000. Of course a difference of thirty millions is only a small item, but you will notice that they say here that the figure is to be multiplied by four as being trade within the country. Thirty millions multiplied by four makes the trifling amount of $120,000,000. I am not advancing this as an argument but merely pointing out that these gentlemen from the Northwest, these new economists who have been studying political economy and all other forms of economy, during the last year, might have paid some attention to the facts, and seen that this book was published in correct form. That would occur to me as a good thing for them to do, and I would recommend that the next time they venture upon such a publication they will see to it that it is accurate. And here I might pause to observe that although in

the first book they issued they went into a lot of particulars they have since learnt a lot of sense; the latest book contains no particulars but simply a lot of glittering generalities—that is all, just generalities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the argument is correct that the duty is also collected on all internal trade—that because the internal trade is four times as great as the trade that goes through the custom house then four times the amount of that revenue goes into the pockets of somebody else—I assume that if the internal trade should amount to ten times as much as what comes through the custom house, there would be ten times the amount of duty plundered by somebody—because "plunder" is the word these people use in another case which I shall mention presently. To illustrate the effect of their argument I propose to go through the tariff and mention some of the articles that it contains. First of all I will roughly run through the tariff items that I have marked down; I have not done it very carefully but hurriedly in order to show how absolutely unjust and entirely unreliable any such statement as made here can be. Now out of this $103,000,000—not $133,000,000 as they say in their book—there is the war tax collection and the balance consists of the regular customs returns for that year. But the manufacturers are certainly not interested in the figures that I am going to read, however much other people may be. Consequently if four times, or ten times the amount of taxes have been collected than should have been it cannot be on the items I am going to read. That will be self-evident as I read them. The first item is—animals, $110,000 duty. Now if there has been $400,000 of duty cribbed by somebody else on this item, you will have to go down into the pockets of some hon. gentlemen sitting on the opposite benches below me and recover that money. The next item is—grain, duty of $400,000. That money was collected on different kinds of grain and if you deduct the exports I assume the grain consumption in the Dominion would be very considerable. Therefore, if it is true that that amount of duty has to be multiplied ten or twelve times I would like to know which hon. member among the Farmers' party has got this money. The next item is $4,000,000 worth of coal. Now the manufacturers cannot be held responsible for that.

Mr. EDWARDS: What has the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) to say?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Perhaps that hon. member can tell us whether four times the amount of money I mentioned for coal was received by somebody in Nova Scotia? I pass over the item relating to coffee and come to the sum of $113,000 for eggs. Now who has cribbed this egg duty? Then there is $170,000 collected on fish. I would like to know whether the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) can tell us who got the multiplied amount in this case? Then there is an item of fruits, including nuts, $1,500,000. Well, there is a lot of fruit grown in my county but the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Stacey) will also have to stand for some of that $6,000,000 steal. The next item I run across is hay—$19,000 collected on hay.

Mr. BUTTS: The Speaker's county.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker; I understand that that has reference to your own county. Honey—my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), a good Scotchman; we will put the honey on to him; he got it. Butter, cheese and lard, $336,000.

An hon. MEMBER: Frontenac.

Mr. EDWARDS: I wish it were.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Now, here is another item: vegetables, $676,000. I have something to say about this vegetable business. One item on the vegetable list is potatoes. Potatoes, I understand, carry a duty of 20 cents a bushel. The value of the potatoes grown in Canada for home consumption in that year was about $51,000,000. At 20 cents a bushel there was $10,000,000 that somebody grabbed; I think that the member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), and probably some hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island constituencies had better divvy up with the rest of us and call it square.

Now, I do not want to continue; there are a lot of other items—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

An hon. MEMBER: Good stuff.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The items of spirits on which the duty was paid amount to a good many hundred thousand dollars. Brandy paid $960,000; cordials, $114,000; gin—where is that consumed?—$2,047,000; rum, $534,000; whisky, $3,245,000;—and yet to read the Farmer's book you would suppose that all that stuff was properly chargeable against the manufacturers, multiplied by four, because that is really the way the thing reads. If it means anything at all,

that is what it is intended to convey, and in dealing with the matter as I have, I am simply following the directions that they laid down as to how the thing should be applied.

Now, this brings me to another phase of the question. I wish again to refer to the Farmers' platform, page 19,—and this is where the word "plunder" comes in: "Plunder over boots and shoes:"

> During the year ending March 31st, 1911, Canada imported $2,000,000 worth of boots and shoes—

I am not giving the odd figures.

> —the duty upon which was $585,000. In that year the Dominion imported six times the value of boots and shoes from the United States that it did from Britain, and paid duty thereon amounting to $522,000, equal to 30 per cent. The value of the domestic product for that year is given as $33,967,000, of which $60,000 was exported.

Now, here it is again, the same argument, so it is not a mistake like the other mistake of $33,000,000,—it is in the game. I read:

> Now, if our contention is sound, that the manufacturers add the full amount of their protection to the selling price of the commodity when disposed of in the home market, the people of Canada paid for that year, by way of taxes, the following sums:
> Customs duties.. .. .. $ 585,996.71
> To the manufacturers.. .. .. .. 10,177,893.90

Then the amount of wages and salaries is given, but that does not enter into the argument. That is to say, the Canadian people paid by way of taxes, directly and indirectly, to the manufacturer and to the customs, $10,736,000. The way this is written: "Now, if our contention is sound" would make me believe, Mr. Speaker, that the man who wrote it was not quite sure of his ground; he was not very certain, so he put it that way. From the statement made in the House last year by the member for South Waterloo (Mr. Scott) I am quite convinced that the consumer pays little, if any, duty on the article manufactured in Canada. I am quite convinced that with the keen competition amongst over two hundred manufacturers in this country it would be absolutely impossible for any body of business men carrying on a business of $33,000,000 to make a profit of $10,000,000. What is more, I say to the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and to the other members of that aggressive party that there is no better field in Canada for a manufacturing enterprise than a proposition built upon that basis; if I were a younger man I would get after that business very quickly. It seems to me that that party would be a good deal better off to build up a business of this kind in their own part of the country than to try to pull down similar business in another part of the country.

Another industry referred to is that reviled industry of canning. Every time some hon. members of this House look around the Chamber you will hear some attack upon the canning industry. Now, I have something to say about the canning industry. I have in my county over fifteen canning factories, and not half of them are associated with Canners, Limited, either; they are operated by independent concerns, farmers' co-operative and other enterprises. It seems to me that if hon. gentlemen on the other side would get together with these men rather than hammer the business, they would make more progress and probably do more to benefit the country than they will ever do by trying to pull them down. It seems to me that there is a class of men running about in this country endeavouring to create class prejudice. There are men who are trying to make the farmer believe that the citizens in the town, his best customer, is his enemy, and others who are trying to make the city man believe that the farmer, his best customer, is his enemy. Such business as this ought to be "sat upon," to use a common expression, by the rest of the people of this country.

I want to refer again to this book. I would advise all hon. members of this House to get this book.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

An hon. MEMBER: And live up to it.

Mr. CHAPLIN: There is no book that I would rather discuss before an audience of intelligent people anywhere in my constituency. I will take the book back to my constituents. I shall be glad, indeed if the secretary will send me a dozen or more copies of it. Let me read a few words on page 25 in regard to trusts and tariffs:

> Truly, the tariff is "the mother of trusts" and when it is abolished the trusts, with their high prices, unfair competition with the small producer and unfair practices, are bound to be broken up. Free trade England is free also of the trust which flourishes in every protected country in the world.

The emphasis is not in the book.

Mr. LALOR: That is a joke.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I want to say something about this oft-repeated statement "no trusts in free-trade England". I wish the hon. member for Red-Deer (Mr. Clark) was here.

because he knows all about English history, and I want to go back a few pages in history and tell him some things that he will probably not be so sure are satisfactory to his free trade theories. I have under my hand a list of mergers that were formed in free-trade England and that cover a large number of trades. This list is not by any means up to date, but I can tell hon. members whfere they may procure the list and thus, probably, they may be able to get in touch with someone from whom they can get the more up-to-date list.

Mr. BURNHAM: I have the British reports, if any hon. member would like to have them.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I should be very glad if I had recent ones. This, however, will suffice to let the hon. gentleman know that free-trade England has been a trust country not only since a gentleman from Montreal went over there a few years ago and now threatens to come back upon us with another one. I know the English people could teach our people a good deal about the trust game before we ever learned it. This list of businesses that the affected starts off with the names of the companies, the nature of the industry, the number of firms joined together and the capital. The first of them is the Nobel Dynamite Trust Company, Explosives, four firms combined, capital £2,785,000; stone, seven companies; cotton spinners, three companies; salt, 64 firms in one combine. (We hear something about salt from our hon. friends across the way.) Then, there are chemicals, 51 companies; fireclay, 7 companies; lime, 12 companies. Some of thes industries are repeated, but I will not read the names. Then there are thread, 5 companies; coal selling, 8 companies; shipping, three companies; thread 15 companies; engineering, 2 companies; shipping and oil, 11 companies; steel shipbuilding, etc., 6 companies; coal mining, 4 companies; tubes, 4 companies; tubes, 3 companies; dying, 4 companies; linen thread, 6 companies; gun powder, 8 companies; cotton spinning, 47 companies; dyes, 4 companies; dying, 34 companies; borax, 12 companies; combs, 3 companies; coal selling, 2 companies; dyeing, 11 companies, coal selling, 8 companies; oil cake, 18 companies; wool combing, 41 companies; linoleum, 3 companies; dyes, 8 companies; wool machinery, 7 companies; calico printing, 47 companies; dyeing, 22 companies; shipbuilding and engineering, 2 companies; shipbuilding, 34 companies; wall paper, 31 companies; dyeing, 51 companies; dyes, 5; bleaching, 53; cement, 28 companies. We heard something about cement here. Then there are rivets, etc., 15 companies; velvet, 5; wool, 7; knitting yarn, 5; dyeing, 10; fustian, 5; steel, 3; steel, 3; engineering, 3; coal, iron and steel, 2; textile machinery, 3; shipping, 2; granite, 8; shipping, 2; shipping, 3; coalmining, 4; omnibuses, 3; shipping, 3; shipping, 6; ice, 3; tobacco, 19; iron and steel, 3.

I am leaving out twenty more. I hope we have heard the last of beautiful free-trade England as regards combines. As I said before, we may know something about combines in this country; but the game was not big enough here, and certain gentlemen went from this country to learn the trade in England and now I understand they are coming back to Canada, as the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Casgrain) said a few minutes ago, with an English corporation to do the job over here. We cannot do it in a big enough way for them, and they are being helped, not particularly by this Government, but by the Government of Nova Scotia of my hon. friends opposite. If anybody wants to find any fault with that corporation, it is, I understand, getting its capitalization from the province of Nova Scotia and not from the Dominion of Canada.

I wish to refer briefly to the present condition of British trade; but before doing so, I should like to quote a few words from Henry Clay. These words were spoken at a time when there was a tariff in England. We hear a great deal about free-trade England, and free traders do not like to listen to the story that British trade was built up on protection and that England had a start ahead of any other nation. But when we consider that a number of hon. members in this House who are older than I am have referred to long-gone-by affairs, I may be forgiven for trespassing a little upon the time of the House in quoting a word or two coming out of the past from a man as eminent as Henry Clay, when he was addressing the House of Representatives a good many years ago. Mr. Clay finished his address in the House of Representatives in this way:

> The committee will observe that the measure of the wealth of a nation is indicated by the measure of its protection of its industry, and the measure of the poverty of a nation is marked by that of the degree in which it neglects and abandons the care of its own industry, leaving it exposed to the action of foreign powers.

Now mark what he says regarding Great Britain:

Great Britain protects most her industry, and the wealth of Great Britain is consequently the greatest. France is next in the degree of protection and France is next in the order of wealth. Spain most neglects the duty of protecting the industry of her subjects, and Spain is one of the poorest of European nations. The views of British prosperity which I have endeavoured to present, show that her protecting policy is adapted alike to a State of war and peace. Selfpoised, resting upon her own internal resources, possessesing a home market, carefully cherished and guarded, she is ever prepared for any emergency. We have seen her coming out of a war of incalculable exertion, and of great duration, with her power unbroken, her means undiminished. We have seen that almost every revolving year of peace has brought along with it an increase of her manufacturers, of her commerce, and consequently of her navigation.

We have seen that, constructing her prosperity upon the solid foundation of her own protecting policy it is unaffected by the vicissitudes of other States. What is our own condition?

He was talking to his own people in the United States, and at that time the United States was free trade, or practically so. He was advocating protection in the United States. To continue:

Depending upon the state of foreign powers —confiding exclusively in a foreign, to the culpable neglect of domestic policy—our interests are affected by their movements. Their wars, their misfortunes, are the only source of our prosperity. In their peace and in our peace, we hold our condition the reverse of that of Great Britain, and all our interests stationary or declining. Peace brings to us none of the blessings of peace. Our system is anomalous; alike unfitted to general tranquility, and to a state of war or peace, on the part of our own country, it can succeed only in the rare occurrence of a general state of war throughout Europe.

I wish the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) had been here, because I think I have heard almost similar words from him in respect to Great Britain at the present time. How history does repeat itself! That was the opinion and spoken word of the man who was trying to induce his own country to adopt a policy that had built up British trade. I think there is a lesson for us there.

In 1846, Great Britain changed her fiscal policy. Mr. Codden, speaking at Manchester on January 15, 1846, said:

Europe altogether has been corrupted by the vicious example of England in her commercial legislation. I believe that if you abolish the Corn Law honestly and adopt Free Trade in its simplicity there will not be a tariff in Europe that will not be changed in less than five years to follow your example.

On another occasion Mr. Cobden said:

You might as well tell me that the sun will not rise to-morrow as tell me that foreign nations will not adopt Free Trade in less than ten years from now.

Mr. Cobden may have been a wonderful economist, but as a prophet he did not amount to very much.

I have here a list of the customs tariffs which the British are imposing at the present time. The list is too long for me to read it all, but I will give a few articles to show that free trade England is no longer free trade:

Customs Tariff of the United Kingdom.

Clocks and watches and component parts, 33⅓ per cent.
Motor cars, 33⅓ per cent.
Musical instruments, 33⅓ per cent.
Gramaphones, 33⅓ per cent.
Pianolas, 33⅓ per cent.
Accessories and component parts of musical instruments, 33⅓ per cent.
Playing cards, 3/9 per dozen packs.
Chicory, raw, £1 19s. 8d. per cwt.
Chicory, roasted, 6d. per lb.
Chloral, hydrate, 1/9 per lb.
Chloroform, 4/4 per lb.
Cider, 4d. per gal.
Cimematograph films, from ½d. to 5d. per foot.
Cocoa, £2 2s. 0d. per cwt.
Cocoa husks, 6/- per cwt.
Cocoa butter, 4½d. per lb.
Coffee, not roasted, £2 2s. 0d. per cwt.
Coffee, roasted, 6d. per lb.
Coffee and chicory, roasted and ground, 6d. per lb.
Collodion, £1 14s. 11d. per gal.
Ether, acetic, 2/7 per lb.
Ethyl bromide, 1/5 per lb.
Ethyl chloride, £1 1s. 10d. per gal.
Ethyl iodide, 19/- per gal.
Fruit dried—
Currants, 2/- per cwt.
Figs and plums, 10/6 per cwt.
Glucose, solid, 16/3 per cwt.
Glucose, liquid, 11/8 per cwt.
Gramaphones, 33⅓ per cent.
Matches, 5/2 per standard gross.
Mechanical lighters, 6d. to 1/-.

I will not give you the duty on beers because that covers all of two pages. There are four pages more of the duties, but I think I have read enough to show that Great Britain is no longer a paradise for free traders.

I want to say a word about the iron and steel industry in the Old Country. My hon. friend the member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) elaborated on this the other evening and so did the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen). I shall give only a few figures and put the matter in a little different way. I am giving these figures to show that free-trade England has not advanced—and I very much regret it,—as fast as protectionist countries. Whatever is the reason, free trade is not helping Great Britain; it may be helping her the other way. The United Kingdom in the year

1900 produced in round figures 8,900,000 tons of pig iron, and in 1914—I will not take a war year because that would not be fair—8,924,000 tons, which is a shade less than she produced in 1900, namely 8,960,000 tons. Germany produced in 1900, 8,500,000 tons, practically the same as Great Britain, but in 1914 she had increased up to 14,000,000 tons, just about double. While Great Britain had stood pat, Germany had gained almost 100 per cent. Now let us look at the United States. In 1900, she produced in round figures 13,000,000 tons, and in 1913. 30,000,000 tons—more than double, or about 150 per cent. France had increased at an even greater rate, but her output was not large.

The production of steel is on exactly the same basis. Germany and the United States advanced by leaps and bounds, while Great Britain did not advance. I can say this from personal experience: For nearly forty years I have been a buyer in the British market of certain lines of steel and we never failed to buy in Sheffield from people like Henry Bessemer & Co., and Steel, Peach & Tozer, two grand old English firms. To-day we are not buying one solitary pound there, not because we do not want to buy. We would pay 15 or 20 cents a hundredweight to have the British connection, but we cannot pay any more. The relative difference between the cost to-day is 30 per cent in favour of Pittsburg. That seems remarkable, and it applies not only to steel but to tin plates as well.

In 1891, there were no tin plates made in the United States, as the hon. member for Fort William told us the other night. What happened? The United States put on a tariff, and to-day they are making tin plate into the billions of pounds. We used to be importers of tin plate from England. England was, one might say, the source of supply for tin plate, but last year whereas this commodity came into Canada from England to the value of $11,000, we bought $11,000,000 from the United States. Is there not a lesson there for some one to learn? I do not mention this fact for the purpose of in any sense belittling England. I wish the facts were otherwise, and I would sooner buy there than from the United States. But there is a great deal to be said in the matter. English tin plate can be landed in Montreal at about twelve cents a pound, whereas the price from the United States is eight cents. Under those circumstances are you likely to buy tin plate from England, even if you give them more preference than they have? I think I have said enough on the British aspect of free trade. I might say something in connection with the cotton industry. In 1870 Britain had about three-quarters of the cotton spindles of the world. She had thirty-seven and three-quarter million spindles, and all the other countries of the world put together had twenty million spindles. England has increased her capacity in the matter of cotton by fifty per cent, and during the time she has brought about that increase the continent of Europe has increased two hundred per cent and the United States three hundred per cent, while other countries, including Canada and France, have increased theirs four hundred per cent. This is another line of business in which Britain was predominant.

Now, I want to revert for a moment to the question as to who pays the duty, and I should like hon. members to be indulgent enough with me while I refer to a line or two of my own manufacture. I believe that the best way in which one can put an argument is to deal with one's own line of goods, and, in passing, I may say that I was somewhat annoyed to see one of my lines in the Farmers' platform which has been referred to. This list puts me in mind of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) when he brought forward his wonderful resolution a year ago and began to dress the farmer upside down, putting on his boots before he put on his socks. I see one article of mine in the list of farm implements mentioned in that book, and that is an axe. It is a small item, it is true, but there it is, and it bears a duty of 30 per cent. Now, I want to say that axes are being sold in Canada, delivered at a point like Montreal or Toronto, as cheap as the Americans are selling similar goods of he same weight delivered at Pittsburg, without any reference whatever to duty. Some hon. gentlemen will say: "Well, if that is so, why do you want a tariff?" I will tell you why. By that tariff I get one hundred per cent of the business, and I am satisfied with the margin of profit that I can get out of it, and I will sell my goods, irrespective of the tariff based on cost of production. That is what I am doing, and I believe there are hundreds of people who are doing the same thing. I come from a district of Canada that is very well favoured and is looked upon as the garden of the country. It is an important district so far as either farming or manufacturing is concerned. There has been in that country a wonderful development in manufactures and a most wonderful development in farming.

I desire now, Mr. Speaker, to refer to a few other manufactures in my own town. I am cognizant of the fact that I am not very consecutive—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on; you are doing splendidly.

Mr. CHAPLIN:—but I shall put before the House all the facts that are in my possession. My own city has wonderfully improved during the last few years, and there have come into our district a number of American factories. Now, I would ask my hon. friends this question: If it is true that the duty is collected entirely by the Canadian manufacturer how is it that the American comes in here to establish factories? If the American could place his goods on the Canadian market on an equality with Canadian goods there would be no necessity for him to build factories in Canada, and I may say that there are 150 new factories in my district. Would these men be foolish enough to start these new concerns if they could make their goods in the United States and place them here on an equality with the Canadian goods? The argument is ridiculous. The argument that the consumer pays the duty is absolutely futile and ridiculous. But if any other argument is needed to show the necessity for a tariff I will supply that argument by stating a matter of personal knowledge. A short time ago an automobile tire company came into our town. It was a branch of an Akron concern. Some time last fall the Toronto Globe was worrying about the tariff, and, like my hon. friends opposite, indulging in generalities, undertook to discuss the question of tires. Someone had written to the Toronto Globe stating what an awful shame it was that they had to pay 47½ per cent on tires, and one tire company, which makes goods in Canada and in the United States, wrote under its own signature to the Toronto Globe and said something to the following effect: We are probably the largest makers of tires in the United States and certainly the largest in Canada, and we are selling our product in this country at just about the same prices as it is sold in the United States. Now, for three years the prices of tires in the St. Catharines Company, which is a branch of the Akron concern, have been the same as those at Akron. Who pays the duty there? If there are some people who want a tire not made in Canada and who are prepared to import it, of course he will pay the duty on it; but if he is content to buy from one of the eight or ten manufacturers of tires in this country he will get a tire as cheap as one that is sold in the United States. What I say now has reference to the condiion of affairs a month or two ago. What prices are to-day I do not know. Rubber and fabric both come from the United States, and the rate of exchange may have altered matters to a slight degree; but under no circumstance is there more than a difference of 5 per cent between the tires made in Canada and those made in the United States.

I have a few remarks to make in regard to some more goods sold in St. Catharines, and I have personal information in regard to the matters of which I shall speak. I did not want to take figures from any firm in St. Catharines for the purposes of any comparison; I took the trouble to write to a Montreal concern, competitors of mine, who do business in the United States. I do not mind telling the name of the company; it is the Simmonds Saw Company. I got my manager to write and ask what was the selling price in the United States, and in reply we were advised, "The prices are practically the same." In giving some examples the writer said:

> We are selling such and such a style of saw to mill men in the United States at $5.50 per hundred, and we are selling it in Canada at $5.75 a hundred.

A difference of only 25 cents, or a little more than a postage stamp, especially where we import our raw material. The writer also says:

> On mill saws, high grade cross-cut saws, cheap cross-cut saws, points, shanks, etc., there is the same slight difference, and in order that you may have the fullest information which I can give you on American prices, I am attaching discount sheet effective April 1st, 1920, showing the Fitchburg, Mass. and the Canadian prices.

There is another American firm in my home town, and they write me to say that their largest item of production, malleable iron, is sold just as cheap in Canada as it is in the United States.

Then I have a letter from the Yale & Towne Company, a well known concern, also located in St. Catharines, giving me a list of their products,—and I could give a few figures showing their American prices as compared with their Canadian prices, but I will not weary the House with these details. It is sufficient for me to say that the figures show the benefit our people are deriving from these American factories having been established in this country, and that we

are not paying a sou more for their products.

One more item and I have exhausted my list. A firm which manufactures grape juice—a beverage which is very much needed in these dry times—established a factory in my home town, and in reply to my inquiries the manager writes me:

> We are selling grape juice in Canada just as cheap as we are selling it in the United States.

Yet our friends of the Farmers' party would have us believe that the full tariff is taken by the manufacturers on everything they produce

Before I close I want to refer to one other matter which perhaps I should have mentioned before; it is another personal illustration of how the British manufacturer or shipper can be protected without a tariff. Not very long ago my company was enjoying business at the coast on a certain article, and suddenly that business dropped off, our agent advising us that the decline was owing to some British goods coming in. We know that the British trader as a rule does not cut prices, and in that respect he is not like his brother in the United States; the British trader makes his prices out of the freight rates and his lower cost of manufacture, and very seldom does he cut prices. We applied to our Liverpool agents to ascertain what the rate of freight was from Liverpool to Victoria, B.C., and we discovered that the Canadian Pacific Railway was carrying the goods from Liverpool across this continent at $1.25 per hundred freight. Our freight rate from the factories at St. Catharines to the same point on the identical class of goods was $1.80. In other words, the difference in the rate was a profit in itself. I appealed to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, because it looked to me like an outrage, but I got no satisfaction. Then a body of our manufacturers got together in Montreal, and from our plant there we shipped those goods down to Vera Cruz in Mexico and across Mexico up the Coast and landed them in Victoria at 90 cents a hundred. It was not until we were able to protect ourselves in that way that we could deal with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Then they came to us and quoted us a rate of $1 a hundred, which enabled us to hold that trade. I just mention that to show that there are other factors besides the tariff to protect a manufacturer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am through. I merely want to add that I come from a county that has had a wonderful expansion in manufactures, and I ask the people of this country if their representatives here are going to do something which will injure that industrial prosperity. I come from a county that has spent on its fruit industry millions of dollars; and those fruit farmers want the duty on fruit retained. Gentlemen of the Farmers' party may talk as much as they like, but the fact remains that the people in my county want that tariff, and if my friends of the Farmers party will go down there they will find out the real state of affaires in pretty quick time. Again I ask hon. gentlemen: What are you going to do? Are you goin to do something that will destroy these industries?

I am rather ashamed, Mr. Speaker, at having taken up so much of the time of the House, but I have the excuse that I have not transgressed very much before. I wish to thanv hon. members very heartily for the kind atention that they have given to me remarks.

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton (N.B.): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to discuss the Budget and the amendment to it which is before the House, I would like to deal briefly with some of the remarks made by the last speaker, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin). Especially do I want to deal with his statement with regard to the difference in the American and the Canadian price of a Ford car. And when I speak on this matter I am not speaking of something that some one told me or that some one wrote to me; I am speaking from personal experience.

In the early stages of this session I made a statement in regard to this matter, and I might say that the hon. member for Lincoln was not the only person who got up in the air about it. Here is a letter I received from the manager of the Ford Motor Company, covering four large sheets of paper, as the House will observe. In it he advances much the same argument as that employed by the hon. member for Lincoln, and he even threatened that he would put this in the hands of some hon. member and that I would get a "trimming." Well, I am quite prepared to take a "trimming" when it is coming to me, but it is not coming this time, thank the Lord! I want to quote some of the contents of this letter, and then I will come to the facts. The manager of the Ford Company wrote:

In the case of the Ford touring car—which is the article which is the major proportion of our production—I may say that the equipment of the Canadian car is somewhat different from that of the car in the United States. Inasmuch as we put on larger tires and the car is also equipped with demountable rims and extra tire carrier and other items of this kind, which makes the car in Canada of considerably more monetary value.

Further on he says:

We put on a one-man top and a ventilating wind shield also.

I have worn out one Ford car. In September last I bought another one, and I have the receipted bill right here, the items of which I will give a little later. I bought this car in Woodstock, N.B. I was in the town of Holton, in the state of Maine, only twelve miles from Woodstock, the day before I bought the car. I priced the value of the car in Holton. I will admit there was a difference in the forward tires. The forward tires on the Ford car in Maine are three inches whereas in the case of the Ford car sold in New Brunswick those tires are three and a half inches, representing a difference in the neighbourhood of $7 in price. In all other respects the car was exactly the same as the car I bought in Woodstock the next day. The car I bought did not have the one-man top, or a ventilating wind shield, or demountable rims or have even a tool box or tire carrier; the only difference was in regard to the forward tires. The car I bought has a self-starter which is identical with the self-starter made by the same firm in the case of the Holton car. With regard to the starter the difference in the price was $40. This starter cost $70 in Holton whereas in Woodstock it cost $110, a difference of $40 on a $70 article notwithstanding the fact that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat told us that manufactured goods are as cheap in Canada as they are in the United States notwithstanding the duty.

Mr. BURNHAM: What was the duty on that car?

Mr. CALDWELL: If the hon. member will have the patience to listen what I am stating may penetrate his cranium if it is not too thick, before I have done. Now the car I bought cost $900, and the tire carrier $7.25, a total of $907.25 for the bare car without any tool box to carry tools in. Even without any tire carrier the car cost $900 in Woodstock when I could have bought it for $640 in Holton. Allowing for $7 on account of the difference in the tires that would make the Holton car $253 cheaper. I said to the dealer in Woodstock "I should have bought a car in Holton yesterday, I could have bought one for $240 less." He replied "Yes, but the car would cost you just the same when you brought it in because you would have had to pay duty on it." It was because of the duty I was charged the extra $240 in Woodstock, and in these purchases we cannot help ourselves. There has been a campaign conducted in Canada for the last few years—you will see the posters on every fence, and on every vacant lot—urging you to buy "Made in Canada goods" otherwise you are a traitor to your country. If I had bought this car in Holton I would have got it for $240 less and would have paid $240 in duty on it, and I consider that I would have been more patriotic to my country because then the revenue of Canada would have benefited to the extent of $240 instead of it going into the manufacturer's pocket.

The hon. member for Lincoln made the statement that there was a duty of twenty cents a bushel on potatoes. I did not quite catch the whole of his remark in that connection and I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not at present in the Chamber. If he were here I would ask him if that applied to potatoes going out of or coming into Canada. I want to tell him that he does not know what he is talking about, there is no duty on potatoes going from Canada to the United States or on potatoes coming from the United States into Canada. He also states that there were 20,000,000 bushels exported I can prove that he is wrong in that statement because we have never exported more than 4,150,000 bushels from Canada in any one year according to the export statistics.

It would also be of interest to the House, it would certainly be of interest to the people of Canada, to know that the hon. gentleman—who by the way just made the kind of speech I would expect him to make after looking up, shall I call it his pedigree, in the Parliamentary Guide—is the president of two large manufacturing firms therefore he delivered just the kind of speech I would expect such a man to make. I do not blame him much because if the Farmers' platform is put into effect—to call it by its right name, which he seems to think we are ashamed of, but we are not—he and his like will certainly lose a nighty good graft they are collecting off the people of Canada.

The hon. gentleman also said he would like to discuss the Farmers' platform throughout the country. Mr. Speaker, I think you will admit that the discussion of the Farmers' platform has so far not brought very good results to the party the hon. gentleman supports. That platform has been discussed not by the farmers alone but by others. In the recent by-elections we had the spectacle of some of the ablest ministers in the present Cabinet going out and discussing the features of that platform. If they were not able to present it in a way that would make the people condemn it, that fact is surely a commendation of our platform.

Another thing the hon. member said was that the gross difference in the price of a Ford car in the United States amounted to $165. He worked that down, I believe, to $48. The manager of the Ford Motor Car company claimed that there is a difference of $130 between the American car and the Canadian car. Therefore he could not have written the same letter to the hon. member for Lincoln that he wrote to me, and I have the bill of the car I bought, under the Ford Motor Company's own bill heads, at $900 without even the tire-holder or tool box. The House will believe me when I make this statement and I am not saying something that somebody wrote me or telegraphed me. As I say I bought this car and paid $240 more for it on account of buying it in Canada instead of the United States. They tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the experience you buy is the best experience you can get if it does not cost you too much. I feel that my experience in this case cost just a little too much.

I had not the privilege—on account of illness in my family—of being in the House when the Budget Speech was delivered. Perhaps I was more disappointed than surprised to find that no provision was made for a revision of the tariff, although we were promised last year that the whole tariff question would be investigated before the present session was called so that the Government could deal with it intelligently. The ex-Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White) in the Budget Speech which he delivered on June 5, 1919, is reported as making the following promise:

> It is my hope that within a year conditions will have become so stabilized as to permit of a general revision of the tariff, which is long, but, owing to the war, unavoidably overdue. Preceding such revision there should be a thorough inquiry conducted by the Minister of Finance and two or more of his colleagues representing the different geographical sections of Canada. Such inquiry should afford all interests, agricultural, industrial, fishing, lumbering, mining, commercial, and financial, producers and consumers alike, an opportunity of expressing their views and opinions and urging their particular needs and requirements. The rsult of such inquiry should be a body of information which will enable the Government to effect a general revision of the tariff fair to all parts of the community, and effectually promoting the national welfare of Canada. This inquiry should proceed with its work just as soon as conditions are sufficiently stabilized to permit. My own view is that it might well be commenced about autumn of this year.

That was in 1919. And yet we had the spectacle in this House recently of the Finance Minister (Sir Henry Drayton) bringing down his Budget and promising that there shall be a revision some time in the dim and distant future. The ex-Finance Minister said that this revision was overdue a year ago, or almost a year ago. If it was overdue at that time it is certainly more than overdue to-day. I think we have a right to be disappointed to find that no mention is made of the revision of the tariff this year; the Government speak of waiting until the conditions are stabilized. I think, Mr. Speaker, that considering the course the present Government are taking the conditions will be no more stabilized than they are to-day until we have a general election and perhaps a change of Government—who knows? I think the low tariff supporters of the Government must be easily satisfied if this continued promise of revision from year to year satisfies them. However, I was glad to notice yesterday that they are not all satisfied; that some of them have the courage of their convictions, the courage to get on their feet and condemn the party which they have supported, when they believe it is wrong. If the Government are wise they will take warning from the defections from their ranks, made by men who have supported them for years.

I would warn the Government also not to put off too long this promised investigation into the tariff, because if they put it off a couple of years or more they man not have the opportunity of making the investigation. If they wish to investigate tariff conditions and adopt a tariff that will be satisfactory to Canada, they are making a great mistake, if I may be allowed to give them that advice, in putting it off as long as they have. Their chances for re-election would have been much better if they had brought down a measure for reduction of the tariff this year.

I am very much pleased to see the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) in his seat; I thought that he was going to leave the Chamber, and I wanted to direct his

attention to one or two matters. I was rather amused at his speech the other evening, and he is not usually amusing. I do not think that he really meant to be amusing on this occasion, because he seemed to be in his usual sarcastic form. Shall I be allowed to say that he even seemed to be a bit anxious? In one breath he said that it would be the ruination of Canada to lower the tariff, and in the next breath he claimed credit for the party he supports for lowering the tariff on a number of articles, and for taking off the 7½ per cent special war tax.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to quote two sentences that will illustrate the truth of his two remarks?

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not know just what two sentences out of his speech a man could find that would illustrate what the minister said with regard to any particular matter; but if he will have patience I will go on. He did not explain to this House or to the country that the present Government put on this 7½ per cent duty in the first place; yet he brags that the Government took it off. He puts me in mind of the method followed by some of our retail storekeepers when they put on a cheap sale: they mark their goods up fifty per cent, then mark them down twenty per cent and call it a cheap sale. The minister's reduction of the tariff reminds me very much of this kind of cheap sale.

Another statement the Minister of the Interior made the other evening was that he thought the new Progressive party should support the party in this House that acted, not a party which only professed and did not act on those professions. He also made a great ado because we did not move the Farmers' platform as an amendment to the Budget. Now, no man in this House knows better than the Minister of the Interior that the rules of this House allow only one amendment to be moved to the Budget. The fact that the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) was the first speaker after the Budget was delivered and that he moved his amendment before he sat down effectively shut us out from moving any other amendment. But, in the first place, I wish to state that the new Progressive party do not propose to support either party in this House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I be permitted to suggest to the hon. member that he may still move that Farmers' platform in amendment to Supply?

[Mr. Caldwell.]

Mr. CALDWELL: Thank you; no doubt we will do it. I have no doubt that the Government will adopt that platform after the discussion is over. I notice that it seems to be in great demand among the supporters of the Government and that they have already adopted some of its best features. If they should be lucky enough to hold on to office by hook or by crook, I think that they will adopt it all.

But, as I say, we do not propose to support either of the old parties in this House. When a question arises such as the present question before the House we intend to take a stand on it that will be in the best interests of Canada. We may err, but if we do we shall err in judgment; we shall not be whipped into line to support this party or that against our convictions,—do not make any mistake about that. I think that we have proved our independence in this House during the present session; we have voted with the Government perhaps as often as against them. I am only sorry that we were not able to vote with them oftener, because if we had been able to vote with them it would have meant that they were bringing down good legislation, legislation for the good of Canada and which we would have been pleased to support. We do not come here to oppose any party; we are not like the Irishman who said: "Is there a government in the country?" and upon receiving a reply in the affirmative, said: "Well, I am opposed to it." We are certainly not in that position. We are here to support good legislation, not party. Partyism is what has brought governments in Canada—and I use the word "governments" advisedly—to such a condition as that which we see to-day. When people support a party regardless of how—I am almost at a loss for a word to express it strongly enough without disobeying the rules of the House—regardless of how much evil they have committed and how bad the administration is, it tends to bad government. The indications are that this Government will be turned down, if the late by-elections are any indication of the feeling of the people in constituencies where opinion was formerly pretty well divided as between the two parties. I think the Government themselves realize what that means.

With regard to the amendment that is before us, I for one do not approve it in its entirety. But I shall certainly support the amendment, because we have been denied by the rules of the House the privilege of moving a second amendment and I consider

the amendment is the lesser of two evils. I would like very much, however, to see the third party in this House recognized as such, so that we should have the privilege of moving a second amendment. When there were only two parties in this House it was certainly proper that there should be only one amendment moved to the Budget, but when there are three parties it is no more than right and fair that two parties should have the privilege of moving amendments. However, we do not feel like insisting very strongly upon our rights as a third party, because we do not expect always to occupy third place in this House. I do not think any hon. member who is in touch with the feeling of the people would be considered a prophet if he expressed the view that after the next general election the present Government would be occupying third place in this House—I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but I am not afraid to make this prophecy—and those who live to see will know—that the Unionist party will be the smallest party in this House after the next general election. I firmly believe that, and, as an hon. gentleman near me says, I think the Government believe it too.

Mr. COPP: They look like that.

Mr. CALDWELL: Now, the new system of taxation as proposed by the Finance Minister is said to be a luxury tax on manufacturers and wholesalers, but, to my mind, if that is the mark aimed at, the minister has missed it by a considerable distance. The maximum price on articles exempt from this tax is too low. The poorer a man is the less, for instance, he can afford to buy shoes under $9 a pair, because the cheaper shoes are not of good quality and not good value for the money. What applies to shoes also applies to clothes. No man knows better than the Finance Minister that you cannot buy a decent suit of clothes at less than $45, the maximum price of an untaxed suit. If the maximum amount exempted had been half as much again, it would have been nearer the mark. On the other hand, instead of taxing the manufacturer and wholesaler, the Government are simply imposing another tax on the consumer, because the manufacturer adds the amount of these taxes to his invoices. In fact, the Minister of Finance has instructed him to do so; on Hansard, unrevised edition, page 2571, the manufacturer is specially instructed not to include the tax in the price of the goods but to invoice the goods at the factory price and to state the amount of the tax as a separate item on the invoice. Therefore, the Minister of Finance, by no stretch of his imagination, could claim that this was a tax on the manufacturer, because the manufacturer was instructed to pass it along and mark it as a separate item on the invoice.

I notice the Minister of Finance, as reported on page 2571 of unrevised Hansard, states that this tax shall be deemed to have come into force on the 19th day of May, 1920. I do not know what time of the day these resolutions were presented, but I understand they were presented one afternoon and put into effect the next morning. If this be the case, if the minister can draft a Bill and present it to this House one afternoon and have it put into force the next morning, what is the need of calling Parliament together at all? I had thought that a Bill had to pass this House by a majority of votes and after that be ratified by the Senate, and be signed by the Governor General before it became law. Of course, we know that the present Administration has set all kinds of precedents by way of Orders in Council, but it certainly gave me quite a jolt to find that the Finance Minister could enact a law overnight, and put it into effect the next morning before breakfast. Truly the day of miracles is coming back to us again. It would be much quicker, instead of calling Parliament, for the Minister of Finance to handle this end of the matter; the Minister of the Interior could handle his department, and so on. The trouble is that the Government have not sufficient ministers to man all the departments, and they dare not appoint any new ministers and send them out for election because they might not come back; they might get lost. I might, however, suggest to the Minister of Finance a source of revenue that would not impose a hardship on the common people of Canada; in fact, I believe it would confer a benefit on them. My suggestion would be to impose an export duty on our print paper, say of 10 per cent. I believe there is a possibility that hundreds of our small papers will go out of business after July 1, because at that time their contracts for newsprint, I understand, will expire, and the cost of paper at the present time is so great that the small papers, without increasing their subscriptions to a price that their subscribers would not, perhaps, feel like paying for the paper, will not be able to carry on.

This may not appeal to the Government because, perhaps, the Government would

be pleased if there were fewer newspapers printed in this country. Perhaps they would be as well pleased if the doings in this House, especially an event that happened on the other side of the House last night, were not heralded broadcast in the newspapers of this country. I saw this big headline in the newspapers this morning: "Big defection from the Government ranks last night." No doubt the Government would have been pleased if that had not appeared. I believe the United States' papers are willing to pay per ton for newsprint $240, in American money, which means much more in Canadian money at the present time. I believe the representative of a number of British dailies is in Canada, and he has $40,000,000 with which to buy what newsprint he can pick up. If there were a 10 per cent export duty on this commodity, we would collect $4,000,000 on this one deal. I believe there is also in Canada a Hindoo who represents a large combination of publishers in Bombay and who has power to purchase newsprint, price being no consideration, and he wants newsprint in thousand-ton lots. Two years ago, our publishers were paying $45 a ton for newsprint; after the 1st of July they expect to be compelled to pay $240 a ton. Of course, our publishers are not objecting so much to the price; their fear is that they may not be able to secure a supply at all, because these outside firms are willing to pay almost any price for the full output of Canadian newsprint. If I might be allowed, as a new member, to make a suggestion to a gentleman so high up as the Minister of Finance, I would suggest that he take this into his serious consideration.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Did the hon. member say that at the present time Canadian publishers were paying $240 a ton for newsprint?

Mr. CALDWELL: I understand that American or British firms are willing to pay $240 a ton. Canadian publishers are not paying that at the present time. Their contract does not expire until the 1st July; but after that time they expect they will have to pay this sum, or at least, I am so informed by a good number of publishers.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am sorry I misunderstood the hon. gentleman, because at the present time Canadian publishers are paying $80 per ton.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does the hon. gentleman deny that it will be likely that they will have to pay $240 per ton after the 1st July?

Mr. RICHARDSON: The price after the 1st July will be $110 or possibly it may be $115 per ton, but we are notified that the price will be from $110 to $115.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for correcting me, because I do not wish to mis-state the matter. There is a big difference between $110 and $240 a ton. The publishers who have written me do not object so much to the price; their fear is that they will not be able to get newsprint at all.

I have said that I was somewhat surprised and disappointed at different matters in the Budget Speech, but I was more surprised at a statement made by the mover of the amendment (Mr. Fielding) in his speech of May 18, more especially as he has been looked upon for a long time as the father of the reciprocity agreement and an exponent of lower duties on manufactured articles, especially the instruments of production. On page 2582 of unrevised Hansard, for May 18, he is reported as saying:

> I had a call one day from a manufacturer who informed me that he had no complaint in regard to the tariff. He said he was satisfied with it, and as a matter of fact, was doing fairly well in his business. Indeed, he said, he was contemplating an expansion of his business, and he felt that in view of the large trade he was then doing, and the larger business he was planning to do in the future, he could afford to sell to the ultimate consumer at a little lower price, and so he had scaled down the price of one article of importance in which he was dealing. I remarked that that was gratifying, but he said: "Wait a moment, I want to show you a letter I have," and thereupon he placed on my desk a letter written by an agent of an American manufacturing concern which is engaged in making in the United States a similar commodity to his and shipping it into Canada. This agent wrote to the man of whom I am speaking: "Why do you cut the price? You can just as well get the larger price and there is no reason why you should not. If you reduce your price we will have to reduce too. We will meet your reduction and we will do more than that; if you are going to start reducing prices we will meet you and keep on reducing, and no matter what price you name we will cut below you." Ah! that was a new light upon the question of dumping. Again, I suppose my free trade friends would say: "All right, let him send his goods in; let him come in; so much the better." Well, if we could have got a bond from those manufacturers in the United States that would compel them to send their goods forever at sacrifice prices it would have been an excellent thing to have adopted the course suggested in this hypothetical quotation. We could afford to close our Canadian factories and buy American goods if we could have got a bond from across the border guaranteeing us their goods for all

time at a sacrifice price. But who imagines that the American had any intention of doing that indefinitely? His avowed intention was to cut prices and sell at a sacrifice just long enough to close the other man's business. That was the clearest thing in the world, and my manufacturing friend visiting me asked me what he was to do.

Notice that he speaks of just this one friend.

I said to him: "What do you think of the situation yourself?" He replied: "Well, I suppose I have to go back to the old price or shut up shop," and I told him that I could not blame him; I said we would have to think the matter over. We did consider the matter, and the conclusion we came to was embodied in the dumping duty. We came to the conclusion that if big manufacturing concerns in the United States could come here and close up Canadian manufacturing interests it was right that there should be a special duty to meet that condition. It was considered by some as a piece of freak legislation, but I am glad to know that it has been copied in other countries, and the present Government have paid us the compliment of continuing it on the Statute Book.

In the first place, he says that a number of people consider this freak legislation. I think they do yet. I myself would not have felt flattered by having the legislation copied by the present Government, or by having anything in common with them at all. What impressed me most about this statement of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's was that if a call on him from one lone manufacturer, who "had no complaint in regard to the tariff" had such an effect on him, an avowed low tariff advocate, as to cause him to enact a protective tariff to protect his one lone manufacturing friend, not from hardship, but from something he was afraid might happen—price cutting—what would he not have done if the Canadian Manufacturers' Association had called on him en masse with some of the cock-and-bull stories they are able to put up with regard to the menace of the United States manufacturers? Does any hon. member of this House or any intelligent elector in this country believe that the United States manufacturers can manufacture goods or machinery any cheaper in the United States than can be done in Canada, or that the United States manufacturer is any fonder of cutting prices than his Canadian competitor? I heard my hon. friend who took his seat not long ago say what good fellows the British manufacturers were because they did not cut the price. That seems to be the one thing in common with all these manufacturers. In the above statement of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's you will see one writing to another, "Why do you cut the price? You could just as easily get a bigger price." And the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's was willing to pass legislation to enable these men to get together and hold the prices up. And still they talk of reducing the cost of living to the consumer! This bogey in regard to the American manufacturer and price-cutting is trotted out time and again and made to do service by our protectionist friends, but I was surprised to find so old and shrewd a politician as the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's riding this hobby, and I would be inclined to think that he is riding for a fall with his own party when he rides that hobby. I should like to warn him that it will have a tendency to discredit his party's low-tariff professions throughout the country. I would also point out to him that there are a large number of electors in this country who are still of the opinion that the duties on the necessities of life should be lowered, if not entirely taken off, and certainly lowered on the implements of production.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that on a former occasion in the early days of this session I made my position fairly clear with regard to the present tariff, but even at the risk of being tedious I wish on this occasion to emphasize some of the remarks I made at that time. I wish especially to impress on this House and the country the fact that a tariff law that will enable an American manufacturer to establish a branch factory or assembling plant in Canada, bring in his raw material practically duty free, and charge the Canadian consumer the price of the finished article, plus the duty, putting that duty in his pocket, or worse still into his Yankee bank account—a tariff law that will enable that to be done has something radically wrong with it. The duty that this American manufacturer collects from the Canadian consumer does not stay in Canada. It might make us feel a little more comfortable if we felt it was going to make Canadian millionaires, but we are making American millionaires, for this money does not stay in Canada.

The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) made a statement that you could buy machinery as cheap in Canada as in the United States. Fortunately, I had heard that statement before, and I went to the trouble of securing price-lists of an American farm machinery company doing business both in the United States and Canada. It is an American firm with a factory, or assembling plant, whichever you like to call it, in Canada. My hon. friend quoted the

prices of axes in Montreal and Pittsburg. No doubt those axes were manufactured by different firms at widely separated points. The price-lists I have here are those of an American firm with a Canadian branch factory, or assembling plant—the firm itself calls it a factory. The two points at which these price-lists are put into effect are only six miles apart on either side of the American boundary, one being in the State of Maine and the other in New Brunswick. I am not simply giving hearsay in this matter, because I live within six miles of the American boundary line myself, and I know the conditions; I know whereof I speak. Two men living on adjoining farms, one on the American side, and the other on the Canadian side, buy the same machine and one pays the American price, while the man on the Canadian side pays the bigger price. Here are the prices. On a six-foot mower the price in Canada is $97.50; in the United States, $90; a ten-foot rake, $57 in Canada, $52 in the United States; five-foot reaper, $134 in Canada, $125 in the United States; nine-foot land roller, $77.50 in Canada, $60 in the United States; six-foot binder, $258.50 in Canada, $235 in the United States; six-row potato sprayer, $235 in Canada, $185 in the United States. If you want any more evidence I can give it by the yard. I am sure that these prices will be of interest to the hon. member for Lincoln, who, I am sorry, is not in his seat. I know they are of interest to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), who I see eyeing me very sharply. I have some of his prices here which I could compare with the prices of machinery sold by the Grain Growers in Winnipeg, but I will not put them on Hansard unless he wishes. He shakes his head. I do not blame him.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Do not consider me. You won't hurt me.

Mr. CALDWELL: Of course the same old cry will be raised, how will you raise your revenue? I should like to ask my high protectionist friends how the revenue has always been raised. The people of Canada must always raise the revenue, but there has been a tendency for the party in power in this country to make the people believe that the Government by some miraculous agency was able to raise the revenue of the country without going into the pockets of the people. The sooner we get away from that fallacy the better, because there is no miraculous way of raising the revenue. It is up to this Parliament (and we can all assist if they will take our advice a little) to devise the most economic method for raising the revenue. I do not think a man needs to be any very great student of economics to realize that our present tariff is the most extravagant method of raising the revenue that could be devised, for, as I have shown, pretty clearly I think, for every dollar of duty, especially on the implements of production which I have mentioned, that goes into the treasury of the country, perhaps three or four go into the pockets of the Canadian manufacturer, or worse still, into the pockets of the American manufacturer with a Canadian branch factory, who sends the duty he collects from the Canadian people back to his Yankee bank account.

Mr. COPP: Does that apply to the ploughs as well?

Mr. CALDWELL: Undoubtedly. I do not blame the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, or the hon. member for Lincoln for protesting against the lowering of the tariff, because it would cut off a mighty nice graft they have been collecting from the people. I put the blame where it rightly belongs, and that is on the shoulders of any government or any party in this country which will enact legislation allowing them to do this. The Canadian Manufacturers' Association, or its members, are only human after all—we are all more or less human. One of these Canadian manufacturers is so human that I think he made the statement under oath that he was not running his factory for the glory of God, but to make dividends for the shareholders. That is what we are all doing more or less, but I hope that some of us, in our daily work and business, are giving a little more glory to God than that man was. However, I say I do not blame these people, but the Government, which enacts legislation which enables them to do it, and even instructs them through that legislation how to do it by stating on the invoice to the next man to whom the manufacturer sells his goods what the tax is and to charge it up, for fear it would not otherwise be charged up to the retailer. and in turn to the consumer. From my experience with the manufacturers I do not think those instructions were needed. I do not think the Minister of Finance needed to add that rider to his Bill.

Of course, your high protectionists will say that if you take the duties off these things, it means direct taxation. I for one, am not afraid of direct taxation, nor are the farmers of this country, and if the farmers, the largest property holders in

Canada—I say that without fear of successful contradiction—are not afraid of direct taxation, why should the rest of the people be afraid of it? I consider that direct taxation is the only equitable method of raising the revenue, because then every man in Canada will pay his share according to his ability to pay. In other words, he pays according to what he is worth, instead of on what he consumes. I think the tariff carried to its logical conclusion even tends to race suicide in this country, and I will show you why. You need not laugh Mr. Cockshutt, because I can show you that what I say is true.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must point out to the hon. member that the rule of the House requires that a member shall refer to another hon. member by his constituency.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am sorry for having transgressed the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, but I assure you I did so inadvertently. May I ask if it is in accordance with the rules of the House for one hon. member to laugh at another?

An hon. MEMBER: Of course; if you talk rubbish.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not mind the laugh, Mr. Speaker, and I know it does the member for Brantford good. By direct taxation a man is taxed on what he is worth and not on what he consumes. I believe, Sir, that the tariff, carried to its logical conclusion will tend to race suicide at the present high cost of living. Take a labouring man working for ordinary wages and having to support a family of nine; indeed, Mr. Speaker, I know a man in my constituency—he is a farmer—with a family of twenty-one. At the present high cost of living, with the high duty on woollen goods and shoes, and with this new tax added to all these articles if they come above the maximum price at which goods are exempt—and I believe that a good many articles will come above that price even when bought by the poorest people in Canada—it will be almost prohibitive for a poor man to raise a family. For that reason I think I am justified in saying that the tariff will tend to race suicide; I think I am logical in that statement. With regard to direct taxation I am very much pleased to know that I am in such close accord, on this very important subject, with one of the oldest and possibly one of the wisest parliamentarians in Canada to-day. I refer to the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), and I desire to quote from his speech delivered on May 18, 1920, at page 2592 of unrevised Hansard:

> Every one must realize the fact that there is a duty to be done, and that it is not by the indirect method that it shall be done. We have had two systems of taxation, one almost entirely predominating up to the present time, and that is the method of indirect taxation, by which the people paid heavily and did not know when they were doing so. All sorts of assertions have been made as to the amounts they paid,—assertions which of course would partake of the particular power of imagination of the man who made them and of his boldness of speech. All kinds of assertions, have been made, many of them grotesquely exaggerated; but nevertheless one of the features of indirect taxation is that you pay out not knowing how much you do pay. I doubt if that system of taxation altogether imposed upon a country is a good school teacher to that country, and does finally eventuate in what is best for the interests of the people.

To draw a comparison, Mr. Speaker, or to illustrate the principle of indirect taxation I might suggest that it is just the same as if a storekeeper, when a customer went into his store to buy something, got some one to divert that person's attention while he picked his pockets, and if the customer did not know that this was being done it would be all right. That is the principle of indirect taxation carried to its logical conclusion: "If you do not know that your money is gone, therefore it is not gone." The statement I have just quoted, coming from an hon. gentleman of the ability and experience of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, a man who has always advocated the indirect method of raising a revenue—or in other words a tariff for revenue—cannot fail to impress the members of this House and the people of this country.

I wish also, before I sit down, to compliment the hon. Minister of Finance on the fact that he had the courage to say that he would not exempt the last Victory loan from taxation, especially in view of the precedent which his predecessor had established in the matter. I wish also to compliment the Government on the enactment of the income tax measure, as I believe it is one of the wisest acts that have been passed by this Government, and I also believe that the exemption of the former Victory loans was perhaps the most unwise act of the present Administration. I think, Mr. Speaker, that "unwise" is even too mild a word to express my disapproval of this act, and I hardly think the ex-Minister of Finance realized the seriousness of this act at the time, nor the far-reaching consequences of it. In the first place, now that we have this very wise income tax Act,

the people with large incomes are seeking every avenue of escape from its operation, and this exemption of the Victory bonds provides a very good way of escape for them. And in view of the immense revenue that Canada must raise, not only this year, but for at least as long a period or possibly longer, than these bonds are issued for, I consider it was little short of criminal to exempt them from taxation, for in this way our wealthy men in Canada are able to tie up their wealth so that we cannot tax the income from it, and the Government know what that means; at any rate I hope they do. It means that if the wealth of the country escapes taxation, the rest of us must pay more in consequence.

Last summer as I travelled through the province from which I come I saw in every broker's window, and in the windows of a good many barristers in the different towns through which I passed, some such notice as this: "Victory bonds bought and sold"; and I wondered what they meant, because I knew there was no Victory loan floated at that time. My mother used to tell me when I was a boy that I was of a rather inquisitive turn of mind, and I fear that I have not entirely overcome that failing, if it is a failing. I was therefore somewhat curious to know what this notice meant. On inquiry I found that they were not selling Victory bonds at all but were buying them, and I was anxious to know the reason. The corporations and individuals in our province—and I imagine that what is true in the case of New Brunswick it true in regard to every other province in Canada—who formerly had money to loan on real estate were withdrawing it as fact as they could find tax-exempt bonds to invest in. They were withdrawing their money out of these loans as fast as possible and getting different brokers and barristers to buy Victory bonds. Someone will say, perhaps, that they would not get many. Well, Sir, it would surprise you to know how many they gathered in. We have many patriotic people in our province, and though I would not claim a greater share of patriotism for that province than exists in any other province, I do not think that it will take second place to any other part of Canada so far as response to duty is concerned. We have a number of very patriotic people in our province, I say, who did not have very much money to invest but who felt that they should do what they could to help in the crisis that faced the country. A number of these people bought Victory bonds and made a payment down of only 10 per cent. At a later period they were having a hard time to finance their business, or for one reason or another they were not able to make their further payments, either it was not convenient for them to do so, or they could make more money perhaps in some other avenue of business; at any rate, a large number of these small bond holders—not the big ones, but holders of $50, $100, and $500 bonds—were anxious to sell, and the brokers gathered up their bonds. The consequence is that in New Brunswick to-day you cannot borrow money on real estate at the same interest that you could before those Victory loans were floated. It not only deprives the people of this wealth in New Brunswick, as well as all over Canada, but it makes it harder for the poor man who wants to get into business to borrow money; so it has had a double effect.

Another thing that makes the tax exemption of these bonds more iniquitous than an ordinary Act of Parliament is the fact that it cannot be repealed; it is like the laws of the Medes and Persians. Being a part of the agreement made with the people of Canada when we borrowed this money from them, no Government has any power to rescind or vary it, and we must stand by that agreement, no matter how iniquitous we find it to be.

I wish also to refer to another matter, contained in a series of questions that I put on the Order Paper and which were answered on March 16 by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid)—and I am very sorry that he is not in his seat. However, he will be able to read this in Hansard and I hope he will be able to clear the matter up for me, because I must confess that it has disturbed me somewhat. The questions are as follows:

Did the Dominion Government make an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to secure running rights for the said St. John and Quebec Railway trains over the said Canadian Pacific railway between Westfield Beach and St. John?

The answer is: No. The next question is:

If so, what was the date of such agreement and the terms?

The answer is: Answered by No. 4. The next question is:

And if the Dominion Government did not make such agreement, who did, and what are the terms?

The answer is:

St. John and Quebec Railway Co. The terms are as follows: St. John and Quebec Railway Co.

are to pay interest on a proportion of the value of the joint section plus a proportion of all working expenses calculated on a wheelage basis.

The last question is:

Is the Dominion Government now operating the St. John and Quebec Railway as part of the Dominion Government railway system?

The answer to which is:

This line is being operated by the Canadian Government railways as part of the system.

Those answers look all right on their face, but I was afraid at the time that possibly the Minister of Railways did not have correct information, for I did not suppose the error was a typographical one and knowing the facts in connection with this transaction I realized these answers could not be correct. Consequently I was not at all surprised when I saw the statement made by the Premier of New Brunswick in the Provincial House of Assembly on April 19, 1920, in regard to this matter. It will be noticed that the answers to my questions were given on the 16th of April, and the Premier of New Brunswick made his statement three days later. He said:

It was expected that the Canadian National railways would take over the road for operation when completed on September 1st, 1919. For more than a year previous the directors of the company had been urging on the management of the Canadian National railways the necessity of making some arrangement with the Canadian Pacific railway for running rights between St. John and Westfield. Assurance had been given by the officials of the Canadian National railways that such arrangements had been made and that there would be no difficulty or delay. When the road was completed, however, it was found that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would not allow Valley railway trains to run over their tracks until an agreement in writing had been made. The statute provided that if the St. John and Quebec Railway Company did not make an arrangement for running rights that the Canadian National railways could do so, in which case the Valley railway could take no share of the receipts from the line between Westfield and St. John, nor would it be obliged to pay the rental and other charges in respect to that section. The Canadian National Railway people had due notice that the province would not assume the burden of paying the Canadian Pacific railway for running rights. It was felt that the interest on the money borrowed for the purpose of constructing the railway entailed a sufficient burden for the people of New Brunswick and it would not be wise to assume additional obligation, a rental which apparently would have amounted to $100,000 per year. They thought that the Dominion, which had done so much to relieve other provinces in railway matters, could very easily take up the responsibility of providing for the connecting link between Westfield and St. John. The Government of New Brunswick and the directors had been active in seeing to it that an agreement between the Canadian National railways and the Canadian Pacific railway was consummated, and after considerable delay the Valley railway trains were allowed to run into St. John. The delay was regrettable, and the Government of New Brunswick felt that it was attributable to the officials of the Canadian National railways and not to the directors of the St. John and Quebec Railway Company or the Provincial Government. Neither the Government of New Brunswick nor the railway company has agreed to be bound by any arrangement with respect to running rights, nor had the Canadian National railways been authorized to act on behalf of the Government of New Brunswick in connection therewith. The Government of New Brunswick did not expect to receive any portion of the receipts for the section between St. John and Westfield.

That is a copy of the official report of the statement made by the Premier of New Brunswick. It will be readily seen that if the answers of the Minister of Railways are correct, this statement is not correct; while if the statement by the Premier of New Brunswick is correct, the answers by the Minister of Railways to my questions are not correct. I hope that when the railway Estimates are before the House the Minister of Railways will clear up this matter, because it is of some concern to our province.

I believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway proposition was that the Government should pay 6 per cent on half the cost of the ten mile section from Westfield Beach to St. John, valued at $3,000,000. That would amount to $90,000 per year. Besides that the Government were to pay a proportion of all the working expenses calculated on a wheelage basis, which would amount, as the Premier of New Brunswick has said, to $100,000 or more. Perhaps this will give us some insight into why the Canadian National railways made a deficit last year of $47,000,000, for if the system is managed by the same inefficient methods as the running rights were secured by, it is no wonder that we have such a heavy deficit.

The gross earnings of this St. John and Quebec railroad for the five months from October 31, 1918, to March 31, 1919, were $31,505.08. At that rate they would amount to $75,612.12 per annum. For the further period of six months from March 31, 1919, to September 30, 1919, the gross earnings were $24,873.08, or at the rate of $49,746.12 per annum. For the four years that the railway has been in operation, from April 1, 1915, to March 31, 1919, the total gross earnings were $145,121.45. So it will be readily seen that if the management of the Canadian National railways has to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway Company $100,000 yearly for running rights

over ten miles of road, when the traffic over the whole road for which they want those running rights will only earn at best $49,746 per annum, it would take over four years to earn the money to pay for the running rights over this ten mile section for one year. Surely this is poor business.

The criticism I have to offer, Mr. Speaker, is this: When this road was first contemplated it was proposed to build it so as to connect with the Transcontinental at Grand Falls and with the Intercolonial system at St. John. But unfortunately this railroad has been made a political football from its inception. If the road had been built as it was first intended from Grand Falls to St. John it would have been competing with the Canadian Pacific between these two points. I would not like to say that the Canadian Pacific held this project up, but there have been some sinister influences at work ever since the line was first surveyed and construction begun. Instead of beginning at one end they began construction in the middle; they built in both directions and have not got to either end yet, although it has been under construction and partly in operation for four years. It still lacks some forty miles of connecting with the Transcontinental at Grand Falls and it lacks the necessary ten miles that would give it connection with the Intercolonial at St. John. However, my criticism in connection with the securing of these running rights is that the management of the Canadian National railways did not endeavour—it would seem from the statement of the premier of New Brunswick—to secure running rights over the Canadian Pacific until the road was completed and trains were being operated. I know for a fact that trains were operated to Westfield on the St. John and Quebec railway for nearly a week before the Canadian Pacific would allow their train to run into St. John over this road because the arrangements had not been made. According to the Premier of the province of New Brunswick if the management of the Canadian National railways had endeavoured, before the road was completed, to secure running rights from the Canadian Pacific according to its agreement they would have obtained those running rights at that time and would have got much better terms from that company, because they could have said "Why, your terms do not suit us. We can build that ten mile section and the interest on the cost of construction yearly will not be more than it would cost us for running rights. We will build to St. John and compete with you." If they had taken that stand the cost involved to the country would have been less than $100,000 yearly. That is the criticism I have to offer on the subject of not securing running rights for this road, because I am informed on credible authority that no agreement has yet been signed with the Canadian Pacific. If I am wrong the Minister of Railways will be able to correct me and I will be pleased to submit to his correction. I asked for the production of all the papers and correspondence in connection with this matter some time ago, and although I was promised them they have not yet been brought down. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that whoever is responsible for the carrying out of this promise will see that I get those papers, and I hope that the Minister of Railways, when the railway estimates are before the House, will furnish Parliament and the country with the information in answer to the statement of the Premier of New Brunswick.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have already taken up more time than I expected to, but there is still another matter that I would like to speak on.

An hon. MEMBER: Carried.

Mr. CALDWELL: No doubt hon. members opposite would like me to cease from further remarks because I do not think they have been at all enjoying what I have been saying. I would like to dwell for a few moments on the attitude of hon. members opposite towards the farmers of Canada. They have not missed an opportunity to belittle the farmers or the men who were elected on the Farmers' platform—if you care to call it that. We think that the new Progressive party sounds a little better. Still we are not ashamed of the Farmers' platform; it is a good platform, it is a platform that was promulgated by the men who feed you all.

On more than one occasion hon. gentlemen opposite have accused the farmers of being profiteers. Not to be partial with my favours, I would say that members of the Liberal party have also accused us of being profiteers—although not as often or as severely as members on the Government side have done. There has been a great deal said about the present high cost of potatoes in Canada or, to be more correct the high cost of potatoes during the last six weeks or two months. Now I desire to give the House a little inside information as to the reason for the high cost of potatoes.

I would like also to state that the potato growers of Canada have not benefited very much by the high cost of potatoes during the last few months for the simple reason that they had none to sell. I think I will be able to prove this to you before I have concluded my remarks. However I want to indulge in a little retrospect before I do that. In 1918 the Union Government instituted a "Greater Production Campaign" and it was one of the wisest things they ever did. I may say I was a member of the Greater Production Committee for our province. I think perhaps I spent as much time as any one individual in New Brunswick in advocating greater production. I attended a number of meetings with the speaker whom the Government paid a good salary for his work. I did not get any salary or any expenses—I did not want any. I also assisted at a number of these meetings. However, I want to tell you that the speaker I have referred to was doubtless as good a man as the Government could have got in New Brunswick—I refer to Professor Keirstead, of the university of New Brunswick. The Government could not have secured a better man for the purpose and he did his work well. Our farmers responded nobly to that appeal. Being potato growers largely in New Brunswick, and not wheat growers, our farmers increased their acreage of potatoes, perhaps forty per cent that year, but, due to adverse weather conditions and the poor grade of fertilizer we got, we were not able to secure as good results as were hoped for. We were not able to get any of the Alsatian potash at all. Now any man who is familiar with potato growing knows that potash is one of the essential plant foods for potatoes. Before the war we were able to get fertilizer, containing ten per cent of Alsatian potash, at $36 per ton. In 1918 some of the fertilizer we were able to obtain, without the ten per cent of Alsatian potash, cost us $65 or $70 a ton. You will readily understand therefor that the resultant yield was not nearly as good as formerly; the crop per acre in New Brunswick in 1918 was smaller than ever before. Consequently the cost per barrel of growing this crop of potatoes was higher. The cost per barrel is always higher when you get a small yield because the raising of potatoes is not like manufacturing an axe, a wheelbarrow or anything of that kind. It cost us that year $65 or $70 per acre for fertilizer, and it costs us so much per acre to raise potatoes regardless of whether we got a big yield or a small one. We only secured a yield of fifty or sixty barrels per acre at a much greater cost per barrel than in the case of the 100 or the 125 barrels per acre which had been our usual yield in New Brunswick. In this connection I want to assure you that I know what I am talking about as I was president of the New Brunswick Potato Growers' Association for the first two years it was in operation. It was an organization formed for the better production of potatoes; it was not a commercial organization but was formed for the purpose of promoting seed selection and better methods of cultivation, and getting a larger yield per acre. No official of that organization got any salary at all; we all gave our time gratis. The New Brunswick potato growers benefited largely by that organization. The average cost per bag of raising potatoes in 1918 in New Brunswick was $1.30—that is grown and harvested. It cost the farmers about ten cents per bag to deliver them at the railway—that is the way we sell them and not in our field. The potatoes sold until some time in November for $1.50 per bag, so you will very readily see the farmers were not making large profits. When the potatoes delivered at the station cost $1.40 and we got $1.50 per bag you will see we were not making any big profit taking into consideration the work done in planting this crop. However, on the 21st of November an article appeared in several Canadian papers—and I am going to read it to you. I am not like the hon. member for Algoma East (Mr. Nicholson); I am not ashamed to give you the name of the paper and the date. I could not help thinking when the hon. member was quoting that article with regard to the way the British protected themselves by raising prices to cut out competition that that quotation was taken from one of the Hearst publications. I was inclined to think so by the tone of it, because I think it is one of the most unusual things in the world to raise your price to cut out competition. I never was able to do it. This is the information which was sent out by the Canada Food Board:

> Potato Crop of Canada for 1918 Set New Record. Exportable Surplus. Over and Above all Needs for Domestic Use and Seeding Canada has 28,433,000 Bushels to Send Abroad.
>
> OTTAWA, November 20.—A revised estimate of the Canadian potato crop from figures in possession of the Canada Food Board shows an exportable surplus in six provinces of 28,433,000 bushels over all requirements for domestic use and seeding.

It goes on to say that in the other provinces of Canada there will be none for export, but that the total export for Canada will be 28,433,000 bushels. In view of the fact that Canada had never exported more than 4,000,000 bushels in one year, you can judge what effect this had in the market in which we were selling our potatoes,—and that year we were exporting largely to the United States and Cuba. I received a letter from a prominent dealer in Cuba who had evidently got my name as President of the New Brunswick Potato Growers' Association, and perhaps he thought I was a more important man than I really was. In this letter he inquired about conditions in New Brunswick and asked if this large amount of potatoes was actually available in Canada for export. I told him that while I did not have anything but the Government report, I did not believe any such thing, and I think that later information which I have received has fully justified that statement. However, this report had gone out broadcast to the dealers in the United States and Cuba to whom we were shipping our potatoes, and it was natural that they should expect to get potatoes for little or nothing. Potatoes are not like wheat or hay; they are perishable, and you must sell them within a year from the time they are produced. Now, I had the export returns for that year and knew what they were, but I put a question on the Order Paper to which I received an answer on April 19th, because I wanted the Department of Agriculture to put themselves on record. I was somewhat in the position of the Minister of the Interior, who said in a recent speech in this House with regard to resolutions passed by the G.W.V.A., that he was just a little suspicious of their motives in moving these resolutions. Well, I was just a little suspicious that my hon. friends opposite might question my figures, but I knew that they could not deny their own. The question was as follows)

What was the total export of potatoes from Canada to all countries from the crop grown in 1918, giving the number of bushels exported each month from August 1, 1918, to July 31, 1919?

To which the reply was:

Hon. Mr. Burrell: The total export of potatoes from Canada to all countries from August 1, 1918, to July 31, 1919, is as follows: The department has no information as to the export of potatoes as to crop grown in 1918.

The reason why I asked for the returns by the month was this: we begin to harvest our potatoes towards the end of August and we finish marketing them before the end of the following July, because they are perishable. Very few are shipped in July, so that shipments from August 1918 to July 1919 cover the 1918 crop. No potatoes of the former year's crop are carried over until August of the following year; nor are any left in the country from the crop of the year before to be shipped out after the end of July. The answer then proceeded to give the following figures of the exports by months between August 1st, 1918, and July 31st, 1919:

1918.	Bushels.
Month of:	
August	4,321
September	27,861
October	275,952
November	515,800
December	328,866
1919.	
Month of:	
January	438,343
February	350,653
March	599,613
April	472,939
May	877,659
June	200,227
July	58,613

Instead of 28,000,000 bushels, which the Canada Food Board stated to be the exportable surplus, these figures show a total of 4,150,847 bushels of potatoes available for export from Canada for that year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to give you the effect of this statement which was published in the Canadian newspapers and heralded broadcast throughout the world. Up to the 24th November, about three or four days after this statement appeared in the Canadian papers, potatoes had been selling at $1.50 a bag or $3 a barrel. The price immediately dropped off after this: it went down to 75 cents a bag; at least half the potatoes that were exported from New Brunswick were sold at from 75 cents to $1 a bag—potatoes that cost the farmers $1.40 a bag to produce and haul to the railway siding. So you can understand that the farmers of New Brunswick were not making much money in the growing of potatoes; they were not profiteering. In March, however, the supply of potatoes ran out; this 28,000,000 bushels did not materialize and the price went up at one jump to $3 a barrel or $1.50 a bag. It advanced to $2.50 a bag, and there was not a sufficient supply to meet the demand. Consequently our potato growers in New Brunswick—and I think what is true of New Brunswick is true of the other potato-growing sections of Canada—in the spring of 1919 did not plant a very big acreage of potatoes, and I do not think that the people of this country can

blame them very much for that. They said: If the Government, while urging increase of acreage and of production generally and calling upon the farmers to raise a larger crop at greater expense than ever before, issue an absolutely false statement that causes us to lose 65 cents a bag on our potatoes, certainly we are not going to be caught in that trap again. As I say, therefore, the farmers planted a very short acreage of potatoes last year, and as high as $12 a barrel has been offered for them. In that connection, as I said before—and I do not fear successful contradiction—the potatoes were not in the country. Now, it may be said that this statement was sent out by some official who is no longer in the service of the Government. But I am inclined to think that the same man is there yet, because a further estimate was made of the quantity of potatoes said to be in the farmers' hands on April 24, 1920. I got the following from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics a short time ago:

Ottawa, April 24, 1920. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics issued to-day a press bulletin giving in summary form the results of its annual inquiry as to the total quantities of wheat, oats, barley and flaxseed in Canada, at the end of March, the stocks of all kinds of agricultural products remaining in farmers' hands at the same date.

I will give the quotation only in regard to potatoes, because it is potatoes that I am talking about. This statement says that the stock of potatoes in the farmers' hands on April 24, 1920, as stated by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics was 31,646,000 bushels, compared with 32,836,000 bushels last year and 24,130,500 bushels in 1918. Now, here is a quotation from a paper,—and by the way, I am able to give the authority for this too; I do not believe in making any quotations without citing the authority for them. This despatch is headed: "Says Canada is Swept Clean of Potatoes." It is a Canadian press despatch dated at Montreal, April 23, the day before the statement was issued by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics to which I have referred.

Montreal, April 23.—Are American buyers invading Canada in droves to buy up every potato that can be discovered? The assertion that they are doing so is made by local dealers who give this as the greatest reason for the high price now being paid here by the housewives for the family supplies.

Here is the way a dealer sums up the situation:

"It is almost impossible to get potatoes anywhere in the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island now."

And these are the big potato-growing provinces.

"The Americans have sent swarms of buyers into the Dominion and there are four or five men bidding for everything that is available. One United States buyer told us he had got five carloads at $5.75 per bag f.o.b. in Prince Edward Island; another said he had found eighty cars for Pittsburg at the same rate. I tried to get two cars for Montreal in Prince Edward Island. After a long time I got them at $4.75 f.o.b. there for a bag of 90 lbs. It costs about 75 cents per bag to bring them on to Montreal, making the cost here about $5.50. But the real reason why Montrealers are paying such enormous prices now is that the country has been swept clean of its crop by the Americans and so it has passed over the border."

I want to tell the House why the potato growers received such high prices for these potatoes. You will say: Well, the farmers are profiteering in getting such high prices for these potatoes. The farmers had already sold all the potatoes they intended to sell, as I can prove that by any number of witnesses, but I think my word is sufficient. These were potatoes which the farmers had intended to plant his spring, and a large number of potato growers have sold half the quantity of their seed potatoes this spring, having been tempted by the high prices. Consequently, the acreage planted in potatoes will be short this year, and owing to the statement issued by the Canada Food Board on November 21, 1918, there will be high prices for potatoes next fall because these things have far-reaching results. As Premier Drury wisely said in the Ontario legislature a short time ago, when he was asked to put an embargo on a few cars of potatoes on track in Toronto, "it is a very unsafe thing to interfere with the law of supply and demand."

I think that concludes my remarks. No, it does not; I have one other thing.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CALDWELL: Do not be disturbed though, Mr. Speaker, because I will not detain you very long. I want to compare the attitude this Government adopts towards our farmers with the attitude of the authorities in the United States to their farmers, and I want to read this quotation also from the Associated Press:

WASHINGTON, May 25.—Decrease in agricultural production may result in the United States becoming dependent on overseas food supplies, Herbert Hoover—

That is a name to conjure with in the United States and perhaps in Canada, I am sure it is in Europe, when you come to talk of food supplies and food matters.

—to-day declared in a letter to Representative Diddlick, Republican, Montana, setting forth the

former Food Administrator's views as to practical measures to insure better returns to the farmer for his labour and investment.

Asserting that present high prices of commodities sooner or later will decrease, Mr. Hoover said " this deflation must not begin on the farmer." Shortage in production outside the United States, wild extravagance, and misuse of extended credits for speculation and profiteering and non-essential production are contributing factors in the present inflated prices, he wrote. When the collapse occurs, he predicted, intermediate dealers will be able to pass the greatest portion to the back of the farmer, no matter how carefully handled.

"The whole marketing system in many of our commodities is indirect, expensive, wasteful, obsolete and increases the margin unduly," the latter continued.

Our manufacturing industries have developed out of pace with our agriculture and labour is being drawn in thousands from the farm to the town at wages which the farmer cannot contend against

A commission studying the whole situation, Mr. Hoover declared, would deal with these things with that same common sense—

I should like hon. members to listen to this:

—with which similar commissions of farmers met the great economic problems of the food administration during the war with equal consideration for farmer, distributor and consumer.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS (Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell). I thought when he was giving us that long defence of the high price of potatoes, he took fully longer time to explain why the farmer was getting this high price than the famous manufacturer from Sherbrooke, who gave utterance to that famous phrase that he "was not working for the glory of God", took in explaining the cost of his woollen product. I am inclined to think that even that Sherbrooke manufacturer made a better shift of his defence in connection with the high price of woollen goods than the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton in connection with the high price of potatoes.

The hon. member, in the course of his remarks, made this most remarkable statement, that he could not understand a Minister of Finance delivering a Budget and stating that the resolutions contained in it would come into force the day on which it was delivered. He was under the impression that it would be necessary for the Budget to pass this House and receive the assent of the Governor General. If the hon. gentleman had only stopped to think for a moment, he would have seen what a tremendous loss to the country it would have meant in any Budget proposal which dealt with trade and in which profiteering to a most gigantic extent might have taken place provided such notice were given. It is to be hoped that the hon. gentleman who is leading the Agrarian party has in his ranks men who more thoroughly understand how business is conducted than the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton, or this country would suffer very severely if the prognostications which these gentlemen give us should ever come true, namely, that they would govern the affairs of this country along the lines which they have laid down.

Mr. CALDWELL: I rise to a question of privilege. I do not think the hon. gentleman can find anywhere in my remarks a statement that I expect to govern this country.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: If that is a question of privilege, I hope the hon. gentleman is satisfied.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear the hon. gentleman when he rose, and I thought he was rising to ask a question. He would not be in order in any case, in rising now to a question of privilege..

Mr. DOUGLAS (Strathcona): I am not going to detain the House for every long at this late hour; but I wish to discuss the Budget for a few moments and to give reasons for the course which I shall pursue when the vote takes place on the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. We have heard, in the discussion of the Budget, the question of protection,—moderate, adequate, and high—and free trade. I have been a member of this House for about eleven years, and I have heard that same subject discussed during all the time I have been a member of this House. For a great part of that time I supported a Government which had as its platform a policy of tariff for revenue, and I am in the same position to-night. The view which I hold is that the Government should lay down a tariff which would be productive of revenue, and I see that principle evolved in the Budget as laid down here. We have come through a series of extreme years caused by the war. We have incurred an enormous debt which has to be met, no matter what our theories or pet views may be, and I am convinced that the revenue of this country must be raised from every conceivable source. I might have the profoundest respect for the moderate tariff or tariff-for-revenue views. Under ordinary conditions a moderate tariff would supply the means for raising the

revenue of this country, but under present-day conditions, with a debt of over two bilion dollars, with a sparse population such as we have, I am convinced that we have to resort to every measure of taxation to preserve the credit of Canada at this particular time.

When the question comes up, what is protection, I find this position. I have listened very carefully to this debate on the Budget this session because I took a course last year which caused me to be careful how I should go at the present time. I have listened very carefully to the arguments brought forward as to how the revenue might be raised. I have listened to hon. gentlemen of the progressive party telling us how they would raise the revenue, but I have failed up to this moment to hear one constructive speech, which would lead me to believe that they could raise the necessary money to carry on the affairs of this country by any programme they have brought forward. The amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has left me in the same quandry. If that amendment were carried, logically it defeats all the proposals under the present Budget. It does away with the income tax, it does away with the luxury tax, it does away with the sales tax. It obliterates all the new proposals and says: We want to assist the consumer by reducing tariff taxation. Now that does not commend itself to my best thought. I do not believe it is logical. I do not believe the people of this country would take me seriously if I would support an amendment of that kind under present-day conditions.

I do not for one moment want any one to imagine that I have discarded any of the beliefs which I hold as to what constitutes a tariff in this country. We hear the question of adequate or moderate protection raised. I have made many inquiries as to what protection means. To my mind any tariff, whether it is five per cent or ten per cent, constitutes protection to a certain degree. I cannot conceive of any tariff being placed on goods imported into this country which would not afford some measure of protection. To that extent I am a protectionist.

When we consider the plan for raising the revenue put forward on behalf of opponents of the Government we are confronted with the platform put forward by the official Opposition. To my mind, it is a good platform. If the official Opposition would go further, and if I believed that the people of this country thought that they would raise the revenue under the platform which has been laid down, I should find no fault with it. But I am convinced, as I stated before, that that platform is not sufficient to raise the necessary revenue for this country under present conditions.

I commend the Government for the imposition of an income tax. It is a true Liberal principle. It is a direct tax. I commend them also for the new Budget proposals. I perhaps might criticise the details of the presumed luxury tax. I think $9 for a pair of shoes may not be the proper basis for exemption. I do not think $45 for a suit of clothes is the proper basis for exemption. I am positive that $5 for a hat is not the proper basis for exemption. I am also sure that $5 for underwear is not the proper basis for exemption. But these are matters of detail. The principle is there that those who can pay must pay, and if the effect is to curb extravagance then I am heart and soul in favour of the tax. When it comes to the question of the sales tax, we hear the statement made on all hands, why, the consumer pays it. Certainly he pays it. We are all consumers in this country, and how can we avoid paying it? It makes no difference how the taxes are imposed, the consumer pays them, because there is nobody else to pay them.

As to this question of the manufacturer absorbing, the manufacturer absorbs just as much as his business will permit him to absorb, just as my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) absorbs the potato crop. Just so far as he can get the price, just that far is the absorption. That is taken up by all manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers and other distributers. I have no brief for any of the merchandising class, but my judgment is that in this Dominion of Canada our trade is conducted along as honourable lines as in any other country. I am of opinion that the less restrictions we put on trade the better it is for the country, and when we get rid of this tremendous load we are carrying at the present time, I say, give us all the freedom of trade that we can have. In the meantime we are dealing with conditions which must be met, and in my judgment the present proposals put forward by the Minister of Finance are the best proposals that I have heard from any party in this House, and I therefore intend to support the Budget.

Mr. J. A. ROBB: On behalf of the Opposition I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think the arrangement is not being observed by my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Robb). Another speaker was to have spoken on that side of the House, then the adjournment was to be moved by myself.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion for adjournment has been submitted, and I must put it. It is not debatable.

Motion negatived.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have hesitated a good deal to enter on a discussion of this matter, having spoken on many Budgets during the last fifteen years, but if there is one subject more than another that I think I know a little about it is commercial and manufacturing propositions. It has been my life study and my life work, and I have had a great deal of experience not only in manufacturing, but as an importer and exporter of merchandise. So with these qualifications, I think I would certainly be expected by my constituents to express my opinions upon a question such as this. As the night has worn away and day is at hand I think it would now be in order for me to move that the debate be adjourned to be renewed this day at three o'clock. I therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are confronted here with a situation which is somewhat awkward. Unless hon. members will permit the motion to be made by unanimous consent, the debate cannot at this stage be adjourned.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. SPEAKER: There cannot be two successive motions to adjourn the debate unless there is some intermediate proceeding.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Well, I have proceeded to a certain extent already.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) moves that the debate be now adjourned. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that some hon. members insist that the motion be not entertained unanimously?

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to make a statement, I may say that it is quite true, as the hon. member for Brantford has said, that there was an understanding that we would put up another man, but that understanding was arrived at early in the evening when we expected our friend would come on not later than eleven o'clock. For my part I have no objection to adjourning the debate, on the understanding that the hon. member will be brief to-morrow and not occupy the whole day.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. Friday.

Friday, May 28, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS TABLED.

Report of the Militia Council for the Dominion of Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1919.—Hon. Mr. Guthrie.

Memorandum No. 6, European war, respecting work of the Department of Militia and Defence, from November 1, 1918, to October 31, 1919.—Hon. Mr. Guthrie.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENTS.

Rt. Hon. C. J. DOHERTY moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 137, to amend the Criminal Code.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. DOHERTY: This Bill deals with quite a few articles of the Criminal Code, but several of them are mere matters of procedure, which, perhaps, do not call for any development at the present time. For instance, there is a provision designating the courts in the different provinces, to which the word "court" when used in the Code is to apply. This is to meet changes in designation in the courts of different provinces, resulting from provincial laws.

There is a provision amending the articles that deal with the possession of firearms and the necessity of obtaining permits in order to be entitled to have such firearms in possession and to carry them. The effect of the provision is to extend the present law so as to include a larger number of kinds of firearms.

There is a provision making it an offence to use as a sworn document or affidavit, representing it to be such, an instrument which has not been sworn to. We have had from different parts of the country, representations that such action has been taken at different times and that it should be made an offence.

There are provisions dealing with raising the age of consent, which are the same provisions which this House has already passed on more than one occasion, but which failed to pass in the Senate.

There is an amendment to section 235, which is the section dealing with gambling, and more particularly the section which, under the law as it stands at present, permits the carrying on of wagers and betting upon a race track. It is proposed to modify the present legislation by limiting the method of organized betting which is permissible, to the use of the pari-mutuel machine, and furthermore to make it a condition of the permission that the profits derived from the betting operations shall be restricted to a limited percentage of the amounts at stake That is the extent of the modification in the law on that subject.

There is an amendment to section 300 for the purpose of making a person convicted of attempting to commit rape liable to be sentenced to be whipped. Under the existing law, whereas a person found guilty of indecent assault may be sentenced to be whipped, a person found guilty of the graver offence of attempted rape is not subject to that punishment. Several judges have called attention to this anomaly and pointed out that it ought to be remedied.

There is a provision making an offence and providing punishment for the unlawful wearing of a uniform of any of the forces of His Majesty, or badges, buttons and so forth, indicating military service.

There is a provision requiring that in order that a person may be arrested or summoned from one province to be brought into another, the warrant should be issued in all cases on the authorization of the Attorney General of the province in which it is issued. This is making a general application a requirement which is already contained in the Act for the protection of provincial prohibitory laws.

There is a provision making more severe the penalties for persons convicted of keeping bawdy houses.

M BUREAU: What are the penalties?

M. DOHERTY: This is the amendment:

The provisions of section 1035 shall not apply or extend to any person convicted more than twice under said paragraph (f) of section 773 for keeping a common bawdy house or of keeping a common bawdy house in any premises with respect to which premises more than two convictions have been made, whether the same person has been convicted as keeper thereof or not, and any person so convicted shall not in either case be sentenced to less than three months' imprisonment, nor shall any sentence imposed in either of the cases be suspended under the provisions of section 1081 without the concurrence of the counsel for the Crown in the prosecution of the offender.

The purpose is to make imprisonment imperative in the case of a third offence and to provide that where the offence is committed more than twice in the same premises, even though it be committed by a different person, the third time the offence is committed, it shall be treated as a third offence. It has been pointed out by the administrators of the law that it has been impossible to get convictions as for a second or as for a third offence; though the premises continued to be used for carrying on the business, because after each conviction there would be a substitute or a new person carrying on the business.

Mr. BUREAU: The offence follows the real estate instead of the person?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: That is a new theory.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is perhaps a novelty, but I think the circumstances justify it.

We have a provision to meet this situation which has arisen. There being no appeal in criminal matters in cases where the courts of appeal of the provinces are unanimous, it has happened that on several differnt questions arising under the Criminal Code, the Court of Appeal of one province has decided in one sense and the Court of Appeal of another province has decided in another sense, and there being no appeal, we have contradictory jurisprudence interpreting the same law.

It is proposed to enact that in any case where the judgment of the Court of Appeal of a province is in contradiction of the judgment of another Court of Appeal of another province on the same point, the Attorney General or the accused shall have the right of appeal to the Supreme Court. The purpose is simply to make it possible to have a uniform jurisprudence in the application of this law, which is common to the whole Dominion and rests on a Dominion statute. There are also provisions in regard to appeals in two of the western provinces which have been asked for by the authorities there. There is also a provision to enable the Attorney General to make application in the province of Quebec for a change of venue in cases where there happens to be perhaps only one case in a district and it is not thought

desirable to have a criminal court in that district to try only one or two cases. The Attorney General of the province has made application for this provision and it seems to be one that ought to be granted.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PENITENTIARY ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 138 to amend the Penitentiary Act.

Mr. BUREAU: Explain.

Mr. DOHERTY: There are just three provisions to the Bill. The first one is to make clear the power of the minister with regard to the making of regulations. The second one is to provide that wardens, when they are appointed, instead of being appointed warden of a particular penitentiary, shall be appointed simply wardens and be susceptible of being moved from one penitentiary to another according as the best interests of the administration may require. The third provision repeals an Act which fixes a schedule of salary for the penitentiary officers, the usefulness of that Act disapearing in view of the operation of the Civil Service Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADMIRALTY ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 139 to amend the Admiralty Act.

Mr. BUREAU: Explain.

Mr. DOHERTY: The purpose of the Bill is to confer power upon the Governor in Council to appoint a deputy judge in Admiralty. At present the power to make such appointment is in the hands exclusively of the Judge in Admiralty. It has happened that the Judge in Admiralty being taken ill unexpectedly, and so ill as not to be able even to make the appointment of a deputy judge, there was no possibility of appointing a deputy no matter how great the necessity might be. The present amendment proposes to confer power on the Governor in Council to appoint a deputy judge in such a case.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 140 to amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Mr. BUREAU: Explain.

Mr. DOHERTY: There are just two provisions in the Bill. One is to give greater power of remand to the judge of the Delinquent Court. The present limitation on the period of time, which is eight days, I think, has been found to work great inconvenience by judges administering the law. This provision is to enable the judge to remand for such time as he may think proper. The second provision has to do with the defining of the situation from the point of view of the application of the Juvenile Delinquent law to persons of the Ruthenian-Greek rite of the Roman Catholic church.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 141 respecting the Canadian National railways.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Explain.

Mr. J. D. REID: The House will understand that we cannot make any further extensions to the Canadian National railways until a charter covering the extensions has been granted by Parliament. There are three small extensions required to the present lines of railway in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and we have an item in the Estimates providing for them, but it is necessary to obtain a charter before the work can be proceeded with. It is my intention to refer the Bill to the Railway Committee, which is the usual practice in connection with applications for a railway charter.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

SENATE BILL.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 136 (from the Senate) for the relief of James Lyon Lincoln Cobbin.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

THE PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice): I should like to ask the Committee of the House of Commons which has supervision of the Parliamentary restaurant if there is any official list of those entitled to be admitted to the restaurant.

If there is, I would ask that it be laid on the table of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is most unusual for an hon. member to submit a question to a committee.

Mr. BUREAU: I submit the question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall submit the question to the chairman of the committee and endeavour to see that an answer is given.

Mr. BUREAU: I wanted to direct my question to the chairman of the committee. May I ask for an answer from him?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is most irregular to submit a question to the chairman of a committee in this way.

Mr. BUREAU: I thought we could put a question to any member of the House.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, upon giving notice in the usual way.

Mr. SPEAKER: That could be done by giving notice in the usual way, but not upon the Orders of the Day.

Mr. BUREAU: I think I am right.

THE BUDGET.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON THE ANNUAL STATEMENT PRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

The House resumed from Thursday, May 27, the debate on the motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, the occasion of the delivery of the Budget Speech in this House of Commons of Canada is probably the most important event that occurs during the session The Budget is of particular moment at this time inasmuch as around it there is being waged a controversy that threatens to be the principal object of attack and defence in the approaching elections whenever they may come. For this reason it is my purpose to devote most of the time at my disposal—I assure you, Sir, that I do not intend to take up an undue portion of the time of the House—particularly to the tariff issue. Before doing so, however, I might perhaps be allowed to make a few running comments upon what has transpired since the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) delivered his Budget Speech to this House about ten days ago.

This was the first opportunity this House had of listening to the new Minister of Finance, and I venture the assertion, Sir, that all will agree that the hon. minister acquitted himself admirably. I do not think that it will be seriously denied that he has discharged his responsible duties in connection with the Budget in an able manner. This, I believe, will be conceded, even though we do not all agree with everything he has proposed; for I admit that protests are arriving in fairly large numbers with regard to certain of the details of the Budget, and paticularly the tax on luxuries. These, however, are matters of comparatively small importance and they can be dealt with better in Committee of the Whole House than in a speech on the Budget. I therefore do not purpose at this present moment to criticise the proposals with regard to the luxury tax and other items that are being objected to in certain quarters; I reserve the right to take up these questions when they are before the House in Committee of the Whole.

The new taxes proposed are fairly drastic and are expected to raise a considerable amount of revenue. It must be evident to all, Mr. Speaker, that a vast revenue is required for this country at the present time; and however much we may desire to see the burdens of the people lessened to as great an extent as possible, it is not practicable at this juncture that reductions of a substantial nature can be made in the tariff or in the income tax, the business profits tax, or in any other provision intended for the raising of revenue. The business profits tax as it has been collected in the past has been more or less of a detriment to manufacturers and others inasmuch as it has tended perhaps to an undue inflation in some respects in the salaries of some of the higher officials; and in other ways it has probably reduced the possibilities of making the necessary extensions to plant which in the past have always been taken out of the results of the year's operations. Every hon. gentleman who is acquainted with the laws of trade will realize that it is not possible, because it is eminently undesirable, to float new capital for any institution too often. If you come before the public too frequently with any security, no matter how gilt-edged it may be, you will encounter great difficulty in selling. Every one knows that a corporation must find it difficult to sell its securities if it is constantly coming before investors and offering those securities in order to make extensions and establish

branches possibly in distant parts. The manufacturer and the merchant have therefore in the past looked to profits for their extensions and betterments, and any one who thinks that a manufacturing concern or a business is all profit has only to enter that department of commercial activity to be convinced to the contrary, and convinced very suddenly and to an alarming extent. My experience in new enterprises has been such, Mr. Speaker that I venture to say that not fifty per cent of the manufacturing projects of the country have succeeded in making any money, and in many cases they have lost the capital that was originally invested. That has been my experience after trying a great many companies, and I can say therefore that the idea is altogether fallacious which some people, and particularly our friends across the way, seem to promulgate, that it is easy to make money out of a business or out of a manufacturing concern.

The income tax is materially increased by the Budget proposals. That probably was also to be expected, but it does not perhaps press very heavily on many of the fairly well-to-do people in this country. It will have this effect, however, as any one can see, that those who are philanthropically inclined, and who from time to time have contributed very liberally to all the charities, and good works of the social world, and of the church, sustaining every beneficent object which is promoted in their community, are going to have less money at their disposal to devote to these purposes, than had the Government not come forward and taken a comparatively large slice of their income. This fact must be apparent to all: but I say that while the proposal of the Government may bring money into the coffers of the country it is not necessarily going to interfere with the personal living of the individual so much as it will with the assistance which he has been contributing to the various institutions of the country, which in the past he has felt morally called upon to support.

I had hoped that the large deficit that has been shown in the operation of the National railways would have been taken care of before the Budget was presented. That, however, has not been done and I am not sure whether or not it is contemplated to do it; but I wish to reiterate what I said at the opening of the session, namely, that in my judgment the rates in regard to both passenger and freight traffic should be immediately increased. I say that as one who will have to contribute a very large share towards such increase, but it is only proper that our railways should be placed on a self-sustaining basis so far as operating expenses are concerned. That, as I say, has not been done so far, but with a railway deficit of some $47,000,000 I can see that our treasury will be considerably taxed to take care of this amount to say nothing of all the other financial burdens that the war has placed upon us. I would therefore commend to the Minister of Finance, and particularly to the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) the earliest possible attention to this matter, because I look upon it as a crying necessity, and I trust that before very long some means will be found to meet this immense deficit in connection with the National railways.

Another matter which will receive immediate attention from the Government is the West India trade, and I want to go on record as being very keenly desirous to see largely developed our interchange of trade with the British West Indies. I hope that the delegates who are coming to Ottawa to represent the British West Indies and adjacent territories will receive a sympathetic hearing from the members of the Government and particularly from the members of this House. There is no class of trade which we could extend to better advantage and which should appeal more to our sympathy. Therefore, I hail with satisfaction the idea that these gentlemen are about to enter upon a conference with a view to vastly increasing the trade between Canada and the West Indies. It is well known that our Canadian territory is not in the banana belt and while we can raise in the Niagara district and in some parts of British Columbia a good many products that are almost semi-tropical, we cannot in a sense take care of the products from the tropics, that are required for our people. The West Indies can furnish us all these necessary products, and being under the British flag and being a part of the same Empire as that to which we belong, I am favourable to anything that will bring about closer commercial relations between the British West Indies and the Dominion of Canada.

I believe that is a sound policy; a patriotic policy; and one that should be pursued in the interest of the Empire.

A few years ago we gave a preference to the sugar of the British West Indies and where would we have been to-day had it not been for our foresight? During the war, and since, Canada has been pinched in her sugar supply and we have had great difficulty in getting sufficient for our re-

quirements but the fact remains that Canada is perhaps better off than many other countries in the world, not barring free trade Great Britain, which, prior to the war, lived on the bounty-fed sugar of Germany and Austria, and which after the war broke out, was short of sugar. When the boys sent home for a parcel they always said: "Do not forget the sugar; do not forget the candies; we cannot get them here." That was the result of the foresight of Canada in giving a preference to the sugar planter of the British West Indies at a time when the produce of the West India plantations was being driven from the market by the fierce competition of the bounty-fed sugar of Germany and Austria. The British free trader said: "It does not matter; people are getting cheap goods and our policy is to buy in the cheapest market and to sell in the dearest and may it always remain so." It is not a very wholesome thought that the black inhabitants, the coloured races, of our West Indies, should be practically pushed into the ground as a result of the encouragement of the bounty-fed sugar of Germany and Austria which finally used all the resources that they had gained from their trade with Britain to try and drive the British Empire, British institutions and civilization, generally from the earth, crushing all other peoples who did not place their necks under the heel of the Hun. I am glad that now the West Indies are to receive consideration.

Mr. DEVLIN: Is the hon. gentleman in favour of a confederation with the West Indies?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The political question is a matter involving considerations that differ from the trade question. I am in favour, as I said, of the broadest kind of trade with the West Indies. I scarcely think that the people of Canada are prepared to pit their votes as citizens against those of the inhabitants of the West Indies. I do not think they are prepared to admit that perfect political equality should exist between the inhabitants of the West Indies and Canada. Personally I have very great sympathy with the black races. I have felt when I have heard so much about congressional resolutions in favour of Ireland that it would not be a bad thing if we went on record in regard to upholding the rights of the coloured races especially in the south. I was nettled pretty badly when I saw eighty-eight Congressmen telling England how she should govern Ireland while at the same time receiving pictures that would almost bring tears to the eyes of any human being showing five, eight, or ten blacks hanging in a row who had been done to death without trial and without justification at the hands of a ruthless mob. They had been hung up and in some cases, burned at the stake without any trial whatever. Still eighty-eight members of the Congress of the United States are prepared to tell the British Government how they should handle the Irish question while at the same time they are meting out treatment to the races in the south and elsewhere that brings a blush to the cheek of everybody who has any regard for the equality and brotherhood of man. My hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) who I believe may have more or less sympathy with the resolutions that have gone forward might take these matters into his consideration at the same time and if he will bring in a resolution in condemnation of these outrages I shall be prepared to support it.

Mr. DEVLIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I will not qualify the hon. gentleman's language; he has been stating an absolute falsehood in connection with—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member (Mr. Devlin) will withdraw that term. I am quite sure he does not mean to imply that the hon. member (Mr. Cockshutt) has uttered a falsehood deliberately.

Mr. DEVLIN: His statement is absolutely false, Mr. Speaker, I rise—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will not repeat the statement he made in the first place; otherwise I must say that it is not parliamentary and that it will be necessary to withdraw it.

Mr. DEVLIN: I have absolutely nothing to withdraw from what I have just said respecting the statement made by the hon. gentleman concerning my conduct in connection with other countries. I asked him a simple question. I asked it as a Canadian citizen and then he turns upon me and makes statements in connection with what my sentiments might be in order to cast a reflection—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. DEVLIN: You have the floor, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not stating his point of order. As to the

wisdom or propriety of the manner in which the hon. member for Brantford interpreted the question submitted by the hon. member for Wright—that is one thing but I do not apprehend that he encroached upon the rules of the House in what he said.

Mr. DEVLIN: Is not a rule of the House that one member cannot impute motives to another member?

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not understand that there was anything in the remarks of the hon. member for Brantford which reflected on the hon. member for Wright.

Mr. DEVLIN: Oh, no; I have absolutely nothing to say as to a reflection. I am simply on the point of order that the hon. gentleman imputed to my remarks as a Canadian citizen a sense which they did not bear and something that I had not mentioned at all and which had no connection with them. I asked him about the blacks and he speaks of Ireland.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that the hon. member for Brantford would be the first to deny that he had any intention of imputing motives. It is open to the hon. member to make such argument as he chooses so long as he does not reflect upon the character and motives of the hon. member for Wright, and I do not apprehend that the hon. member has cast any reflection upon the hon. member for Wright.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think, Sir, that you have quite correctly interpreted the rule and stated the fact about my not casting any reflection on the hon. gentleman. I simply said that he possibly had sympathy with the resolution.

Mr. DEVLIN: With what?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: With the resolution sent to Lloyd George.

Mr. DEVLIN: Which resolution?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not desire to be questioned further.

Mr. DEVLIN: Which resolution?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My remarks are there on the record, they speak for themselves and it is not necessary that we should continue this discussion.

Mr. DEVLIN: I still stand by what I said before.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member for Brantford has the floor; he may not be interrupted except with his consent.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. DEVLIN: I am not interrupting him, Mr. Speaker, but he imputes to me—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member for Brantford has stated that I have properly indicated his position with respect to the matter.

Mr. DEVLIN: What is his position?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The hon. member is only endeavouring to interrupt but I shall not be turned aside from my remarks on the Budget by any such matters as he is endeavouring to place before the House.

Mr. DEVLIN: Be man enough to say to what resolution you refer?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I have said that I believe the hon. gentleman if he says he has no sympathy with this resolution.

Mr. DEVLIN: What resolution?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The resolution that I referred to.

Mr. DEVLIN: What resolution?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The resolution sent from the Congress of the United States by 88 members.

Mr. DEVLIN: Now you are speaking of another thing.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That is what I was speaking of.

Mr. DEVLIN: Why did you not say so?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That is what I was speaking of all through and I had no intention of ruffling the feelings of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BUREAU: Let the hon. member for Brantford ramble over the United States.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Our trade returns have been shown to be very satisfactory, Mr. Speaker, and I think it should be a matter of congratulation to the country that the trade of Canada is in the splendid position it is in at present. Employment has been plentiful; and in spite of all the attacks that have been made upon the Government and upon their proposals it has not yet been shown that there is any serious suffering in Canada. With regard to labour, from one end of the country to the other work is abundant at the highest wages ever known in the history of the country; and when the labouring man is prosperous, when he has a full dinner pail and is getting the reward of faithful service there is always peace, plenty and quietness in the land. I believe that the bulk of our people throughout the

Dominion are well satisfied with the trade conditions that exist and with the extent of the employment that is being found in all the great centres of the country, as well as on the farms, in the forests and in the mines.

Our imports and exports have, within the last two or three years, reached the highest figure ever known in the Dominion; and it will be seen that although we are sometimes told that this is a very highly protectionist country, upwards of one-third of the imports of Canada come in absolutely free of duty —no duty whatever is collected on over one-third of the imports that come into the Dominion, which is very close to the figures that obtain even in Great Britain. I have here a copy of the Budget Speech delivered by Austen Chamberlain, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, the other day. It is in very brief form, and perhaps I may be permitted to make two or three observations in regard to that Budget. Speaking of the two hours' speech delivered on the 19th of April by Mr. Chamberlain, the article from which I am quoting goes on to say that during the past year, 1919-20, the revenue was £1,340,000,000, and the expenditure £1,660,000,000, leaving a deficit of £326,000,000 in the Budget of Great Britain for the year mentioned. Therefore I think that if hon. members opposite will contrast the financial statement made in free trade England with the statement made in this House, they will realize that the Canadian Finance Minister has been able to bring down a fairly satisfactory Budget when he declares that about $49,000,000 or $50,000,000 of a surplus is expected as against a deficit of £326,000,000 in Great Britain on the operations of the past year. If the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) were in the House I would draw his attention to the fact that $250,000,000—and that was published in one of our papers only recently—was given as a bonus by the Government of Great Britain to ensure cheap bread. The hon. member, a day or two ago, told us we were shipping Canadian flour to Great Britain and then receiving it back in the shape of biscuits and that that was what a free trade country was able to do. He forgot to notice, however, that $250,000,000 was required to be paid out by the British Government to enable the poor man to buy his loaf at a price he could afford to pay; $250,000,000 was lost to the Exchequer in Great Britain on the bread business alone.

Mr. CRERAR: I would ask the hon. member if that is the permanent policy of Great Britain?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is not the permanent policy, probably, but it has been in vogue, as my hon. friend knows, for about three years. The hon. member for Red Deer made the statement only the other day that biscuits were being shipped back to this country made out of Canadian flour by biscuit manufacturers in Great Britain who received the flour free and could afford to do that and so they fed us in Canada with our own flour made into biscuits. I am pointing out that in order to enable their own people to buy bread at a fairly satisfactory price they have contributed $250,000,000 out of the treasury to enable the poor man to live within his earnings.

The first item in the national balance sheet—and I commend this specially to our friends over the way—is customs £150,000,000, or in round figures according to the ordinary rates of exchange, $750,000,000 in customs duties alone which, divided among about 45,000,000 of people would make between $16 and $17 per head. Let me pause here to say that I hope the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) who is now leaving the Chamber, will not be long absent, as I intend to address a remark or two of interest to him. So that over there $750,000,000 in round figures were raised in customs duties from 45,000,000 people making, as I say, $16 or $17 per head which was collected from the British people in customs duties in free trade England; whereas in Canada, under what my hon. friends opposite are pleased to call a very high protectionist policy, we contributed a shade over $20 per head during the past year—calling the customs duties $160,000,000 and our population 8,000,000 that would make exactly $20 per head contributed by the people of Canada. The excise duty which was collected in Great Britain—that is, the internal revenue—was £198,000,000 making a total of £348,000,000 for both customs and excise. On motor vehicles duties amounting to £4,500,000 were collected in addition to what I have stated; the estate duties amounted to £45,000,000; stamp duties £25,000,000 in round figures; land tax £2,500,000; income tax £385,000,000; excess profits tax £220,000,000; corporation profits tax £3,000,000; and land value duties £500,000, a total inland revenue of £682,000,000. The combined total receipts from taxes were £1,035,000,000. Then postal services gave £37,000,000; telegraph service £6,000,000; telephone service £10,000,000; or £53,000,000 for these three services; miscellaneous £650,000; ordinary receipts

£744,000; special receipts £8,756,000; miscellaneous ordinary receipts £18,000,000; special receipts £302,000,000, making total receipts from non-taxed revenue of £383,000,000, and a total revenue of £1,418,000,000. The total expenditure is also given but the items are not of very much interest and therefore I shall not read them. The total expenditure was £1,184,102,000 and for debt reduction £234,000,000. So that the Budget, as delivered in the House of Commons in Great Britain, shows that they were over £300,000,000 in debt at the end of last year and though they anticipate a surplus this year it remains to be seen whether or not it may be realized.

Another matter I wish to debate for a moment is that of the Canadian Merchant Marine service. The other day when the question was before the House the member for Red Deer told the Minister of Marine that he could never expect to make his ships pay unless he not only shipped out goods but also brought goods in and filled his ships. I wanted to point out to the hon. member at that time the weakness of his argument but not wishing to intervene in the debate I refrained. Now, I think I should draw attention to the point and say that the hon. member, and those associated with him, stand for a policy that will never bring in by ships what they say should be brought in. These hon. gentlemen are ready to send out cargoes to sell to Great Britain, but when it comes to the vast amount of our imports they want to bring them in on the short haul from the United States, thereby killing our railways as well as our industries. All the excess importation comes from the United States, and under the policy proposed it will continue to come in increasing amount from that source, and it will never fill our ships with return freight—as the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) can well tell him—after they discharge their cargoes in Great Britain.

That is the policy we object to, for it is not a national policy, and it will kill our merchant marine so long as return cargoes are necessary. As a result of our excess importation from the United States to the extent of $250,000,000 or $300,000,000 we have not only a great loss of traffic to our railways and to our people, but we have also a grievous slump in the value of the Canadian dollar to the extent of from 10 to 15 per cent, so that to-day when we want a dollar's worth of American goods—having bought too much already from across the line—we have to pay $1.10 to $1.15.

[Mr. Cockshutt.]

That result has been brought about entirely by over-importation from the United States and by neglecting what our friends opposite sometime say they wish to see—a very large importation from the Mother Country, which owes us a heavy balance because she buys from us a great deal more than we buy from her. Therefore I submit that the argument that a merchant marine cannot pay because we do not bring in goods by shiploads, will not hold good as long as we continue to bring in by the short haul rail route from the United States the goods that we should be buying from our friends and relations overseas.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to refer to a few of the speeches that have been delivered in this debate. As a Budget debate it has been one of the best I have heard during my fifteen years as a member of this House. The speeches have been of a high order throughout, and most of the hon. gentlemen who spoke confined themselves very closely to subjects germane to the question. I have already briefly referred to the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). I want also to compliment my friend (Mr. Fielding) who moved the amendment. We know that he was in office for fifteen years, and though he was I believe of somewhat free trade
4 p.m. inclinations when he entered office, he discharged his duties as Minister of Finance and initiated a trade policy which was very fairly satisfactory to most of the people of this country, and during his term of office very little protest was heard even from a man who is supposed to be so high a protectionist as myself. I very rarely found it necessary to wait on my hon. friend in relation to any grievance from any of the large number of industries that flourish in the city of Brantford. I am willing to pay him that tribute. He was good enough to remind us in the course of his speech that he was the father of the dumping clause in the tariff. I want to give him the highest commendation for that clause, although it was taken exception to last night by some hon. members, for I think it is one of the wisest provisions in the tariff; and it has succeeded, as I will show a little later, in finding a way to get after the man who endeavours to destroy his weaker brother starting in business.

Mr. BELAND: Will you support the amendment?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am not saying I will support the amendment. I am giving

a little meed of praise where I think it is due.

Mr. BUREAU: For fear he might become Minister of Finance again.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I cannot say anything so flattering of the member who sits behind him representing Brome (Mr. McMaster). He is continually shouting, "Let the voice of the people be heard."

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: "Let the voice of the people prevail."

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am sure we were all astounded to hear from the member for St. John city (Mr. Elkin) that the member for Brome has the distinction of representing the smallest number of people of any member in this House.

Mr. McMASTER: But think of their quality.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: He represents between 13,000 and 14,000 people. Now, if he can make his voice heard in this House, as he does, on every occasion, in season and out of season, as the representative of only 13,000 people, what would be the sound of his voice if sitting for the division of St. James with its 60,000 electors? Surely it would be as the voice of a modern Stentor. The member for Brome according to his light and knowledge is perhaps one of the most heterodox members of this House in relation to trade policy. I am sorry to have to say so, but I say it in all kindness, in the hope that my hon friend will mend his ways, because I want to say there are McMasters in Montreal who, I understand, are somewhat closely related to the hon. gentleman, and who deplore his speeches on trade questions; and if he does not give better value in law than he does in business I am sorry for his clients.

I want to say a word or two with regard to the new addition to this House in the person of the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) who yesterday addressed the House for the first time. His speech was most creditable to a young member and would indeed have been creditable to the oldest and most experienced member. His perfect control of voice, the charm of his manner and the excellence of his matter, as well as the chaste English in which he expressed his views, were models for those who so to speak, are to the manner born. No one could have delivered a finer address. I have, however, to add this by way of criticism, that after he had told us that he had a fresh mandate from the people, and had received all the light and knowledge that his constituents could give him on the tariff, which is the most important matter before the House at the present time, he had a very milk-and-water statement to present to us. He practically said that he did not run on a protection platform; but he admitted that he had stood on what he called a platform of "moderate protection."

Mr. BELAND: He presented you with an egg.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Yes. I have not broken it yet, but I hope the yolk will turn out to be good.

Mr. BUREAU: It may be a Chinese egg.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The hon. gentleman from St. James succeeds a gentleman whom we all respected and whose demise we regret. The late Mr. Lapointe coming from the same division, had the manliness to get up in this House on the Budget debate of last year and tell a lot of hon. gentlemen over the way where "they got off at," and I think he turned rather savagely on them on that occasion. Not only did he so express himself, but he translated his views into action by voting with the Government on that occasion. Therefore I hope that his bright successor will give his enlightened vote on this occasion in the same way as did his predecessor on a similar occasion, because, with all due respect to my hon. friend, the late Mr. Lapointe faithfully represented the St. James division with its large manufacturing and industrial interests. I believe that he received no rebuke from any of his constituents for his action on the occasion I refer to—at any rate, no protest was made public.

There have been heard, too, some notable speeches by members on this side of the House, particularly by those who very seldom speak. I refer to the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Elkin), to the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion), to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin), to the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson), and many others, but the others, perhaps, are older members—yes, and also to the member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Stacey) who made a plea for "team" play between all the people of Canada, and I commend that plea particularly to hon. gentlemen opposite. It is one of the brightest thoughts that were brought before this House during the whole

debate, and we are a Dominion of nine provinces, enough to make a team out of. We can make a country out of this; but that must be done by team play, by co-operation and standing together, not by ploughing the lone furrow or hoeing the lone row and having regard only to our own narrow interest of our particular selves, but by fighting and standing for united team play, for a united country, for a country of nine provinces, each of which looks after his brethren's interests as well as his own. If that policy is engaged in, I feel sure that a bright prospect is in store for this country.

I wish to deal with the tariff, and I must hurry along as I do not desire to detain the House at any great length, this being the principal subject with which I have to deal. I am a man of very moderate views, as is well known to all members of the House, yet, you know, Mr. Speaker, that some of our agricultural friends have dubbed me the high priest of protection. I do not object to that term if I can only live up to the sacredness of the garments that I wear. The priestly office that has been bestowed upon me, by my farmer friends in particular, is one that I esteem rather than despise. I was wondering whether I could carry out the analogy a little further; and being a man who studies the Scriptures somewhat, and noting how our friends in the Agrarian corner gathered together the other night on the vote and that they were led in by a chief whip whose name, by the rules of the House, I am not allowed to mention, I may say that from the way they followed him, it appeared to me as though the members of this Agrarian aggregation were Levites, and we find that in the Scriptures, priests and Levites are very closely associated. Taking that thought up and being desirous in a most friendly way of inculcating into my friends across the way a little palatable truth, I am going to speak in a parable as a priest should do, and I hope my Levite friends will try to follow me.

Once upon a time there were two farmers who lived, we shall not say where, but they had adjoining farms. One of them had 10,000 acres upon which he had 10,000 steers.

Mr. BELAND: Some farmer.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Yes, my hon. friend may say "some farmer," and rightly so. On the other side of the fence was another farmer who had 50 high-bred cattle, shorthorns, muleys, and others that were accustomed to peaceful habits. Between those two farms, from end to end, there stretched a barbed-wire fence.

Mr. J. F. REID (Mackenzie): Protection.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Yes, that is what I am coming to, but do not forestall me. These farmers lived on excellent terms with each other. This being a time when we hear a great deal about the brotherhood of man and the desirability of being friends with every people in the world, these neighbours one morning met at the barbed-wire fence, and they got to talking. The man who had the 10,000 steers, who lived on the south side of the fence, if you can realize that, said to the other: "Do you know, I have been thinking that, in accordance with the rules of the brotherhood of man and of the teaching of Holy Writ, in the early days there were no fences, no divisions between cattle and cattle, nor between farmer and farmer. I have been thinking, if we could only arrive at an arrangement whereby we could do away with the expense of this immense quantity of barbed-wire and cedar posts, both of which cost a very large amount of money in these days, we could both save a great deal of money, and those 50 cattle of yours, which are in that beautiful meadow with clover up to their knees, would have a wider market and range on the south side of the fence. I propose, therefore, that we abolish this barbed-wire fence, and your short-horns and polled angus can stray over my 10,000 acres, and this would be a vast advantage to your flock as well as mine. Why should we have a division between us? The farmer who lived on the north side of the fence was either from Missouri or Scotland, and he said that he would take the matter into consideration. He went home and talked the matter over with his wife, saying that he thought a good deal of consideration should be given to this friendly neighbour who lived over the way and who had made a friendly proposal, and that it would be a good idea for these 50 short-horns and polled angus to be allowed to enter into company with the 10,000 steers on the other side of the fence, thus having 20,000 acres over which they could stray instead of 10,000. But he said: "I think we shall look over the situation a little first and see how it will work out." This was in the spring of the year; the grass was growing; there was food for all of the animals, and they were resting contentedly or grazing on the north side of the line. But later on when, under the summer sun,

drouth set in, the situation did not look quite as good, and this farmer again visited the field, and he found these 10,000 acres that were occupied by the 10,000 steers nipped down pretty nearly to the roots. In other words, the 10,000 steers were too many for the land, and his friend again meets him at the fence and he says: "Well, what have you thought about my suggestion?" "Well," he says, "it has a good many points about it; but I am thinking, now that the drouth has set in, probably my animals will require what is on this side of the fence, and I do not think I can agree, but I will not say definitely now." Later on the situation became more acute, and the farmer on the north side of the fence, visiting this land about the 1st September, finds a ramping, raging number of steers who are pressing against the barbed wire, shaking every cedar post on it, threatening to come on with a rush, and some of the breachy animals nearly going over the top. These animals are Texas steers; their horns look longer now that they are so lean; their ribs can all be counted, and their hip bones are sticking through their hides. The Scotchman goes home and he says: "Wife, I have learned a lesson; that fence is not coming down. If the Lord spares me until morning and the fence does not give way, I shall have some more cedar posts in the ground and I shall have an extra strand of barbed wire on the top to keep those breachy brutes on their side of the line."

That is the parable. I want now to bring home to my hon. friends, in a trade way exactly the situation. With a free trade policy, you have no fence; you have no protection; your fields are open. On the other side of the line there is a ramping, raging herd of 10,000 manufacturers who are feeling the pinch of the time, who are ready to put in goods at cost, who are ready to sacrifice any balance left over at the end of the year, and they say to our friends: "Let us in; we will pay for the fence, yes, we will pay the duty;" and as the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) says: "You shall not come over at that; we shall have a dumping clause that will keep you out." That is exactly the position with Canadian industry in relation to the United States. It is all very well to glory about the beauties of free trade; but it is a fair weather policy; it cannot be changed to meet any emergency. No one can show where free trade can come to the rescue of any man who is in danger. Protection is the first law of nature: The Almighty created every creature with beak or claws or teeth to defend itself. The Almighty has placed between nations resources that also can protect them, and the first duty of this or any other Government is to look after the welfare of its own citizens. It is all very well to talk about the brotherhood of man, but you will not be brothers to your fellowmen, you will not be on the earth at all unless you have some regard to the living of yourselves and your families. And you cannot get it in that way. I say in all kindness and without any desire to offend any of my friends that I look upon this Farmers' group as a dangerous one. They are small in numbers but they are far more dangerous than the Opposition of larger numbers alongside of them. They say they have got into the limelight and are receiving more attention than they deserve. I am not sure about that. When a false move is made it should be nipped in the bud, and I look upon this movement as the most dangerous that has ever been started in the Dominion of Canada. I may be wrong, but that is my belief. These men in the Farmers' group are not the only farmers in this House. We have twenty or thirty farmers sitting on this side of the House, and there are twenty or thirty in the Opposition, who are just as much farmers as my friends of the Agrarian group. I say to my friends down there in all sincerity and kindness that this country cannot be allowed to pass into the hands of any class no matter how good they may be, no matter how high they stand in honesty, justice, truth and faithfulness. We cannot allow this country to pass into the hands of any one class. In the debate on the speech from the Throne I made the statement that I looked upon this as a class movement. That statement was combated at the time by the leader of the party. Well, I have here their platform, and it bears out all that I said. I propose to read one or two items from this platform which has already been read very often in this House. It is the United Farmers' platform, the new national policy. I think this is the most up-to-date edition, but so many editions have been issued that it is difficult to say whether or not this is really the final edition. When a new party is formed and a definite platform is laid down, we have no recourse but to take these gentlemen at their word. I believe myself that these gentlemen across the way who form the Agrarian party mean to carry out their platform if they get into power. I

say that it is the most destructive policy, from a trade standpoint, that was ever propounded in our country, and that it cannot receive and never should receive the endorsement of the people of Canada. This country is composed of a vast amount of interests and of a vast amount of callings, every man to his occupation, every man to his duty as he sees it; and when men run for office in this country they should run as citizens of Canada and perform their duty in this House as citizens of Canada, and not as representing any one class. I say that with regard to the farmer and with regard to labour. Let us see what the platform of the United Farmers says. After reviewing the combines and after lambasting protection for fair, it proceeds to the third clause to give definite tariff proposals.

Therefore be it resolved that the Canadian Council of Agriculture, representing the organized farmers of Canada,—

I call special attention to that "the organized farmers of Canada." They do not profess to have called into that Council any labouring man, any merchant, any manufacturer, any railway man, any banker, any educationalist, any clergyman, or anybody except the United Farmers. I do not know how many belong to this organization, but it will be news to me if the United Farmers of Canada represent 25 per cent of the farmers of Canada. I very much doubt it.

Mr. BELAND: I doubt it also.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: After one class has laid down a definite platform it is too late in the day to dub it afterwards "A National Policy." You cannot do that. What my hon. friends should do is to get together with their brothers of all parties if they want to form a new party. Let the labouring men come in, who are nearly as numerous as themselves in this Dominion, and who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow every day of the year, winter and summer. Let them call in the miners and the railway men, of whom there are 150,000 in this country, and all other classes of the community. Every one of them is entitled to be called in to help frame a national platform. It is not good enough to say that you have put the platform out two years ago, and that it is a National Policy that you have propounded. You have propounded simply a farmers' policy, and I say that it represents only the United Farmers, and that there are many excellent farmers outside of the United Farmers, and I hope they will remain outside. My hon. friend—and this refers to the leading Levite in the case, in his speech the other night said: "We, the farmers of Canada, desire all food to be admitted free." It sounded to me very much like, "We, the tailors of Tooley Street." Has this hon. gentleman consulted the farmers of Ontario in that respect? I venture to say that if he will make the same proposal to the fruit growers and the vegetable growers and the dairying interests of Western Ontario they will say to him, "You may speak for yourself, but not for us." The farmers in Western Ontario have voted protection time and again, and if this case is properly put up to them at the next election, not by a long way will the Agrarian group carry the farmers of Ontario with them. Nearly every item we have ever consumed has a tax upon it, and I stand for protection for every farm product—butter, cheese, eggs, milk, cream, vegetables of all kinds, fruits of all kinds. I would have every one of them protected, and protected handsomely. Protection has been of vast benefit to the farmers of our district regardless of party. Everybody who knows the conditions knows that. We know that many of the products of the farm are sold in the United States far cheaper than in Canada, and still there is a duty of four cents a pound on hog products. To whose advantage is that? To the farmer's? What about eggs? The farmer across the line in the South has his hens running in the open all the time in winter. His hens do not require to be warmly housed or to have electric lights in the shed to make them believe the day is longer than it is, but our farmers have to have modern equipment for their henhouses, and the Agrarian group would ask them to compete with the American farmer, although it costs our farmers from 4 to 10 cents more a dozen, and I think that is very much under the mark, to produce their eggs in winter than in summer, while the hens in the South are running in the open all the year round. The same is true of sheep. They run at large and need no protection in the winter. They are out in the open and pick up their living all the time. The same is true of cattle and horses. Yet hon. gentlemen across the way ask our farmers to compete with the farmers of the South in these different lines. Everybody knows that the American crop is always earlier than ours, and the early vegetables and early fruits from the United States would take the cream off the market. Everybody knows that that would be the result of removing our protective barriers. If they were let down, many of our fruit men and

vegetable men in Western Ontario would be driven out of business.

Coming back to the platform of the United Farmers, this is what they propose:

(a) An immediate and substantial all-round reduction of the customs tariff.

Though I am a protectionist I am prepared to stand more or less in line with that. But I say to my farmer friends that they do not carry that out in the later part of their platform, as I shall show in a moment. It goes on:

(b) By reducing the customs duty on goods imported from Great Britain to one-half the rates charged under the general tariff, and that further gradual, uniform reductions be made in the remaining tariff on British imports that will ensure complete free trade between Great Britain and Canada in five years.

Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear a more preposterous proposition for a country such as this? Do our friends opposite realize what that means? I do not think they do. Free trade with Britain means free trade with the world. It means that American goods would come into Canada via Great Britain. It is just like having three wells of water connected by three pipes. The three pipes will convey the water to absolutely the same level in every one of the wells. You connect the United States with Great Britain in free trade and allow Great Britain to connect up with Canada and you will have American goods going to Liverpool and coming into Canada by the back door. That is what it means. Free trade with Great Britain means free trade with the world. The platform goes on:

By endeavouring to secure unrestricted reciprocal trade, etc.

Well, we have had that and the parable and I do not intend to pursue that further.

By placing all foodstuffs on the free list.

That would suit my hon. friend the leading Levite; I have already dealt with it. Now, then, I come to something spicey:

That agricultural implements, farm and household machinery, vehicles, fertilizers, coal, lumber, gasoline, illuminating fuel and lubricating oils be placed on the free list, and that all raw materials and machinery used in their manufacture also be placed on the free list.

Did you ever hear anything more astounding than that Mr. Speaker? The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) yesterday read a list which took him ten or fifteen minutes to go through, and it showed what would be embraced in that class. It would hit directly and indirectly every industry in Canada, because they do not propose to put these items alone on the free list but all materials that enter into their manufacture, and that would cover all the subsidiary interests that supply these various factories. It would wipe out the protective tariff altogether, practically speaking. I have here the figures as published in the Globe of the farm implement industry. I have not time to read the article, nor do I desire to prolong my remarks unduly; but it states that there is an amount of capital, in round numbers, of $74,000,000 involved in the manufacture of agricultural implements and the total product is $34,000,000 per annum. I should think that that is the smallest amount of manufactured goods from so large a capital turned out in any industry in Canada. What is the reason? The hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) stated the reason the other evening and that is, the long terms of credit that are given, the manufacturers getting their money back once a year. It therefore takes over two dollars, pretty nearly $2.50, to produce $1 worth of goods, getting returns once a year, whereas some businesses turn their capital over five, six, seven and eight times in the year. That is a feature that should not be lost sight of. Now, Mr. Speaker, the term "implement of production" is a very comprehensive one and is used very glibly by some people. It embraces almost every conceivable tool from a needle to a threshing machine. Everything that one can think of as an instrument for the production of anything that is made comes withing that category, and it is a most absurd term by which to classify a tariff. There was one implement, Mr. Speaker, which was not productive and which was introduced once into the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I do not suppose that hon. gentlemen intend to include such an implement as that in the classification. But taking it all in all, this very broad term embraces pretty nearly everything we can think of.

Mr. BUREAU: What was the implement to which you refer?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That implement was one that called upon this Government to guarantee bonds in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific and I think that the Minister of Finance will tell you what it cost. I do not think that you should be anxious to introduce any more implements of that kind in Canada. That implement cost $10,000,000 in one year and we had to guarantee at 100 bonds that were selling as low as 84, which would mean some 16

cents on the dollar. The Minister of Finance can give the figures, but I am only reminding hon. gentlemen that when they want all implements free it is not desirable to embrace that particular description of implement in the list, and it would be well to make some mental reservation in regard to that point.

Mr. BUREAU: That implement does not fatten the short horns.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: No, but it makes some hole in the side of the long horns. The document further says:

> That all tariff concessions granted to other countries be immediately extended to Great Britain.

That does not amount to much after what I have said. This is another proposal:

> By a direct tax on unimproved land values, including all natural resources.

I hope that when the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) speaks he will tell us how much revenue that is going to raise. I do not think that the Minister of Finance will be very materially assisted if he adopts the proposal contained in that section. The next suggestion for raising revenue is:

> By a graduated personal income tax.

What do they mean by that clause? We think we have a good income tax already which is hitting us pretty hard; what more do hon. gentlemen want in that respect? I shall refer to that matter in a moment or two, because it is worthy of note. The next clause reads:

> By a graduated inheritance tax.

They are not willing to let a man die free and enter the Kingdom of Heaven, but after he is gone they must tax him through his family, his widow and children who remain to enter into the labours of the old gentleman when he is called to his long home. The Ontario Government has already gone a long way in that direction and I trust my hon. friends are not going to make the future world more uncomfortable than it is likely to be for a good many of us.

Mr. BUREAU: They want you to abandon your wealth.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The next clause in this platform reads:

> By a graduated income tax on the profits of corporations.

I think we have that already, good and hard, as they say. Our friends, Mr. Speaker, I notice are very good at compounding doses for the other man but they are not so ready to take any of their own medicine. It is very much like the man who mixes the nauseous compound. He is eager to prescribe it for the other chap but he says, "I don't think my stomach needs such medicine at the present time."

Mr. BUREAU: Do as I say and not as I do.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Yes, indeed, that is just the idea that underlies this suggestion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the Ottawa Evening Citizen of May 7 which has some remarkable headlines. I read the following in that paper:

> Vigorous criticism of the income tax system before Commons Committee to-day.—Too many questions, and many wealthy men said to be escaping its provisions. Many defaulters found in Toronto.—Ten thousand letters sent out in two weeks. No million dollar incomes in Canada.

These are the headlines which appear in this newspaper and they make fairly interesting reading. I understand that our Agrarian friends were keen on the hunt for some one that was not paying up. Now, I have not heard of any particular rush on the part of our Agrarian friends across the way to get into the list of those who have paid up. In reading this item I find it states that 80 members of the House made no returns in the year 1917. I want it understood, Mr. Speaker, that I was not one of the eighty, and I think that if every other man who is not would get up and say so we would know who the eighty were.

Mr. BELAND: I did not make any return.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The investigation reveals that there are eighty men who did not possess $500 income outside of the indemnity which they received that year. I do not cast any reflections on any of those gentlemen, but when people tell us that they want an income tax I certainly think they ought to live up to the privileges of the one they have got before they try to get another. In Ontario, with 183,000 farmers, I am told that there were only 314 who made returns. That does not show any very great rush to get to the tax collector. I am told further, by the Commissioner of Taxation, that in the city of Toronto, which is stated to contain a large body of defaulters, there was more income tax paid in one particular year than by the three western provinces of Canada added together. Yet, notwithstanding that fact, this paper says that there is a large body of defaulters in Toronto. I am not from

the city of Toronto, Mr. Speaker, and therefore I can say a word or two with regard to that city in this respect; and I desire to state now that there is no city in the Dominion of Canada which, during the whole term of the war, made more sacrifice and was more willing to contribute to the cause in both men and money, than was Toronto.

It is a most unfair and unwarranted slander upon the chief city of the province of Ontario to head it up "a large body of defaulters in the city of Toronto." When our friends of the Agrarian party propound this income tax policy I want them to get busy and get in their own returns. I think everybody should be called upon to keep books. I have to make my returns to the last dollar so far as I can make them up. I want to do my duty to the country. Even with the increased amount that the Minister of Finance has called for, I will try to hold up my end though it may be unfair to my charities because I cannot give voluntarily and have it taken from me by force as well. I must first look after what the Government calls for. Speaking as a priest to the Levites I ask my brethren across the way, nay, I entreat them, to live up to their principles. I do not want to be too hard on my hon. friends and I am glad to see them smile—I like to see them smile—

I am a good friend of the farmer although they do not always recognize it. I am not saying anything here that I am not prepared to say in any township of my own county and I have in it two farmers particularly who are amongst the hottest in the U.F.O. I can mention two or three names and I will do so before I get through. I want to see the farmers represented in this House. I think the farmers are not here in sufficient numbers and I want them to be here. I also want the labour men to be represented here. When my hon. friends say that I represent the manufacturers I want to tell them that the statement is not based upon fact. I have never been a member of the Manufacturers' Association in my life. Upon only two occasions have I ever entered their doors and that was upon their invitation. I am very broad-minded in regard to the farmer. On four different occasions in my political life of upwards of forty years, although the city number over three-quarters of the population of my riding, I backed farmer candidates in the county of Brant. I will give you their names. You will recognize one of them, I am sure. I backed Colonel Fraser, Peter Doran, Thomas Lloyd Jones and Paul Hoffman, all respectable men. When they ran, they did not run as farmers but they ran as citizens of Canada. Any man that cannot enter this House as representing the whole people of Canada, in my judgment, should not sit in Parliament.

Mr. BUREAU: Did they run as Conservatives or as farmers?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: They ran as Conservatives and as citizens of Canada and Conservatives are good citizens of Canada. I would not refer to myself as a Conservative. I do not think I have called myself a Conservative since the Union Government was formed. I am not going to say what I will call myself in the future but I have backed the Union Government and I am going to stay with it at present. I have not gone back on the Union Government except on one occasion and that was that I might support my friends the farmers. I voted with my good friend the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark); I voted with the Levites and others and I voted against the proposals of last years' Budget? I voted to show my sympathy with the farmer. In fact, I am a small farmer myself. Although I say I am a "small farmer" yet I do quite a little farming. I have farmed enough to know the difficulties; I have farmed enough to know what these gentlemen are up against. Perhaps I will qualify as an agriculturist rather than as a farmer. A judge in my county gave a definition of the difference between an agriculturist and a farmer. He said that a farmer is a man who makes his money in the country and spends it in the city, while an agriculturist is a man who makes his money in the city and spends it in the country. I think it hits off the situation as far as my farming is concerned, and probably that of a good many others, but I have been farming enough to know the difficulties and dangers which beset the agriculturist and the farmer. I have the very broadest sympathy with the ideas of these gentlemen, but if they want to form a new party and that is a very laudable enterprise, they should call together all the citizens of Canada and call them not after they have got their platform constructed but call them before, and ask them to help them to make it. Let them help to put down a few of the planks and if they do that they will have to tear up some of those that they have already put in and they will have a platform that will be a good deal better than the one they have now.

What about the labour man? We are told that an alliance is to be formed between the labour men and the farmers and

that is where the danger lies to a certain extent but once the labour man realizes what this Agrarian party is he will not be long with it. I have spoken with a great many labour men. We have in our county two or three of the hottest U.F.O.'s that could be found in the province of Ontario. I have had the privilege of conversation with them, I have watched their operations for years and I may say that for the last fifteen years they have been agitating in this direction. The U.F.O. has not been formed to fight the tariff. The tariff is not what brought the farmers of Ontario into line,—it was to fight the Military Service Act that the U.F.O. was formed. It is only two years ago that the stormiest delegation that I have ever witnessed came down to Ottawa, not to fight the tariff, but to fight the Military Service Act which called for their sons being sent to the front when the tide of battle hung in the balance and it was a question whether our enemy, the Hun, would be the victor. If the enemy had won this country would have neither farm nor factory but it would have been under the heel of the Hun. These gentlemen when they came to Ottawa even threatened the Parliament Buildings. I know I met quite a mob of them at the front door of the Museum. They were down not to fight the tariff but to protest against this Government calling up their sons although it had been stated that farmers' sons would be more or less exempt.

All honour to the farmer who lives according to his principles but as I have said the working men of this country are almost as numerous as the farmers and they are entitled to the very same consideration as the farmers. Figures have been quoted showing that the production of the factory exceeds that of the farm by $1,000,000,000 per annum in Canada. Remember, this is no longer a purely agricultural country. My Levite friends desire to be fair, I am sure, but they do not want to say that it is a purely agricultural country when the statistics show that we produce about $1,000,000,000 more in the factories than on the farms. That being the fact, why should you ignore this vast body of labour? When you speak of the manufacturer you want to remember that he is not just one man. The manufacturer may consist of a manager, or a president, or some of his associates, and five or ten directors. The directors may represent anywhere from ten to ten thousand shareholders holding script in all parts of Canada and who are dependent upon the operations of the factory more or less for a living for themselves and their families. That manufacturer has in his factory from ten to one thousand, and in many cases five thousand hands, and when you are speaking of a certain manufacturer you are not speaking of favours to one man but you are speaking of the dinner pail of thousands of working men on whose labour depends the maintenance of successful industry.

Canada has shown that in competition with the world, under fair conditions, she is the equal of almost any nation on the earth. As our capital, appliances and our markets are as good as those of other nations we can meet and hold our own with the best of them; but in a thinly populated country comprising 4,000,000 square miles and with our people scattered from coast to coast we cannot compete with the skillful manipulation and equipment and the enormous product of the factories to the south. They can run week in and week out, year in and year out, on one particular line, whereas we have to make a hundred lines and produce them in small quantities. In other words, a man selling one hundred reapers and making $50 on each reaper would realize $5,000 per annum; but if he sold 1,000 reapers and made $25 on each, his return would be $25,000 per annum, or five times as much as in the case of the original proposition. This being the case it is the amount of output that we have that will enable us to compete.

Now, I say in all sincerity to my hon. friends across the Chamber: do not begin to pull down—this is not the time to do so—build up.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, build up a tariff.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If this free trade policy that I have berated more or less in a very kindly way is made the fight at the next election, you are going to see more bitterness engendered in Canada than in any fight that has been waged in this country in a great number of years. Finally the issue is going to resolve itself into this—the city against the country, and the country against the city. It would be the most deplorable kind of fight that could possibly be conducted—

Mr. BUREAU: Then do not suggest it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: —and while I have no desire to see my hon. friends opposite occupy the Government benches I would ten times sooner see them seated there than I would to see there the representatives of any mere class in Canada. It is not

safe for the country that such a thing should take place—it is not safe for our civilization and for our Confederation—and I beseech my hon. friends across the way as a priest—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: —addressing most contrite Levites that they will take this under their serious consideration and bring down a materially altered platform which both sides can support, and thus let us have one united party work for the real welfare of our beloved country.

Mr. ARTHUR TRAHAN (Nicolet): Mr. Speaker, although a member coming from the province of Quebec it affords me great pleasure to stay here at the week end—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. TRAHAN: —to take part in this debate. I do not see the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) present.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. TRAHAN: Where is he?

Mr. BELAND: Do not forget that to-day is Friday.

Mr. TRAHAN: Has the hon. member gone for a week-end trip? I leave the answer to the members of this House. As my hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Béland) reminds me to-day is Friday and it is also fish day.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. member for East Edmonton has gone home.

Mr. TRAHAN: The annual Budget is the diagnosis of the financial and economic health of the nation. The speech delivered the other day by the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) reveals that our country is suffering severely from a very serious disease consisting of a progressive weakness of our national credit. It has been created through excess of consumption, deficiency of production and financial and fiscal sluggishness complicated with extravagance and waste both public and individual. It has also been created by currency inflation, inflated bank deposits, and inflated public debt. As the general manager of the Bank of Montreal said on December 1st, 1919: "even with a full measure of faith in our country we must find the near future very difficult to visualize;" and according to the president of the same bank "the state of the national finances deserves a wider and more profound consideration than the subject appears to receive. . . . . The situation is a very serious one. . . . . The feeling as to the future is less optimistic than it has been."

To use the very expression of the Finance Minister himself Canada is faced with a pyramid of debt. Our country is to-day mortgaged by a net debt of $2,273,305,436.92. It has increased by $1,937,308,586.78 in six years and by $210.51 per head of the population as compared with 1914, since at that time it stood at $335,996,850.10 and at $43.69 per head, whereas now it is $254 per head, more than one-eighth of $2,000 the estimated individual wealth per head of the nation.

This tremendous increase of our net debt is not wholly due to the war for, as stated by the Finance Minister, "our total expenditure for the war up to and including March 31, 1920, now amounts to $1,674,000,000." Thus we have, independently of the war, an increase in our net debt of $273,308,586.78 resulting from the bad administration of the Government, of their yearly deficits, and of their iniquitous transactions such as, for instance, the Canadian Northern deal.

Our annual interest charges which were $12,000,000 in 1914 now amount to $142,000,000, that is to say nearly twelve times more than before the war, and our total yearly expenditure is 300 per cent more than in 1914.

Moreover, our currency has been watered by the Government to a most disgraceful extent and, as the consequence, the cost of living has increased by 125 per cent and the purchasing power of the dollar has been reduced to 47 cents. Indeed, in August, 1914, at the outbreak of the war, our gold reserve was 86 per cent of the total issue of Dominion notes, amounting then to $112,793,833.28, and it is now reduced to 32 per cent—a loss of 54 cents in the dollar, since the total Dominion note issue is at present, according to the minister himself, $311,932,791, and our gold reserve held by the Government was $96,161,366 on March 31 last, as compared with $97,136,426.85 at the outbreak of the war in August, 1914. Consequently the Dominion note issue has increased from August, 1914, to March 31, 1920, by $199,138,958, and the gold reserve held by the Government has decreased by $975,060,—nearly one million dollars.

This is contrary to the law, which requires the Government to hold in gold 25 per cent up to $50,000,000 of note issue, and dollar for dollar for any further issue. If the law had been observed, we should have

$273,500,000 of gold to redeem our currency; that is to say, $177,000,000 more than we have at the present time. The minister dodges the issue by dividing the Dominion currency into two classes: One, issued against gold and amounting to $128,366,066; the other is the remainder issued against approved securities. Twenty-six million dollars, says he, was issued under the authority of the Dominion Note Act, 1915, and secured as therein provided.

What are these securities, Mr. Speaker? If you look at the statute, chapter 4, you see that for $16,000,000 they are securities of the Canadian Northern railway and of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. It seems to me that if, as the minister said the other day, the advances of the Government to the Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway cannot be treated as active assets, their securities given to guarantee the redemption of $16,000,000 of Dominion currency cannot be considered as sufficient for the protection of the public.

The minister adds that $50,000,000 of Dominion currency is secured by the pledge of approved securities, but he has omitted to give us the list of such securities. That list would have been very interesting for it would have enabled us to ascertain the real value of those securities. But no matter what their value may be, they are not as liquid as gold. The minister closes his statement by saying that " $107,566,725 was issued to the banks, secured by the pledge of approved securities, consisting largely of Imperial Treasury bills and our own Treasury bills." The amount of those Treasury bills so applied to guarantee the redemption of our Dominion currency is not given by the minister, although it is a very important matter.

Mark you, Sir, the Government instead of holding gold to redeem its currency, as required by law, gives its own paper to guarantee other paper. What sound finance! In these transactions the Government plays a double game. It gets advances from the banks; that is to say, it can draw cheques on them, but it pays them in currency notes. It obtains credit from the banks by giving to them the instrument of credit.

Now, if we take the return of the chartered banks, dated March 31, 1920, we shall find that they claim to have deposited in the Central Gold Reserves $108,200,000. Yet the minister in his statement said that there is only $79,900,000 gold held by the banks. Could he explain the difference between the figure given by the banks in their return and the figure he has given us in his Budget Speech? Is the difference of nearly $29,000,000 included in the $97,700,000 Dominion notes, which are held in the central gold reserves? It looks like that, Mr. Speaker, and that the minister must be wrong when he deducts this $97,700,000 from our total Dominion and bank note circulation to establish the percentage of the gold reserve to our total outstanding circulation. Because, I repeat it, Sir, it is paper which guarantees paper, and it is not a sound guarantee.

I submit that in order to have the exact ratio of gold to our circulation, we must take into consideration only the gold that we have, and not these so-called securities or other Dominion notes or Treasury bills. If we adopt this basis, which is the sole legal and sound economic basis, we find that the percentage of gold reserve to the Dominion and bank note issue is only 35½ per cent, since the total outstanding circulation is $537,702,420, and the total gold amounts to $190,777,106. This percentage is below the 40 per cent required by the federal reserve legislation of the United States, so much praised by the minister, and in that fact lies, to a large extent, our adverse rate of exchange on the New York market. This manufacturing of hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars of irredeemable currency by the Government and by the banks, the huge amounts of Government borrowings during the last six years, have not increased by one iota the production of useful and necessary commodities in Canada; on the contrary, the Minister of Finance, in his financial statement, has admitted that "the production of the country, instead of increasing, has actually decreased." As a result, the spending power of the people has grown very rapidly, but it has to be exercised upon a smaller quantity of commodities, and that produces the effect of a force pump and brings about the high cost of living. Prices of commodities have risen in proportion to the amount of water put into our fiduciary circulation; our dollar and bank notes have shrunk to 35.5 per cent, and their purchasing power has shrunk accordingly. "The real explanation of the high cost of living," said Mr. Lloyd George in the House of Commons in February last, "is the devaluation of money. You may put on a percentage to the cost for profit, but it is only a percentage and not a considerable one. The real inflation of prices is due to the fact that money has not got the value which it had before the war."

We have also inflation of credits, which is intimately connected with currency inflation. The Government, by their incessant borrowings, have created $2,100,000,000 of fresh domestic credit instruments. This is lost forever, because these loans were contracted for a non-productive purpose. As a natural sequence, Sir, bank deposits have increased by $863,397,502, from $991,734,246 in March, 1914, to $1,855,151,598 on March 31, 1920. Dealing with this subject, the Minister of Finance said the other day that "the public purchasing power, gauged by the total currency in circulation and total bank deposits in Canada, increased 91 per cent in 1919 over the prices in 1914." To my mind, this statement is not accurate, and is probably the result of a lapsus on the part of the minister. It is not the purchasing power of the public which has increased by 91 per cent, but the spending power, quite a different thing. Why? Because this huge increase of bank deposits does not represent real wealth, actual goods, services, or commodities, but is only potential fiduciary circulation. Common people may, it is true, spend more money, but with the same amount of money they can buy only a less amount of goods, services or commodities than before the war. If you make to-day a census of the fortunes in this country, the total, expressed in dollars, will be far greater than before the war. But this superior value is a phantom without reality; it results, not from an increase of real wealth, but from excessive creation of monetary tokens. The circulation of paper money in super-abundant quantities increases the spending power; but as the price rises, the purchasing power decreases.

To sum up, the public spending power has increased by 91 per cent; the cost of living has also increased by 125 per cent, and the purchasing power of our Dominion and banknote paper has been reduced to 47 cents in the dollar.

It is well, as suggested by Sir Edmund Walker, to apply the acid test of measuring the national wealth in terms of commodities instead of money. If you do so, Mr. Speaker, you will find that in 1914 you could buy $991,000,000 worth of goods, services and commodities with the money deposited in banks, since the purchasing power of our dollar was, at that time, at par, and that, with the $1,855,000,000 of bank deposits on March 31, 1920, you could buy to-day only $870,000,000 worth of goods, because, although the spending power has been increased, the purchasing power has been reduced to 47 cents on the dollar. The decrease in our national production last year, as is admitted by the minister, confirms this opinion.

The same principle applies to our trade. It has increased in nominal value rather than in quantity, and in support of this contention let me quote from the Financial Times of January 17, 1920:

> Sir Edmund Walker puts the economic situation of the world tersely and forcefully when, after pointing out that clearing house and trade returns, though showing higher figures in money, generally represent transactions based on smaller quantities of merchandise, he says: "Because we think in terms of dollars and not of merchandise, we live in a fool's paradise."
>
> The two chief reasons for high prices and the low purchasing power of the dollar are an actual scarcity of the things which the world needs and an inflated currency.

By their improvident policy of issuing irredeemable currency to the dangerous extent above mentioned the Government has violated the written laws of the country, but has been unable to free itself and the people from the economic laws which govern exchange. Obligations incurred in floating loans abroad and the interest which falls due on these loans have but little influence on our exchange. The current rate of exchange is 12.5 per cent against Canada and has been created principally by currency inflation and expansion of credits. Fiduciary inflation, Sir, reacts at the same time on the growth of imports and the reduction of exports. When the importer of foreign goods is assured of being able to sell anything at any price on account of the magnitude of the spending power possessed by consumers of all classes, premiums upon exchanges have no restrictive action in checking imports. Fiduciary inflation is also prejudicial to exports. It produces a general rise of prices and services, and therefore a rise in the price of raw products and manual labour. As a result, the cost of production is burdened in such proportions that the natural producer is handicapped on the foreign markets by the producers of the countries where inflation has not reached the same level. This explains in part why Canada has actually an adverse trade balance with the United States, who have been able to maintain their currency on a gold basis. One may say that depreciation of currency should act as a corrective to adverse trade balances by checking imports and stimulating exports. That may be true, theoretically speaking, but we are obliged to recognize that actual facts run counter to this doctrine, which does not take into account

human nature. Our commercial statistics with the United States are a conclusive answer to this theory. People are working less and consuming more. They have lost the idea of values; prices are no more discussed; thrift has been abandoned; luxuries are bought in abundance; greediness, loss of dress, and other motives provoke the people to buy beyond all prudence. Why? Because the Government has set a bad example of spending millions and millions without regard to economy, and has been playing ducks and drakes with the people's money, and as you are aware, Sir, a bad example is contagious; also because the Government by their borrowing policy and their unlimited issue of irredeemable currency have inflated the spending powers of the people for luxuries and encouraged the "orgy of self-indulgent expenditure by the general public." Currency inflation, then, is the main cause of our adverse rate of exchange. This contention is supported by the example of Japan. Although since 1914 Japan has increased its paper note issue by £72,000,000, it has increased its gold reserve by £54,000,000, and is still on a gold basis. In fact the Japanese yen, whose par value is 49.8 cents was at a premium in the New York market on May 26, 1920, being then quoted at 50.5 cents, making $1.01 for a value of one dollar. The reason for this is obvious. There is no currency inflation in Japan. Some have expressed the opinion that exchange was so badly against us because of our adverse trade balance with the United States. Let me quote in this connection an extract from the Farmers' Sun of February 28, 1920. A correspondent of this paper, writing of the speech made by the hon. Minister of the Interior at Winnipeg, says:

> He ascribed it to our adverse balance of trade with the U.S.A. because we had been buying from her $740,000,000 odd worth of goods and selling only $450,000,000. Our American exports are, he admits, 64 per cent of our imports from that country, and that is why our dollar is only worth 85 cents in New York. But in 1911, when Mr. Meighen and others of his breed were howling "let well enough alone," our exports to America were only 41 per cent of our imports. We bought from the U.S. $274,844,858 and sold our neighbours $112,208,676 worth of goods But in 1911 the Canadian dollar was at par across the border, so some explanations must be looked for. Mr. Meighen might have—but refrained from so doing—explained that there were other more potent causes. We have much more paper money in circulation per head of population than the U.S., and our currency was debauched by Sir Thomas White to a most disgraceful extent. America has remained on a gold basis, which we cheerfully abandoned.

[Mr. Trahan.]

In order to alleviate the penalty imposed upon us by our adverse exchange it has been suggested that we should restrict imports. This is not an adequate remedy. By it you endeavour to avert the consequences of the evil, but you do not suppress the cause. The true remedy is that suggested by the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference in their declaration when they say that "it is essential, under the present economic conditions of the world, that early steps be taken to secure the deflation of credit and currency by the immediate limitation and gradual curtailment of the note circulation." This is in contradiction to what the Minister of Finance stated in his Budget Speech. He says that the situation is one in which it is impossible by any direct governmental action to bring about deflation either in circulation or in credit without danger of economic disaster. Yet the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference, as I have stated, says that it is essential that early steps be taken to secure the deflation of credit and currency by the immediate limitation and gradual curtailment of the note circulation. They also suggest the reduction of current governmental expenditure within the limits of revenue. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether this is not a direct governmental action? Further, they suggest the imposition of such additional taxation as is necessary to secure this result, and the establishing of short-term obligations by means of loans subscribed out of the savings of the people.

Another remedy is suggested by the general manager of the Bank of Montreal, who, speaking of the exchange situation at the 1919 general meeting of the shareholders, said:

> Repayment to Canada of the moneys, aggregating $420,000,000, owed to us by Great Britain and the Allies, would quickly cause the premium in question to disappear.

Why, Sir? Because it would help us to deflate our currency and credits. While on this subject, let me say that I regret that in his Budget the Minister of Finance did not give us a detailed statement of our accounts with Great Britain and the Allies. It would have been very interesting for us to know whether all the overseas accounts have been finally closed and proper adjustment has been made. There should be no secrecy in this important matter, and I blame the Government for not having given us the opportunity to scrutinize this question.

The Government, Sir, has inoculated our country with a dreadful disease, namely, inflation, and as a result we are facing an unprecedented financial and economic crisis. Our national debt is enormous; the cost of living is appalling; the rate of exchange operates seriously against us, and unrest is general. I hold the Government responsible for this calamitous situation and I say that by their iniquitous war policy and their waste and extravagance they have depressed the value of Canadian money and aggravated the burdens imposed by high prices. When for the first time during the session of 1918 I asked the Government to adopt immediately a constructive policy by preventing the decline of production and the increase in the cost of living; when at that time I asked them to subordinate their military zeal to the interests of the purest economic patriotism in order to ensure and maintain the economic life of the nation; when I warned them against the evils of the policy of financing this country on paper, I was met by the usual answer: "We must win the war;" and the progressive march towards bankruptcy was continued by the Government. Though favouring the participation of Canada in the war, I thought, with many others, that our efforts should have been proportionate to our resources, that we should not have ruined ourselves in winning the war, and that in the framing of our war policy we should not have forgotten Canadian interests and Canada's future. I protested against the policy embodied in the slogan "The last man and the last dollar" adopted by the Government, who had chosen to place British interests first and Canadian interests in a secondary position. The results of the Government's war policy are before you and the country, Mr. Speaker, and the people will know how to weigh them. Suffice it to compare those results with the results obtained by Japan, which entered the war at its very beginning and stayed in it to the end, and which as one of the principal Allied and Associated Powers signed the Peace Treaty and entered the League of Nations, being a member of the Big Five. Japan's participation in the war was inspired by high ideals but was kept within just bounds. It furnished foodstuffs and munitions and it kept in the field a reasonable number of men. The loyalty of Japan to the Allies was never questioned and the Japanese were never called slackers or deserters.

Let us see now the consequences of the war for Japan and Canada. Japan's debt per head has increased only by 16/100 of a pound or 78 cents per head; Canada's debt per head has increased by £42 or $210.54. Japan's currencey has been maintained on a gold basis; our own has been unduly inflated; the Japanese yen is sold at a premium of $1.04 per $100 on the New York market; we pay exchange at the rate of $12.50 upon the same amount. The financial and economic situation of Japan is sound—brilliant; we are facing bankruptcy.

Again, I ask, Sir: What was the best war policy? I leave the answer to the judgment of the people and of history.

At all events, be that as it may, it is more than ever time for Canada to look after its own business. Having done so much for the Empire and the world, it is time that we did something for Canada. The hon. the Minister of Finance said the other day that "It is impossible for any Canadian to do too much for Canada." But in the course of his remarks he stated that "It is impossible by any direct Government action to bring about deflation either in circulation or in credits without great danger of economic disaster."

May I be permitted, Sir, to differ entirely with this last statement? It indicates that the hon. Minister of Finance recognizes that his Budget proposals are an empirical treatment of the financial and economic disease from which Canada so severely suffers. People are beginning to realize what the tremendous waste of war and enormous public debts mean. They also realize that increased production is necessary not only to lower the cost of living but also to pay the overloaded charges of our national Budget. But, Sir, it is not enough to produce; you must produce cheaply. Many forget that increased production can lower prices only in the measure allowed by the net cost of products. They believe that prices are fallen when supply equals demand. They do not consider the purchasing power of the consumer which has decreased proportionately to the increase in the cost of production and to the decrease of the purchasing power of the dollar. Prices are necessarily constituted by the following elements:

1. National expenditures which enter into prices by way of taxation.

2. Cost of production, transportation and commerce, these three including:

(a) Reward of organization and direction;

(b) Reward of technical skill and invention;

(c) Reward of manual labour;

(d) Reward of lands and capital.

Supply and demand alone are unable to modify prices which necessarily include all these elements. If selling prices cannot pay all these costs, on account of the so-called law of supply and demand, production, transportation and commerce would immediately lay aside their work. Whatever may be the supply, whatever may be the demand, generally prices cannot fall below the total costs above mentioned; their variations are solely determined by the variations of the cost of each of their constituent elements.

Consequently, we may safely assert that national expenditure forms a component part of the cost of production. This cost has been increased since 1914 because, to a large extent, the whole of Canadian production is burdened with national expenditures far greater than in 1914. At that time, when we were buying one dollar's worth of goods, we were paying, at the highest, four per cent of national expenditure; we were then buying an article or part of an article in which we would receive at least 96 cents' worth of work and invention. This year, for the same purchase, we pay 10 per cent of national expenditure. Our purchasing power has then decreased in that proportion. We pay daily the cost of the war and other extravagant expenditures of the Government. Every time we buy a pound of butter we give ten per cent above the real value of butter in order to reimburse the millions which we have spent on acount of the war and of the bad administration of the Government. Mark, you, Sir, national expenditures are borne by production. Taxation, either direct or indirect, enters into the price of goods. While in 1914 the total expenditure was $186,241,047.63, this year it will exceed $600,000,000. The sum of $600,000,000 enters into the selling prices of goods, and by his Budget proposals the Minister of Finance instead of alleviating the burden of taxation aggravates it by $70,000,000 of new taxation which will increase so much more the cost of living. Truly, Mr. Speaker, this is empirical treatment to cure the disease of the high cost of living. The watchword of the Government seems to be "More taxation, more expenditure."

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. TRAHAN: The Liberal watchword is "Less taxation, less expenditure." There must be direct Government action to adopt the policy of retrenchment and to curtail the public expenditures. Will it endanger the economic situation of the whole country if the Government were practising thrift and economy? I say to the Government: Wipe off the Estimates the $12,000,000 for the Militia, and the $20,000,000 for shipbuilding, modify your railway policy in order to avoid the $47,000,000 of deficit caused by the great mistake of public ownership; and economize $20,000,000 for the Civil Service, and then you will this year have a saving of nearly $100,000,000. Then you will not need the new taxation, which will amount to nearly $70,000,000, and you will contribute to a certain degree towards lowering the cost of living by reducing the net cost of production.

Another method to attain this end would be the adoption of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). The more, Mr. Speaker, you study the financial and economic conditions of the world and the financial and economic conditions of Canada, the more you are convinced that it is neither by absolute free trade nor by extreme protection that you can give to our economic life the wideness which it needs. As I said on another occasion, a judicious, practical and patriotic opportunism must, above all, during this period of hardship, actuate and direct every true Canadian in the most noble enterprises for the economic restoration of this Dominion. Neither protection nor free trade are dogmas, and it is our duty to determine to what extent, under press of circumstances, it is proper to practise commercial freedom.

Every one admits that in order to restore our financial and economic situation we must increase production and produce more cheaply. Well, Sir, is it not a fact that protective or prohibitive duties on raw material and on instruments of production have a direct effect upon the net cost of production of industries and of agriculture? Yet, to increase our production we need raw materials, because, first of all, the manufacturer is a consumer; he cannot produce without tools and raw material, and, very often, he is obliged to import them.

The same must be said of the farmer who, before being a producer, is a consumer, and needs agricultural implements and many other articles which should, if imported, come into this country free of customs taxation. Rapid and easy importation of these articles is absolutely necessary to our economic restoration. Excessive customs duties are drawbacks which contribute to increase the cost of living and to raise the price of imported goods and, as a consequence, the

price of goods manufactured or produced in Canada. Some producers may benefit thereby, but masses of consumers will suffer. What are the high protectionists doing? They endeavour, by prohibitive duties, to substitute political prices for economic prices, and to eliminate all products similar to those which they manufacture so as to oblige their fellow-countrymen to buy only from them. By this system they can raise their prices by adding to them the duty and the cost of transportation plus the exchange on foreign products imported. Their profits do not arise from economic conditions; they arise from the action these protectionists have been able to exercise, with the help of the Government, against the consumers, who are the masses of the people.

The present Government very truly constitutes a union with high protectionists to oppress the people by way of excessive customs taxation. Under such a regime Canada is a loser, because high prices lessen consumption of national products at home as well as abroad. It is not at all unlikely that the nominal value of these products is to be greater, prices being higher; but quantities are lower. This, Sir, is an exact description of our economic situation as shown by the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech; our production has decreased, and the prices of all commodities and necessities of life have more than doubled.

Is it not then proper that, with a view to the amelioration of our present difficulties, Parliament should adopt the amendment proposed by my hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding)? Surely an immediate revision of the tariff in the liberal sense suggested by this amendment should be made. This reform is obviously one of the necessary means to ensure the triumph of the policy of increasing production by reducing its net cost. Such a policy will better the present conditions in Canada and enable this country to meet its heavy financial obligations.

The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), answering the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) quoted at considerable length extracts from reports of commissions appointed by the British Government, in order to prove that in Great Britain there is a movement towards protection. Apart from the fact that no action has been taken upon those reports, may I be permitted, Sir, to point out to the hon. minister that the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference has reached conclusions which, in my judgment, contradict the argument of the hon. minister and are in complete harmony with the amendment before the House. Let me read extracts from this Declaration by the Supreme Council as printed in Hansard of May 3, 1920:

Summary of conclusions.—In view of the above considerations,—

They have been speaking of the inflation of currency, the expansion of credit, etc.

In view of the above considerations, the Supreme Council, after a careful survey of this vitally urgent problem in all its aspects, agree upon the following recommendations with a view to the amelioration of the present economic difficulties of Europe:—

. . . . . .

That the states which have been created or enlarged—

And those states include France, Japan and other countries.

—as the result of the war should at once re-establish full and friendly co-operation, and arrange for the unrestricted interchange of commodities in order that the essential unity of European economic life may not be impaired by the creation of artificial economic barriers.

. . . . . .

The Powers at the Conference recognize the necessity for continued co-operation between the Allies and for removing obstacles to the easy interchange of essential commodities.—

And what are the obstacles, Sir, if not excessive customs duties?

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. TRAHAN: I continue to read:

—They will continue to consult together regarding the provision and distribution of necessary raw materials and foodstuffs with a view to the early restoration of normal conditions.

I may say that it is this question of commercial freedom which has been the main cause of the opposition of the Republican Senators to the ratification of the Peace Treaty by the United States. The American Protective Tariff League has entered protest after protest against the principle of commercial freedom which is embodied in the League of Nations. And what are we asking by the amendment, if not to solve the present difficulties by developing our commercial freedom, and so admitting of an easy interchange with other countries of foodstuffs and other commodities and of the instruments of production?

An additional reason for supporting the amendment lies in the fact that Europe owes Canada at least $420,000,000. Europe cannot pay that debt if a prohibitive tariff wall is maintained against its products, and as a result the outflow of goods from Canada will be checked. Yet if we increase our production, we must export our surplus to foreign

markets. To produce, to save, and to export are the three chief means of bringing about our economic recuperation.

On the whole, Sir, I submit that the amendment before you, and the resolutions concerning the tariff adopted at the Liberal Convention of August, 1919, constitute a policy of moderate free trade, which I heartily endorse, because it serves well the best interests of all classes of the community and of this great Dominion.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. JAMES McISAAC (Kings, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure it goes without saying that a Budget Speech, unfolding as it does the financial condition of the country and disclosing to us our position as regards our fiscal policy, from year to year, is one of the most, if not the most, important utterances made in Parliament. If this be true, generally speaking, it was particularly true during the period of the war, and during the years following the war. Perhaps at no time during the period of the war, or before or since the war, has a Budget Speech been anticipated with so much interest and, possibly, in some quarters, even with some anxiety, as at this session. A combination of circumstances, which need not be enumerated in detail, flung around the Budget Speech of this session these peculiar conditions. Our great debt, incurred principally in consequence of the war, our large expenditures and the immense amount of money required to be raised to meet them, necessarily made the Budget Speech of this session of paramount importance. Under all the circumstances, I think the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) deserves congratulation and commendation in the highest degree for having evolved out of all these conditions a Budget so comprehensive, sane and reasonable as the one he has brought down to the House. It is true that the Budget will not please everybody, and I am sure the minister had no idea when he presented it that it would please all the members of this House or all the people of this country. Also, in the working out of some of the schedules having to do with different methods of taxation, some little confusion or dissatisfaction may arise here and there, and it is altogether possible that when these matters come to be considered and discussed in committee, the Minister of Finance, in his wisdom and judgment, after having weighed all the representations that may be brought to his notice in regard to them may be disposed to make some amendments here and there in the resolutions. That, however, is a matter of detail which does not come within the scope of the discussion on the Budget proper.

As the Minister of Finance, in the course of his presentation of our financial position, unfolded the various elements that enter into our fiscal system and the different activities and operations of a national character that go to make up our great system of finance and supply us with the funds to meet the necessary expenditures of the country, I, for one, was deeply interested in the situation he disclosed. In the first place the Minister of Finance gave us figures of the trade of the country by decades covering a considerable period of years, and I must say that I was absolutely amazed at the growth of our trade. From 1909 the total trade of the country increased from about half a billion dollars in that year to over two billion dollars in 1919. That struck me as marvellous advancement. In the twelve months from 1919 to 1920 our trade increased over the previous year by over $165,000,000, the unrevised figures for 1920 being $2,351,174,886. That was a marvellously good showing, I thought. We should keep those figures in mind as a basis in considering the amounts of proposed expenditure which are placed before us for the coming year.

The Minister of Finance also gave figures as to the products of the soil. The production of wheat, for instance, steadily increased from one ten year period to another. From 1910 to 1919 the increase was over 60,000,000 bushels. The last named date shows the total production was $193,000,000. Other agricultural productions, field crops and farm products also increased from 1917 to 1919 to the value of over $350,000,000, and in the last named year the total value of these productions was $1,975,841,000. These figures are gratifying in the very highest degree. They show that our country, with its various sources of production, is in a most healthy condition, and they give us confidence that if our people show energy and perseverance, and get rid of some of their extravagance, and make sacrifices in some degree proportionate to those they made when the tocsin of war sounded and they flew to arms to save the Empire, we

shall be easily able to meet all our obligations.

Our manufacturing industries also show a healthy advance. The value of manufactured products in 1915 was shown to be $1,407,137,140 and in 1917 the value had increased to over $3,000,000,000, an increase of about $1,600,000,000. Bank deposits by the public in Canada increased from 1918 to 1919 by about $172,000,000, the last year showing a total of $1,841,478,895. Be it remembered that in addition to this money deposited in the banks by the people of Canada in these two years, the people of this country had deposited with the Government of Canada by the purchase of Victory bonds about $1,500,000,000. That shows how great are the resources of Canada, and what a firm and stable basis we have for greater progress and expansion, so that we may go on from year to year and from decade to decade advancing to the place among the galaxy of nations which Canada is destined to reach.

A very important part of the Budget Speech and of the Finance Minister's presentation of the financial condition of the country was the national debt. It is of the greatest importance that we should take into serious consideration the very great debt with which the people of this country are confronted. On the other hand, when we consider the almost boundless natural resources of our nation, and what has been done in the last forty years to develop those resources; when we take into account the financial position we are in to-day even facing this great load of debt; when we consider the enterprise and energy of our people, there is no room for doubt that we shall be able to meet all legitimate obligations, no matter how great they may be, that Canada may assume in the public interest. The debt is great, of course, but the larger part of it was incurred in consequence of the war, and no true patriot who loves his country will say that, when the need arose and we were called upon to put all our energies into the titanic struggle to bring it to a successful issue, we were not justified in incurring these obligations. In view of all the circumstances I think we have made a marvellous showing.

Our gross debt is $3,014,483,774.12. In this connection I wish to say that the Minister of Finance did a very frank and courageous thing in not considering as active and realizable some of those items which go to make up the difference of $1,078,537,461.27 between the gross debt and the net debt. To all intents and purposes these investments were assets, and under ordinary circumstances there would be a great temptation to a Finance Minister to show them as active assets. The minister did not desire to retain on the books of the Finance Department anything that was not essentially an asset. These assets to which I have referred were quiescent, and the minister wisely and courageously set them aside, placing them in suspense account. There they remain, and at some future time they may be resurrected and rejuvenated; and when that is brought about our financial condition will be improved, for any interest that may arise from them will be in the nature of treasure trove. I think that the Minister of Finance took an exceedingly wise position, and what he has done has been to ensure that no undergrowth or brushwood, so to speak, might clog our financial status. For these reasons the minister deserves the highest commendation which this House can tender him. The net debt is placed at $2,273,305,436, and starting from this point we must see what our actual position is. The minister has given us a statement of the revenue and expenditures for the year ending March 31, 1920, and we learn that during that year the revenue from ordinary sources was the greatest in our history, amounting to some $388,000,000. If we subtract from that sum the ordinary expenditures we find a surplus. Some people contend that an amount is not a surplus unless all revenues are greater than all expenditures in the statement of accounts, but in the language of our fiscal arrangements, and even by reference to the dictionary, it will be discovered that anything is a surplus that remains after ordinary expenditure has been provided for. Having paid $349,000,000 in ordinary expenditures, we therefore have a surplus of $39,000,000 to be applied to capital expenditure. Of course, there is always capital expenditure, investments, outlays, etc., and these amounted last year to $187,856,991, bringing the total expenditure, ordinary and capital, for the past year to over $536,000,000. That includes the total outlay of Canada for the year apart from what was spent for war purposes, which can by no possibility be regarded as ordinary expenditure. We trust that in a few years we shall have finished paying off this peculiar liability, which was incurred under such regrettable and memorable circumstances.

That disposes of the consideration of our finances up to the 31st of March, 1920. The next phase of the Budget deals with the revenues and expenditures for the year on

which we have entered ending 31st March, 1921. At this stage, of course, as is the case with every Budget, no definite statements can be made as to what the revenues or expenditures of the year may be; we can only estimate them and we must be guided in our Estimates by the figures which we know in connection with past years and by the activities of our different departments and the various enterprises operating in the country. Consequently, the expenditure for this period can only be estimated. Let us now consider the expenditure that the Minister of Finance estimates for the year upon which we have entered. The total expenditure for the current year is estimated as follows:

Main Estimates and Supplementaries about	$574,000,000
Railways	25,000,000
Floating obligations	74,058,000
Total	$673,000,000

Against these estimated expenditures what amount of money have we, and where is it to come from? The sources of revenue are as follows:

Estimated revenue from ordinary sources	$381,000,000
Cash on hand and outstanding accounts	190,000,000
Total	$571,000,000

This will leave an adverse balance of somewhere in the vicinity of $100,000,000, which amount has to be provided for by means outside of the ordinary. At this point the Minister of Finance did another courageous thing, something for which he certainly deserved to be praised. He lopped off the extra war tax of 7½ per cent and at one stroke removed a tax which brought us $30,000,000 yearly. It was considered that as this tax had only been imposed for war purposes, the time had perhaps come when it might be removed in order that the tariff might not be considered unduly high. Just consider the sacrifice we are making by the lopping off of this $30,000,000 of revenue. Up to this stage the Minister of Finance has been removing sources of taxation and making the task of obtaining revenue a more difficult task for himself. Now, we come to the consideration of the question of how the revenue is to be raised to meet the balance between the expenditure and the ordinary, estimated revenue.

At this point the minister says: "We shall have no more loans." I wish to dwell for a moment on the question of loans.

Canada, in so far as her domestic loans are concerned, stands in an enviable position. When we were in the midst of the war, when we were confronted with extraordinary expenditures, when we were not able to obtain the necessary money by loans outside of Canada, the then Minister of Finance turned to our own people. Is not the record of Canada in so far as her Victory loans are concerned a most admirable and highly creditable one? The spontaneity, enthusiasm and generosity with which the people poured their funds into the coffers of the Government for the purpose of carrying on the public business is one of the elements that constitute Canada's greatness at the present day and one that has gone far to impress the other nations of the world with the fact that she is great in war, great in peace, and great in finance.

The Minister of Finance presents to us, in order to make up the balance between the ordinary estimated revenue and the expenditure, several different phases of taxation. I am sure it will be generally accepted that taxation is not an agreeable subject under any consideration. The people of this or any other country do not look forward with pleasure to tax bills piling in upon them one after another and in one form and another. But it is necessary for us, as it is necessary for every country, that there shall be a tax of one kind or another in order that the public business may be conducted in a proper and dignified way and in accordance with the requirements of the country. Apart from the revenues coming in from customs and excise, the Minister of Finance in the various forms of direct taxation that he intends to adopt, has kept well in view, in so far as that could reasonably be accomplished, the placing of the greatest burden on the shoulders of those best able to bear it. His intention was to relieve, as far as might be, those unable to pay very much in the way of taxation. He proposes, as a necessary means of raising revenue, an excise tax, a luxury tax, a business profits tax and an increase in the income tax. We have here surely a sufficient variety of taxation to meet all tastes, although it is quite possible that all will not be pleased; probably quite a number will not be pleased. There have been a number of people who have expressed dissatisfaction with the form of indirect taxation. They are paying taxes unknown to themselves, as it were, by means of customs duties and excise. They are not satisfied—or, at least some expressed dissatisfaction, and they have said that they would like to pay directly. They

will have their opportunity; we have here both, we have an admixture of direct and indirect taxation. It is quite possible that there are some people who will not be satisfied with either. However, that remains to be seen. The main thing is that these taxes shall be so adjusted and so arranged that they will, in so far as that can be done, bear least heavily on those who are least able to pay them, while those who have the wealth and are able to pay shall be asked to pay and pay well. Direct taxation is not altogether new to us; for two or three years, at least, we have had quite a considerable amount and this year it is invoked to an even greater extent. But generally speaking for years past we have had indirect taxation, and therefore people are not so much accustomed to paying a direct tax. This year both kinds are brought into operation and when the tariff has been scientifically revised—after a thorough investigation into all the different phases of the question—we may look forward next year to witnessing the introduction of a tariff as nearly perfect as can be made and may as a result, confidently expect a great stimulus in our industrial and commercial life.

Figures are rather a dry subject and I am inclined to apologize for having dwelt so long on these phases of the question, but in considering a Budget Speech one cannot avoid quoting figures and in very great numbers. Having briefly and succinctly reviewed the administration of public affairs up to this point, having taken cognizance of our different resources and our trade and manufacturing and other activities, having dealt with the question of taxation and the position in which we now find ourselves in the present year, I shall refer briefly to some aspects of the fiscal question as presented by certain hon. gentlemen opposite. In particular, I wish to refer to the attitude taken by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). But before doing so let me say this: Like a great many of the members of this House I have a recollection of the hon. member, in common with a number of political associates, inveighing year after year against protection in any form whatever. Time after time they invoked the maledictions of high Heaven on the protective system. They declared that it was accursed of God and man and that at the very first opportunity it should be pulled up root and branch and totally destroyed—that such an accursed thing as protection should not be allowed to exist in this country. These declarations were not made when the Liberals were in office; they were made when they were in opposition, and were made with special emphasis when elections were close at hand. We now have it from the hon. gentleman himself that in effect those declarations were only intended to win elections and not to be given effect to. In the face of repeated declarations by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, who was Minister of Finance during the fifteen years the Liberals were in office, it was most remarkable the other night to hear that hon. gentleman express his ideas respecting free trade and protection. Let me quote from his speech delivered on May 18 as reported at page 2581 of unrevised Hansard:

> While it is true that at all times for many years all our tariff discussions have been more or less tinged with the question of free trade,—

Only "tinged," mind you. I am sure there are members of this House who were not then supporters of the Conservative party but supported the Liberals in the old days when, like the Liberals of the present, they were in opposition, who know how much "tinge" there was about my hon. friend's views. It was a good deal more than "tinge" I am sure. The hon. member goes on to say:

> —there has of late been a revival of what I may call the free trade movement, and the free trade question is now thrust to the front of our tariff discussions in a larger way than it has been in recent years. That, I take it for granted, is because our farmer friends attach so much importance to the matter and have pushed it into their platform.

Ah, my hon. friend was then coquetting with the party sitting angularly opposite to me to-night—the Farmers' party. I see only one of them present this evening, and he is the chief Levite himself.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): There is more than one of the Farmers' party present.

Mr. McISAAC: I accept my hon. friend's correction. I did not notice him because he is not sitting in his usual seat. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's went on to say:

> With all due respect to them, I take the view that free trade is not a practical question in our tariff discussions of to-day.

This is very strange talk from one who might without exaggeration have been described as the high priest or chief apostle of free trade when he was in opposition prior to 1896—in fact, since then almost down to the present time. The hon. member continuing, said:

There are some things that we should do well to remember. In the first place, it may be well simply to remember that there never has been in the Dominion of Canada such a thing as free trade.

Now, we have the truth. The hon. member here makes open confession that during all those years in which he and his associates preached free trade on every platform throughout the country they were simply deceiving the people. There is a word that has crept into our language lately that is applicable to the hon. gentleman's statements. I hesitate to use the expression because it is almost worked to death. The word in question is "camouflage," and I think the hon. member has given us a pretty good example of it. Proceeding, the hon. member said:

There is not anything of the kind now, and with all due respect to those who may be described as extreme free traders, I think it is no wild guess to assert that there will be no absolute free trade in Canada within the lifetime of any man who sits in this House to-day. It is not practicable, and that is not to say that free trade principles are not sound.

Free trade principles do not seem sound or practicable to the hon. member to-day? It is marvellous that he has become such a protectionist. He now advocates protection "whenever occasion requires it." He is quite prepared to grant protection in the form of bounties; to grant protection in the form of anti-dumping regulations; to give protection in half a dozen other ways—he is a thorough-going protectionist so to speak. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that after this candid confession of the hon. member, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), who for over thirty years had heard my hon. friend denouncing protection, rubbed his eyes and expressed the greatest surprise.

He wondered whether or not the millennium had arrived. He felt that indeed he might well say, Nunc dimittis: Now dismiss thy servant in peace; because he had seen the conversion of my esteemed friend on the other side. But, Sir, while we may express surprise at this apparent conversion, when we sift the evidence there is nothing to be surprised at; he had always held that view.

To emphasize this point I cannot do better than quote from the speech of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), at one time a prominent member of the Liberal party whose leaders when in opposition expressed themselves so strongly in favour of free trade principles. That hon. gentleman does not now sit on the Opposition side of the House, for being an honourable man he felt that he could no longer belong to a party whose professions of free trade in opposition were not translated into practice when in office. But he refrained from telling tales out of school until he heard the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) express himself in the terms I have just quoted, when he spoke thus:

The political aspect of this question is interesting because it is so dramatic. The other night the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) stated his political creed on this matter, and I must say that to me it was surprising. For many years I was accustomed to follow that hon. gentleman, and to agree that what he did in the public interest was right; and during that time any changes in the tariff from the old national policy of our Conservative opponents did not seem to us to be very shocking. I was rather surprised at the confession that was made by my hon. friend. Perhaps because I was brought up in such a strict political school I thought it was very bad politics to admit anything which might be taken advantage of by one's opponents; but the confession having been made that the Liberal party of those days was really not a free trade party but a protectionist party, frees me from the secrecy that I would otherwise maintain, and permits me to say that I concur with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) who made this confession that the Liberals of those days did not, among themselves anyway, claim that they had materially reduced the protective policy of the country.

That is the confession of a gentleman who was within the inner circles of the Liberal party—a confession that they were a free trade party only for the purpose of deceiving the people in order to get into power.

What is the fiscal policy under which we are operating now, and how does it differ from the National Policy of 1879? Did the Liberals when they came into power, notwithstanding their free trade professions and their convention resolution in 1893, take any steps to reduce the tariff when they brought down their Budget in 1897? It has been shown by those who were in the inner circles of the Liberal party—and the statement has not been denied—that .74 per cent was the greatest reduction made on the National Policy tariff brought down by Sir John Macdonald, and that for the last forty years we have retained that identical fiscal policy with little change except a slight reduction here and a slight advance there. Why, then, should our esteemed friend opposite make a loud profession of becoming somewhat of a protectionist? But all his colleagues are not moderate protectionists. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) was in his seat a moment ago—

An hon. MEMBER: I can get him.

Mr. McISAAC: The genial member for Brome has a resounding voice, which is something to be thankful for—I wish I had such vocal equipment, then I would talk! But that hon. gentleman does not agree with the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who after having expressed himself as a protectionist moved an amendment which was extremely vague, and which I think was aptly described by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), who, although he said he would vote for it, inveighed against it, in these words. I will quote his words:

> I should have hoped it would have contained more milk and less water under those circumstances, and would have been less of a shilly-shally temporizing and opportunist piece of print.

I think that describes the amendment in its true colours.

I would like to refer very briefly to the views expressed by my esteemed friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster). He proclaimed himself a Simon pure free trader, and in order to emphasize the difference between himself and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), speaking probably in a figurative sense, said that he did not believe in purgatory.

An hon. MEMBER: What?

Mr. McISAAC: His words will be found in Hansard, "I do not believe in purgatory." Whether we consider that in a theological or in a fiscal sense, there is always this to be said to the hon. gentleman: You might go farther and fare worse.

Mr. DUFF: In which direction?

Mr. McISAAC: Now, Mr. Speaker, all will remember the declarations that were made here a year ago by the hon. gentleman when he moved an amendment to the Budget. Of course, this year he was deprived of that honour, another hon. gentleman having been installed as Chief Financial Critic for the Opposition. But all will remember when the hon. member, in a certain upper chamber, was discharging the duties of what I am disposed to describe as controller of the wardrobe when he was clothing a certain western settler, handing out to him one garment after another. I was struck at that time with the peculiar manner in which he proceeded to clothe that man; he got his boots on before his nether garments and the man had to go out in order to attend his stock, clothed in a way that would shock one's modesty, without his trousers on. That was a deplorable condition of things. But that is on a par with the argument that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), brings to bear on this question when he discusses it in the House. I shall not say anything more in that regard; but if the hon. member had been in his seat, I would be disposed to have a little badinage with him.

I do not observe in his seat for the moment my esteemed friend the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie). The presentation of the financial position of the country is a question which I am sure most hon. members with few exceptions, perhaps with the sole exception of himself, indeed all men of common sense generally must necessarily regard as a most important, difficult and intricate question. But when my hon. friend was speaking on the Budget, he brushed it aside with a wave of the hand, saying: This is only a school-boy performance; any school boy could get up such figures as the Minister of Finance has presented to us today; it is not a difficult operation at all. Talking about schoolboys, I heard my hon. friend's speech and I read it afterwards and I am fully convinced that his was the speech of a schoolboy. He began to manipulate figures; he jumbled up the ordinary and the capital expenditures for the past year; then he took the ordinary revenue and subtracted something from it, added something else to it and, do you know, Sir, he produced a result showing a deficit for the year of $498,000,000. The Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) had shown plainly, as I have already stated, that on the year's transaction there was a surplus of $39,000,000, but of course a schoolboy can make figures show anything. Last session, I heard the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) describe certain figures presented to this House by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria) as arithmetical monstrosities and I think when he was discussing the Budget, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie), indulged in similar arithmetical monstrosities, as I have shown. I heard the hon. member say in this House that he had at one time been a school teacher, and he added that he was a good school teacher. I do not believe there is in Canada another person than himself who will say that he was a good school teacher. What would be the effect of the teaching of an hon. gentleman who will so juggle with figures in this House that they must be described as arithmetical monstrosities, on the youth of the country when the young mind is plastic and susceptible of impres-

sions? What would be the effect of such wrong and misleading impressions made on them? All the rest of their lives they would be handicapped, and they would never be able to get over those wrong impressions. It also appears that the hon. member has been a member of the bar, for he has told us that he has practised at the bar and it is said that he has occupied a judicial position. That makes the matter much worse. What would be the fate of some unfortunate litigant who had lost his case before such a judge as this who is capable of making such monstrous arithmetical calculations, and this judge had to tax his costs? Why, he would be just as likely to say that the costs were $4, or $40, or $400; as long as there was a four in the total, he would be just as likely to put down one set of figures as another.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McISAAC: I am glad that my esteemed and hon. friends opposite are enjoying this so well.

After these digressions, let us return to a consideration of the tariff. The Minister of Finance has told us—and we feel sure he will fulfil his promise—that there will be a thorough and scientific investigation of the tariff and that it will be revised in all its phases and establishments on a firm basis when all the inconsistencies, if any are revealed, and rubbish and underbrush are swept away, and we feel sure that a proper and scientific revision will be presented to us if we are spared to be here at the next Parliament.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: We have heard that before.

Mr. McISAAC: My hon. friend has heard before a number of things that he did not profit by; he has heard before a number of things that he has forgotten; he has heard before a number of things that he should have forgotten and that he would be much better off if he had forgotten.

Some hon. members have attempted to make a point out of the fact that last year we were promised an investigation into the tariff and that nothing has been done. A serious promise was made last year and it was the intention to carry it out, but hon. members opposite surely must be well aware, as all hon. members on this side are, that last year, for one reason or another, no opportunity was afforded of carrying out that investigation. Therefore, the only thing is to have it effected this year, and we feel satisfied that this will be done. That is what we shall have; I quote the words of the Finance Minister as to what is intended to be effected by the new tariff:

> —(a) to assist in providing adequate revenues, (b) to stabilize legitimate industries and to encourage the establishment of new industries essential to the proper economic development of the nation—to the end that a proper and ever increasing field of useful and remunerative employment be available for the nation's workers, (c) to develop to the fullest extent our natural resources, (d) to specially promote and increase trade with the Mother Country, the sister dominions and colonies and Crown dependencies, (e) to prevent the abuse of the tariff for the exploitation of the consumer and, (f) to safeguard the interests of the Canadian people in the existing world struggle for commercial and industrial supremacy.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McISAAC: I am glad that this programme meets with the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite as well as of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. It is really encouraging for a comparatively new member like myself to receive commendation from both sides of the House. I am pleased beyond power of expression. Now what will be the essential features of this revised tariff? It will be founded on the bedrock of the national policy introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald, under which this country during the last forty years has made wonderful progress, stabilized its institutions, progressed marvellously in trade and developed her natural resources. It has contributed in bringing Canada to the proud position she occupies in the galaxy of nations of the Britannic Commonwealth. Had we a spark of patriotism—and I use that word only in its best sense. I interpret patriotism to mean a willingness to exert all our energies towards the advancement of our country, and to be prepared in peace as in war to make reasonable sacrifices in order that our country may prosper and grow great. If we will only put our shoulder to the wheel in earnest and manfully persevere, I am confident that Canada will at no distant day reach a still higher plane among the nations of the world.

Mr. EDMOND SAVARD (Chicoutimi and Saguenay) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to contribute anything new to the debate which has occupied the House for this last ten days, but realizing that I have the privilege of representing one of the most prosperous counties and one which from every standpoint offers the most brilliant prospects for the future, I think that I may be allowed to exercise the right that

belongs to me in common with every member of this House, to state my views concerning the government still known as Union Government, when it strikes all except those who are blind or interested, that there never was a government more divided and at variance than the one that is carrying on the business of the country at the present moment.

Union may no doubt have existed at the outset, when it was necessary that every sacrifice should be made in behalf of the Empire, but, Mr. Speaker, it is no more so since the war is over. If we consider the changes effected in the different departments, the resignation of a certain number of ministers, the protracted absence of the leader of the Government, who was reported to be very sick but whom we were glad to see again apparently in good health, and if we consider also that the heads of certain departments hold no seat in this House even, how can we come to another conclusion than that which I have just expressed?

Whatever may be said or done, we all know what circumstances the Union Government was born. After a few years of a nefarious administration, nay, the most nefarious in our history, with the exception of the present one, numerous scandals were brought to light, popular indignation was at its height and the day of defeat was certain, when war was declared in Europe and in that great turmoil, the mistakes of the Government were unfortunately forgotten and nobody thought of anything but the war.

The Government was not the wiser for all that; the whirligig of scandals continued on a larger scale, peculation was supreme and more especially at that time did vampires of all size appear in such great numbers. We recollect the contracts granted to the friends of the administration; we particularly recollect the boots with paper soles, the perforated shovels (an invention of a well advised lady stenographer); we recollect the purchase of sick or lame horses, to quote a few instances. It was a real orgy which the Government concluded by the Canadian Northern scandal when the country paid millions for a bankrupt railroad of which it was the only creditor.

But there is a limit to everything, and the time had arrived when an appeal to the people was necessary. Parliament had lasted too long already and, in my humble opinion, the Liberal party never should have assented to its being prolonged. Therefore, it was necessary that elections should take place.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, that the people was exasperated, and realizing its unpopularity, the Government could, by no means, ask for a renewal of its mandate with the least chance of success. At that time, in spite of the most solemn promises made from his seat in the House, before all the representatives of the people, the Prime Minister submitted the question of conscription which divided the Liberal party, stirred up the English provinces against the province of Quebec, succeeded, after a most laborious gestation, in giving birth to the Union cabinet, and thanks to the War Time Election Act, which will remain as a monument of despotism and knavery, he retained power.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up the time of the House dealing with the details of the policy which this famous Union Government has followed ever since it was born, I shall only summarize the result of that policy.

In fact, this Government, composed of Conservatives and of Liberals, as many imperialists whose fixed desire was to sacrifice everything to the empire were it the last man or the last dollar—what aberration! Mr. Speaker—has superabundantly proven that the interest of the country was the only thing for which it had no regard.

Sixty-thousand of our young men practically the pick of Canada's boys—are now sleeping their last sleep in a foreign land, and the amount of the country's debt is ten times higher than it was at the beginning of the war.

That is what will characterize the reign of this Government, in the opinion of the future generations, and in our own, as well.

Now, like all those who have preceded me, I have to congratulate the honourable Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) upon the hard work he has accomplished by stating in black and white what is our position from an economic standpoint; but, surely, I cannot approve all the means he has resorted to in order to fill up the abyss dug out by the Government's bad administration. As was stated by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) in his masterly speech on the budget, the hon. Minister of Finance is not responsible for the colossal or pyramidal debt of the country, and I think that when the hon. member said he was not, he certainly voiced the public opinion. However, as the hon. minister has shown remarkable talent, exceptional judgment, I think he should have taken into consideration the idea expressed

some time ago by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) and should have advised his colleagues to demobilize at once, that the people might choose for itself men in whom it had confidence in order to face the most critical situation which can be imagined.

But, no doubt, he never thought of it and, being much of an optimist, he expected or rather he tried to prove that on account of the measures he advocates he might have balanced economic conditions in this country.

However, for the last ten days since the hon. Minister of Finance delivered his grand speech, from every quarter in Canada are coming statements made by knowing individuals. Conservatives as well as Liberals, friends or opponents of the Government, to the effect that the taxes levied are such as to increase still more the cost of living. It could not be otherwise, for when taxes are levied upon commodities which should be deemed necessaries of life, the cost of living must necessarily increase; that is as clear as two and two make four.

The inhabitants of this country have been wondering for quite a while how it is that the Government do not extend a helping hand to the people, and the latter have now the small comfort of knowing that the Government have created a board for that purpose. But, what have been the results, Mr. Speaker? When we noticed anxiously that the cost of living is ever increasing, are we not rather inclined to believe that this board was named in order to shield profiteers? For can we reasonably think that had the board so willed or been granted adequate powers by the administration, it could not have prevented the accumulation of all kinds of commodities which unscrupulous monopolists permitted to decay instead of lowering the prices?

As an hon. friend of mine observed a few days ago, is it possible to justify the prevailing high price of potatoes which were bought last fall for 90 cents a bag, when we are aware that the potato crop was plentiful? No, Mr. Speaker, the Government cannot be excused for neglecting to take measures so as to prevent the making of outrageous profits in that way. We know warehouses are filled up with foodstuffs bought at moderate prices and which are only marketed at virtually prohibitive prices.

In France, a bank director who traded in sugar and reaped fabulous profits was fined $12,000 and his profits amounting to $112,800 were confiscated. And I could give numerous similar instances in other countries.

Do not think, Mr. Speaker, that had the Government done their duty and been guided by other nations in siding with the consumers against those undlefactors of the worst kind, monopolists and profiteers who have accumulated fabulous riches, they would have prevented such an alarming increase in the cost of living? What was the use of that investigation held last year by Parliament, if the Government have not intended to deal vigorously with the culprits or to remedy the ills detected in the course of the investigation? For companies have been shown to have realized incredible profits to the tune of a hundred per cent. What have the Government done, Sir, following those disclosures? They created that notorious board of commerce about whose doings we are utterly in the dark. All we know about it is that its chairman resigned. And the cost of living is ever increasing.

Now, what shall I say of certain manufacturing concerns. I shall not refer to them all, because we have the privilege, so it appears, of having among us some manufactures who are satisfied with legitimate profits, and of course we are bound by the rules of this House to accept their statements. We know, on the other hand, that a great many corporations have seen their profits increase at an exorbitant, excessive rate since the beginning of the war. And yet we have to pay more than ever for the products of those concerns.

Now, in my humble opinion, the enormous indebtedness of this country has been the outcome of the follies of the Government who were nothing else than a factory for the turning out of Orders in Council and boards of all kinds, so as to force themselves of their responsibilities. Orders in Council and boards which were only used to cater to political friends. As I said a few minutes ago, the main causes of that indebtedness are the outrageous contracts awarded to a set of millionaires, the unnecessary conscription, the search for farmers' sons who were surrounded like wild beasts, the acquisition of numerous railways, the money loans to foreign nations. Sir, those are the causes which contributed to increase our indebtedness to an unreasonable extent and which placed the country in the critical situation described by the hon. Minister of Finance the other day.

Now I understand that we must find ways and means of meeting our liabilities, but the people do not trust this Government to find these means and to apply them. For my part, despite the taxes devised by

the Finance Minister, I have the firm conviction that the Government is so inclined to spend money loosely that it will never succeed in balancing the finances of this country.

Last year the Ministry promised to appoint a Board for the revision of the tariff and this promise was instrumental in appeasing a great many, if not all, of the Government's friends. However, the Government, as usual, did not keep its word and, in this connection, we saw to what extremes the party spirit can carry a man when we heard an hon. member state, in this House the other day that he was glad the work had not been started. Still, such is not the opinion of all the hon. members on the other isde of the House. Already a few bolters have left the treasury benches and the Government should realize that there is a limit to everything, although the term "limit" seems unknown to these hon. gentlemen.

For the reasons which I have stated and for many others, I sincerely approve what my hon. friends have shown, that since the end of the war the majority of the people of this country have lost all faith in the Government; hence this latter should go before the people. We have heard it said that the Liberal Party was not serious in its demand for an election and that if such were held the present ministry would be returned to power. It requires unbelievable boldness, Mr. Speaker, to make such a statement before this House. It is as clear as day that if the Government really thought an election at this time would result in a victory for the Ministry it would have been first to call for an election or at least would have turned the tables on the Opposition by accepting the challenge; no sensible man, it seems to me, can possibly think otherwise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words concerning certain instances of unfair treatment meted out, during the last few years, to the constituency which I have the honour of representing. The Government has thrown millions out of the doors and the windows—if I may use that expression—of its numerous buildings in Ottawa; but on the plea of economy the ministers have refused to grant the necessary help to the development of colonization and agriculture, still these last are our mightiest weapons to bring about the re-establishment on a normal base of financial and economic conditions in this country. Under pretense of economy the Government has refused to increase transportation facilities, to construct post offices, telegraph lines, wharves, dykes; has refused to enlarge the wharf at Chicoutimi, of which this district has the most urgent need on account of the remarkable progress of its people during the last few years. On the plea of economy subsidies that for years have been granted and recognized as absolutely indispensable to the well-being, and even to the safety of a certain class of the community, have been withdrawn.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the country what has happened to the people living on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, between Tadoussac and Labrador. I took occasion last year to protest against the crying injustice committed towards the good people of this locality. I want every detail of this affair recorded in Hansard. Let me say first of all that up to within fifteen years ago this part of my riding was entirely shut off from the rest of the world once the season of navigation was closed. My predecessor, who had all the interest in the world to champion the cause of these poor people, interceded with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and the Government finally voted a subsidy for a steamer service between Tadoussac and St. Catherine; and since the district was no longer isolated during the long winter months its population made rapid gains, and its industry likewise. Then, in 1917, the present Government, supposedly for the sake of economy, withdrew this subsidy; you can imagine the resultant hardship among these poor people, bereft during the long winter months of all communication with the outer world. It is quite natural to believe that no pains were spared to obtain justice from the Government in this report.

Petitions have been addressed to me to be transmitted to whomsoever it might concern and I beg leave of the House to insert into Hansard a portion of the correspondence exchanged upon that subject. I shall first read a letter which I addressed to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce together with the aforesaid petitions:

CHICOUTIMI, October 7, 1918.

To the Right Hon. Sir G. E. FOSTER,
Minister of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa.

Honourable Sir,—

I beg leave to forward you four petitions from the county of Saguenay, whose object is to ask for the subsidies required for the mail contract between St. Catherine and Tadoussac. I do not think I need insist in order to show the importance of these requests.

As you may be aware, Saguenay county is formed of six large parishes besides the northern shore, from Bersimis to Natashquan. At the present moment, this population is deprived of communications, as I have informed you by a telegram dated Saturday last, the 5th instant, the Canada Steamship Company having discontinued its service.

I connot believe, hon. sir, that you would refuse helping this population and I venture to expect that I shall receive a reply to the present as soon as possible.

I have the honour to be
Yours humbly,
EDM. SAVARD, M.P.

Now here is one of the petitions which were addressed to the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. I shall not read the four of them, all of them having been written in about the same style:

TADOUSSAC, September 3, 1918.

To the Right Hon. Sir GEO. FOSTER,
P.C., K.C., B.A., LL.D., D.C.L.,
Minister of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa.

The undersigned do hereby humbly state:

That for several years past subsidies were granted by your department for the carrying of mail along Saguenay river, between St. Catherine and Tadoussac during the winter season (November 1 to May 1), with the further object of assisting the transportation and the revictualling of the northern shore.

That it is rumoured that that subsidy has been cut off for the year 1918-19.

That such a measure is liable to be greatly detrimental to the population of the North shore, so isolated during the winter months.

That the subsidy of the last year is no longer adequate to maintain this crossing, on account of the increased cost of materials, fuel and labour.

The petitioners do humbly pray the hon. minister to grant the required subsidy for maintaining that crossing, i.e. $5,000.

Moreover, weather permitting after the closing of navigation in the fall and before its reopening in the spring, the undersigned beg the hon. minister to grant an adequate supply to permit crossing the St. Lawrence from Rivière du Loup to Tadoussac, i.e. $100 per trip, once a week.

And the petitioners will keep on praying you.

Municipality of the
village of Tadoussac.

J. BERGERON, priest.

The petitions which were addressed to the hon. minister bore the signature of the parish priest, of the mayor and of all the citizens of these municipalities.

A little later, I sent a message to the same department to the effect that it was urgent to come to the assistance of the people of Saguenay and I must admit that the department considered my request, as can be seen by the telegrams which I shall read presently. But, before doing so, I wish to read the following letter:

[Mr. Savard.]

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE,
OTTAWA, October 7th, 1918.

Dear Sir:—The minister has received a telegram from Dr. Savard, M.P., stating that the population of Saguenay are absolutely without communication. They cannot transport their products, animals, etc., and conditions there are excessively alarming.

I should think that if the trade warranted it that probably you could make some calls, unless it be up the Saguenay river. I am not yet fully advised by Dr. Savard as to the ports of call. He telegraphs from Chicoutimi East. I have wired him, however, as to what ports he desires communication, though probably you might look into the matter in the meantime.

Yours truly,
F. C. T. O'HARA,
Deputy Minister.

The Gulf of St. Lawrence Shipping & Trading Co.,
147 Mountain Hill, Quebec, Que.

A similar letter was addressed to Mr. Gibson, president of that company.

A few days later, I came to Ottawa and I met the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce with whom I discussed the necessity of granting the required subsidy. Now, here is the telegram which I received from Mr. D'Auteuil, who was then the Conservative member in the Quebec Legislature:

Dr. E. SAVARD, M.P.,
Russell Hotel, Ottawa.

I admit services of a ferry-boat between Tadoussac and St. Catherine Bay in winter of prime necessity for Saguenay population ten thousand souls contributing to common wealth be developing forests, fisheries and other national industries. That population spend winter in dangerous isolation. Government should insure security. I would absolutely approve the granting of a Dominion subsidy for such a purpose.

P. D'AUTEUIL.

Realizing how urgent it was for that population to obtain the necessary relief, I employed every possible means.

I sought and obtained the support of the very lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who handed me the following letter to be transmitted to Mr. O'Hara, Deputy Minister of Commerce:

335 LAURIER AVENUE EAST,
OTTAWA, Nov. 14th, 1918.

My Dear O'Hara: Dr. Savard, M.P. for Chicoutimi and Saguenay, informs me that he is here to obtain the continuation of a subsidy for a ferry crossing of the Saguenay river between St. Catherine's Bay and Tadoussac.

This subsidy was granted by the late Government some twelve years ago, and perhaps more. I understand that it is now proposed to drop it. This certainly would be most unfortunate. I am well acquainted with the locality, and the reason which I pressed upon Sir Richard, who was then Minister of Trade and Commerce, was that in winter the people on both

sides of the Saguenay are absolutely shut off from civilization. This is particularly hard upon the people of Tadoussac, which is a place of some considerable importance. In winter they are without any kind of steam communication, either by rail or vessel, except by this ferry.

I do not know who is your minister in the absence of Sir George Foster. I would ask you to place these facts before him.

Yours sincerely,

WILFRID LAURIER.

F. C. T. O'Hara, Esq.

The hon. Minister of Commerce answered that he had dropped that subsidy as a matter of economy in the first place, and besides because it was for a ferry service which should be subsidized by the Quebec Government; and, he told me the Quebec Government whose financial position was so extraordinarily good, should help this population to obtain what they need. He advised me to see the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec on the subject, and to report later. I met Sir Lomer Gouin. He did not share the opinion of the right hon. Minister of Commerce to the effect that this ferry service should be subsidized by his Government. Sir Lomer Gouin added that he would go to Ottawa and would talk the matter over with the Minister of Commerce. Sir Lomer Gouin did come to Ottawa, but the right hon. Minister of Commerce had left for Europe the day before. Sir Lomer Gouin thought proper to write to the Minister ad interim the following letter:

OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER,
Province of Quebec,
QUEBEC, Nov. 26th, 1918.

The HON. A. K. MACLEAN, K.C.,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Maclean:—

I understand that you have now charge of Sir George Foster's Department. Mr. Savard, the member for Chicoutimi, wrote you on the subject of a ferry between St. Catharine's Bay and Tadousac, for which you have till now granted a subsidy. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux are also interested in the matter. This ferry is absolutely necessary to the inhabitants of the North Shore, and would impress upon you the great necessity to continue the subsidy granted in the past.

Yours very truly,

LOMER GOUIN.

I have an acknowledgment of this letter from the Deputy Minister of Commerce. Notwithstanding all our work, we have not succeeded in obtaining from the Government the aid which we were seeking, and the people of the Saguenay were deprived of communication, were isolated from the rest of the country for a whole winter long in 1917-18. And yet, Mr. Speaker, in that part of the country, in each of the parishes which I have named and which sent petitions to the hon. Minister of Commerce, young men have sacrificed their lives for the cause of civilization and justice. Last year, thanks to the active co-operation of the excellent member for Charlevoix (Mr. Casgrain), it was decided to put the steamer Champlain on this service for three trips a week. This boat plied between Murray Bay and Tadoussac for a few weeks only. I can not say for what reasons the service was discontinued, but I have been told that there was ill will on the part of the crew. And to a question which I put to the Government at the beginning of this session, asking if measures would be taken to restore the interrupted service, I was given a negative answer. The population of this part of the country were again during the balance of the winter, practically deprived of all communication with the rest of the country. Last fall, while it had been decided that the Champlain would make three trips a week to Tadoussac, the inhabitants of the county of Saguenay thought that such a service would not be sufficient for their needs; steps were taken to obtain from the Post Office Department a small subsidy which would allow of a motor boat plying every day between Ste. Catherine and Tadoussac.

We had received a favourable answer from the Postmaster General; the matter had almost been decided upon, when Mr. Girard, the former member, who had been so greatly befriended by the inhabitants of that county, stepped in, and I would not mention it, had he not interfered to the detriment of my constituents, for in my opinion, Mr. Girard is as dead as a door nail, as he was snowed under at the last elections, by an overwhelming majority of over 10,000 votes, and crushed under public contempt; but he nevertheless occasionally comes down to Ottawa, and what for I am at a loss to know. He still has some pull apparently and enjoys some patronage, as I am going to try to show, successfully, I think. On the 7th April, I moved in this House for a copy of all correspondence, letters and telegrams in connection with the granting of an allowance by the Post Office Department for a regular ferry service by motor yacht between Ste. Catherine and Tadoussac.

That motion was made early in April; we are at the end of May and I regret to say that those papers have not yet been brought down, so that I cannot produce the original,

I cannot read a copy of the letter which Mr. Girard set to the department, on the 18th October, 1919, in which he stated that that little ferry service, as he called it was of no use whatever. And it was after Mr. Girard had sent that letter or report that the affair fell through.

Another injustice was perpetrated in my county, at Metabetchouan, in the parish of St. Jerome, one of the finest parishes to be found, not only in the Lake St. John district and in the province of Quebec, but in the whole country, in connection with the appointment of a postmaster. I believe I may prove that that policy announced by the Government, the abolition of patronage, is a farce, a mere camouflage and that patronage is still going on.

The postmaster of Metabetchouan had resigned. Two men had applied for the position. Mr. Girard made an application in favour of the son of one of his friends.

The following telegram was sent by Mr. Girard to the Post Office Department to inform it of the resignation of the former Postmaster.

ST. GÉDÉON, LAKE ST. JOHN, QUEBEC,
September 5, 1919.

Hon. P. E. BLONDIN,
Postmaster General, Ottawa, Ontario.

The postmaster of Metabetchouan has resigned and is leaving on Sunday. We recommend Georges Emile Perron, a returned soldier, qualified for the position and residing near the church. Please notify the Civil Service Commission to that effect. Application by letter.

JOS. GIRARD.

Another telegram was sent by Mr. Joseph Girard to the assistant deputy Postmaster General.

ST. GEDEON Co., LAKE ST. JOHN, QUEBEC.
Sept. 6, 1919.

H. B. VERRET,
Deputy Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Letter of the 3rd received I understand Minister on a holiday when will he be back please see my message to him of yesterday re appointment as Postmaster of Metabetchouan of George Emile Perron returned soldier actual Postmaster there leaving Monday must have resigned please insist on that I have wire accordingly to the President of the Civil Service Commission wire answer please.

JOS. GIRARD.

The following telegram was set to Mr. Girard, in reply to those telegrams:

OTTAWA, September 11, 1919.

Dear sir,—With reference to your telegrams of the 5th and 6th instant in which you state that the postmaster of Metabetchouan has resigned and is about to leave that locality, and recommending the appointement of Mr. George Emile Perron, a returned soldier, to that position, I may say that the resignation of the postmaster in question has not yet reached the department and that the Quebec inspector, with whom we have communicated has no information on the matter, but will investigate.

I may add, however, that, should that position become vacant, your recommendation in favour of Mr. Perron will be submitted to the Civil Service Commission for consideration, whenever the question of making a new appointment comes up.

Your obedient servant,

H. B. VERRET,
Assistant Deputy Postmaster General.

Mr. JOSEPH GIRARD,
St. Gédéon, P.Q.

The following petition was forwarded by Mr. Girard to the Civil Service Commission:

METABETCHOUAN, August 27, 1919.

As Mr. J. A. Garon, the present postmaster, is certainly going to resign, we, the undersigned, recommend that Mr. George Emile Perron be appointed postmaster in Mr. Garon's place.

MM. Adélard Plourde,
Wilfrid Ratté,
Louis Ratté,
Ludger Ratté,
Charles Cauchon,
Didyme Simard,
Ferdinand Villeneuve,
Charles Tremblay,
Ernest Hervey,
Jos. Leclerc,
Robert Lévesque,
Jos. Louis Tremblay,
Jos. Langevin,
Honoré Desbiens,
Armand Larouche,
P. Groreau,
Edgar Girard,
Jos. Boudreau,
Gaudias Potvin,
Georges Potvin,
David Villeneuve,
Johnny Bergeron,
Jos. Bergeron,
Michel Plourde,
Jos. Tremblay, fils,
Eugène Lapointe,
L. E. Perron,
René Plourde,
Arm. Perron,
David Desbiens,
Didyme Boudreau,
Conrad Tremblay,
Louis Ouellet,
Philippe Ouellet,
Amand Genest,
J.-B. Bergeron,
Emilien Genest,
Rosario Bouchard,
Maurice Fortin,
Laurent Breton,
Thomas Julien,
Jos.-Alph. Fortin,
Ferdinand Bilodeau,
Joséphine Côté,
François Côté,
Jos. Doré,
Henri McNicoll,
Pierre Drolet,
Edmond Lapointe,
Edouard Cauchon,
Geo. Cauchon,
Charles Harvey,

Arthur Tremblay,
Alphonse Aubin, fils,
David Tremblay,
Arthur Duchaine,
Xavier Doré,
Xavier Hervay,
Louis Tremblay,
Jos. Côté,
Paul Guérin,
William Desbiens,
J.-E. Perron,
Onésime Desbiens,
Armand Villeneuve,
René Potvin.

I must say that in the copy of the petition which I have tabled and that is now before me, I do not see the name of the parish priest of that locality; however, I noticed that the name of Father Boily appeared on a petition which I saw in the hands of the Civil Service Commission. As I had been notified that Father Boily had signed the petition, I wrote to the mayor of St. Jérome about it and here is his answer:

Metabetchouan.

I, the undersigned, Louis E. Boily, priest and curate of the parish of St. Jerome, do declare to have signed the petition of Mr. J. A. Plourde, of Metabetchouan, applying for the post office at St. Jerome (Metabetchouan). Later on somebody came and asked for my signature in behalf of another parishioner, Mr. Perron. I told him I had signed Mr. Plourde's application and I could not sign both. Moreover, I had promised Mr. Plourde to use all my influence, for whatever it was worth, and I want him to be assured of that.

If my name has been placed on the other petition, I withdraw it. The office is already at Mr. Plourde's and it is desired that it should remain there.

St. Jerome, October 24, 1919.

L. E. BOILY, priest,
Curé of St. Jerome.

Metabetchouan, Lake St. John.

Father Boily's name was forged on the first petition which was sent to the Civil Service Commission.

Finally the Civil Service Commission, in January, 1920, appointed Mr. J. A. Plourde, as postmaster at Metabetchouan.

Here is what occurred:

ST. GEDEON, QUE.

Hon. P. E. BLONDIN,

Postmaster General, Ottawa, Ont.

Re: postmaster Metabetchouan, defer everything until important papers by mail.

JOS. GIRARD.

Do not forget that, at that time, the appointment had been made by the Civil Service Commission. The papers mentioned in Mr. Girard's telegram were simply a letter from Mr. George Emile Perron which reads as follows:

Hon. P. E. BLONDIN,
Postmaster General, Ottawa.
Province of Quebec,
Roberval district,
County of Lake St. John.

In reply to a letter from Quebec dated December 27, 1919, and signed by Mr. Green, post office inspector at Quebec, who states he was instructed by the Civil Service Commission to ask me for information about assertions and complaints that are being forwarded to me, I beg to declare solemnly:

1. That when I wrote the letter of January 19, 1918, complaining about the postmaster of Metabetchouan, I acted in perfectly good faith, as I was authorized by my father to sign his own name to the correspondence, except on cheques, without consulting him.

At that time, a few friends and I were aware of numerous irregularities which occurred in the mail service and we were determined to secure an investigation. By using the name of my father which I was tacitly authorized to do, we thought we could secure more easily the necessary investigation which actually took place, and there was a great improvement in the service at the post office, although the inquiry was not as complete as it should have been.

We have done the people a service and I have retained the competence of my father who has faith in me and keeps me in his employ with the same powers as heretofore. I must add that my father does not look after the mail; my brother and I are doing that part of the work and therefore he ignores and has ignored a lot of irregularities which he could not notice because he had no time to follow the details.

2. I am the son of a merchant of Metabetchouan. I am not a rich man, I work in my father's store with my elder and younger brothers. During the year I spent in the army, my brothers kept the store with my father, and since my return from St. Lucia, I am always sick, very often unable to go to the store and my father gets my brother to take my place. The position of postmaster would be a good one for me, because it does not require very heavy work as in the store, and then I could have a regularly appointed assistant.

3. I am not a merchant, I am simply my father's employee, I assist my father in preparing our family's future, and my brother Edward leads a quiet life attending his own business together with my father.

4. As to that pretension that I did not go to the war and that I was one of the few privileged ones who were sent to the Antilles, etc., and that I have not been away a whole year, as I had left in the fall of 1918, my answer is written upon the files of the Militia Department. Thank God, I left voluntarily, upon my father's advice, on May 15, 1918, and I signed my full engagement on the 29th of that same month; the military authorities sent me to St. Lucia whence I returned in June 1919, being discharged at St. Johns, June 15, 1919, that is to say that I have been absent for more than one year.

It is therefore evident that the information sent to the department, who have in their possession my full military record from beginning to end, was maliciously inspired. And those who to-day pretend that I have been one of the few privileged ones did not say the same thing when I left, for then they were openly cursing me, as well as my father and my whole family, calling us cowards and traitors, these charges being made among the best known people of our locality and elsewhere; they preferred sending

their sons to the woods rather than having them with me to do their duty; and in this whole story I can see but the meanest partisan spirit, because my father and all his family are friends of the present Government.

I do not know the names of the parties who signed the document mentioned in Mr. Green's letter, but, without seeing them, I might wager that all the out-and-out Liberals of the parish and, probably, of other parts, who would like to see the Government thrown down, are against me and want to prevent my appointment, because I am a friend of the Government and, especially so, because I enlisted in spite of themselves.

The site I suggested for the post office is more centrally located than the present one, as can be seen by the sketch here inclosed, and outside of a handful of the village folks, the rest of the inhabitants will be closer to my office than to the present one; and I inclose a statement from three of the principal mail carriers interested in the Metabetchouan service who declare that, as far as distances are concerned, it would not make any difference to them to come to my place instead of going to the present office, but that, considering access facilities to the office, they prefer the site I have chosen.

I might further inform you that, when I left for the war, I was only following the generous example of my sister, Mary Perron, who served as a nurse, in England and in France, for more than four years, from January, 1915, to April, 1918, and those who have contended that I did not go to the front have also taken care not to mention my sister's name.

Under such circumstances, belonging to an honourable family, proud of the military service which I have honourably discharged, honourable myself previously, honourable during that service and honourable since, qualified from every point of view, unless my standing as a friend of the Government and of a retruned soldier should disqualify me, I believe I may claim my appointment as postmaster of Metabetchouan, as a matter of justice towards merit, if, as it is generally said, the soldiers have above all and in the first place a right to public employment.

I have the honour to be

Your humble petitioner,

GEORGES EMILE PERRON.

I meant to have this letter inserted in full in Hansard, in order that his fellow citizens might see the extraordinary impudence of this young man, who claims to be honourable, after having forged the signature of his parish priest upon a petition applying for the position of postmaster, after it has been stated, in the course of an investigation, that he had forged and signed his own father's name. Is a forger an honourable man? He may have done some military service, but his life has never been in danger. The other candidate, Mr. Plourde, was backed by petitions signed by several hundred citizens, representing four-fifths of that parish's population, all the principal citizens included; he has been assistant postmaster for several years. Had he not been more qualified than Georges Emile Perron—a forger—I might understand that the latter, having performed some military service, though he never went to the front nor did he expose his own life, should have been preferred to the other, the aptitudes being even. Upon that point, I have asked, at this session, whether a soldier who had served at St. Lucia could be considered as a returned soldier from the front; I moreover asked whether the Civil Service Commission should be giving their preference to those young men. I was given the following answer:

1. A soldier who served with the Canadian Expeditionary Force in Bermuda is considered a "returned soldier". He holds the same position in that respect as a soldier who only saw service in England; and is entitled to a Class "C" Badge.

2. Where two candidates are considered to be at all points on a parity, if one is a civilian and the other has voluntarily enlisted and been drafted to Bermuda, the latter would be given the preference.

Being at all points on a parity, a soldier should be given the preference, but, in this case, the qualifications are absolutely inadequate. At the Civil Service Commission, I was informed that one had 100 points and the other 65; such is the difference between the two candidates as to efficiency, and that is why Mr. Plourde was appointed in the first place. It was then that Mr. Joseph Girard, ex-member, sent a telegram to the Postmaster General:

Re postmaster of Metabetchouan, suspend all, am sending important record by mail.

The important record is the one relative to George Emile Perron; and, after that, Plourde's appointment was set aside and George Emile Perron was appointed.

I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would be hard to find a case of more glaring injustice and a more convincing evidence of the fact that favouritism still exists as to appointments. I believe this case must be most uncommon, for here, the appointment was made by the Civil Service Commission. And I have in my hands the direct evidence that the appointment was made by the Civil Service Commission. (Reading):

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, CANADA.

OTTAWA, December 17, 1919.

Dear Sir,—Referring to your requisition of the 22nd September, asking for the appointment of a Postmaster at Metabetchouan, P.Q., I am directed by the Commissioners to advise you that they have selected Mr. J. A. Plourde for this position.

The certificate for Mr. Plourde's permanent appointment will be issued as soon as the required information has been received in this

office, and in this connection Mr. Plourde is being communicated with direct.

Yours very truly

WM. FORAN,
Secretary.

HECTOR B. VERRET, Esq.,
Ass's Deputy Postmaster General.
Ottawa.

I cannot understand and I believe it would be impossible for any one to explain how a man such as the late member for Chicoutimi, who has betrayed every political party, who, as I have stated a few moments ago, has been crushed by popular contempt in his own riding, could still have a certain influence in the department in Ottawa, and I mean to protest as strongly as I can against this injustice towards Mr. Plourde, who had made certain sacrifices and fully deserved his appointment as postmaster in that important parish.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I most sincerely admit my full repentance in having been so lengthly in my remarks, but I really feel that I have accomplished my duty and I will conclude by stating that the programme adopted by last August's Liberal Convention suits me absolutely. I believe that that Convention could not have been better organized: The premiers of every province in the Dominion, Ontario excepted, took part in it, the Liberal party's programme was gone through and discussed for several days, and, for my part, I am absolutely satisfied with the conclusions of that Convention's programme; that is the reason why I shall heartily vote in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding's) which is based upon the principles adopted by that Convention.

Mr. O. D. CASSELMAN (Dundas): It is with a great deal of hesitation and diffidence that I rise to take part in this debate, which hon. members on both sides of the House will agree has already been protracted to too great a length. But representing a county in Eastern Ontario, a part of Canada which, east of Frontenac at least, is not often heard from in this House, I feel it my duty, much as I dislike to discharge that duty, to place on Hansard what I conceive to be the views of my constituents in regard to matters affected by the Budget. I do not often intrude my views on the attention of the House, and I think that the House will absolve me of the charge of wasting its time to any great extent. I do make it a point, however, to sit in my seat fairly regularly throughout the session, and it has been a constant source of wonder to me to see the ingenuity and the ability displayed by hon. members in dressing up the same facts in so many different suits of verbal clothing. I have observed that the principal facts in every discussion are usually brought out early in the debate. I have admired the patience both of the House and of yourself, Mr. Speaker, and I have sympathized with the impatience of the people of the country in witnessing the flagrant waste of money, time and energy—the money of the people, the time of the House, and the energy of members. I say, I have sympathized with the impatience of the people in submitting to this waste by a constant repetition of the same facts. I cannot, Sir, see the wisdom of it. I cannot see how the interests of the country are promoted by it, nor can I see what benefit accrues to the political careers of hon. members in consequence. The country resents it. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) yesterday objected to hurrying the proceedings of the House, but Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why this House should not already have been adjourned; and instead of spending our time here talking about the cost of living we might with infinitely better advantage be engaged at home actually helping to reduce the high cost of living by working in the fields.

We on this side of the House have been amused and sometimes, I admit, we have been slightly irritated by the taunts that come from the Opposition because the Government does not dissolve the House and appeal to the country in a general election. What good purpose would be served by such a course? What hope is there, based on any reasonable foundation, that as good a Government or a better one would follow? I do not know the minds of the cabinet ministers, they do not confide their private opinions to me; but I will venture to say that they hold the same broad general view with regard to the question of continuing in power as hon. members back of them hold. We private members are not over-burdened by affairs of state. We have some time on our hands to gossip, to exchange views, and to learn one another's opinions on matters generally, and I am convinced that the majority of hon. members on this side, like myself, would welcome a return to private life. From observation and conversation with members I am convinced that the majority of hon. gentlemen on this side would welcome the relief which a general election at this time might possibly give them. Why then do we support the Government in their

decision to continue in power to the end of the parliamentary term? Sir, the party on this side of the House is peculiarly formed. A large number of the members on this side are not politicians; they have never been politicians and they do not want to become politicians. They accepted nomination and contested their elections because they were convinced that Canada needed a strong, non-partisan, non-political party to carry it safely through the conditions of the war. Are the conditions which have resulted from the war less difficult to-day than the conditions that existed when hon. members were elected? Can we not all see the dark cloud gathering, growing darker, the socialistic and Bolshevistic danger that threatens to disrupt civilization, to destroy the commercial life of the world, to set up mob rule and to overthrow the supremacy of law and order? And yet members of the Opposition, sworn to do their duty by the State, because they imagine that the Government is unpopular would plunge the country into the throes of a general election with a result that could be nothing but disorder and chaos. It may be that the Union Government is not altogether perfect; it may be that there is some one in Canada who does not so consider it. But is there any student of public affairs who is uninfluenced by political considerations, who is unbiased in politics, who will suggest where, at the present time, there is a prospect of obtaining a better, or will suggest how that prospect can be developed into a reality? If there was any prospect or hope that a general election would result in bringing into power a Government strong enough, conservative enough in principle, to carry on as the governments of Canada, of both shades of political opinion, have carried on, I am convinced, Sir, that the members of the Cabinet, and the members who are supporting this Government would welcome the relief that a general election, perhaps, would give them. But the burden that the war has laid upon the shoulders of the Government is a burden that they must still carry and which to lay down now, in view of the conditions that obtain in this country, would be an act of cowardice, a quitting in the face of trouble, which time and the good sense of our Canadian people will overcome—an act which this Government, which has so safely and capably carried us through the period of war, would not be guilty of.

The Opposition gets a good deal of pleasure from repeating, one after another, the statement made by one of its number, that this Government is unpopular and that if there were a general election it would be hopelessly defeated. Perhaps it would, but why is the Government alleged to be unpopular? Canada never had a better or stronger Government than the Union Government; it never had a Government which has been tried like this one. Canada, like every other country in the world, strained with the labours of the war, has suffered less than any one of them from the aftermath of trouble which always follow war. There has not been the slightest breath of slander or charge of graft made against the Union Government. Law and order reign supreme, there are no civil disorders. This Government has conducted the war; it has built up a great Canadian army; it has brought glory to Canada; it has brought the soldiers back from the war, demobilized them and re-established them in civil life with a minimum of trouble and of difficulty. Why then is the Union Government said to be unpopular?

Paradoxical as it may appear, any unpopularity which may have come to the Union Government has come to it because it has kept its pre-election promises. The Government promised to abolish patronage. From all over the country came the clamour that the patronage system was an evil. Undoubtedly evils did exist, as undoubtedly they exist under the present system. It would almost appear that the people resent the action of a Government which attempted to fulfil its promises. The people of the province of Ontario demanded by an overwhelming majority that the Government legislate in the strongest way to prohibit the liquor traffic. The Hearst Government gave them such legislation and immediately the people turned them out of power and put another in its place a Government which has not the courage to assume the responsibility for legislation necessary to make the Canada Temperance Act effective. The people of Canada demanded the abolition of the patronage system. The Union Government abolished that system and they have got themselves into a peck of trouble by so doing. But the Government has had the courage to attempt to place the Civil Service upon a business basis. Perhaps what it has done is a long step in that direction but it still has a long way to go before it can be said that it has been fully successful. What it has done is to take the patronage out of the hands of members who are responsible to the people, who have to answer to the people, whose public careers depend

upon the efficiency with which the public service is carried on, and to place it in the hands of a small commission who are responsible to no one, who hold their positions practically for life and who are independent to all intents and purposes of the ministers in charge of the departments. The war record of the Government is a splendid one, the people admit it; posterity will acclaim it. The wisdom of the reconstruction work of the Government appeals to the people and as time goes on, as that work develops and as its results can be better seen, the people of Canada will appreciate it more and more. I wish I could say that the Government has been equally successful in its efforts to place the Civil Service of this country on a sound business basis. The people are not satisfied with the present system. The civil servants themselves are not satisfied with the present system; they are discontented, they are holding up the Government at every opportunity. It is said that the departments are woefully overmanned, and that for every vacancy there are dozens of applications. If this be the case, why not let the dissatisfied ones go? Why not replace them by others who are applying for the positions? They will suffer no hardships, there is plenty of work in Canada outside the Civil Service. Let the men go and work on the farms Let the women go and do other work; there is plenty of work for all to do.

There is one branch of the Civil Service, however, that is notoriously underpaid—I refer to the mail couriers. When we apply for consideration for them we are told that they are under contract—that they tendered for the service, and that they contracted to do the work on the salaries that are paid to them. Very true, but the other civil servants are practically also under contract; at least they knew the work they had to do and the salaries they were to get before they accepted their appointments. Why not make them fulfil their obligations just as the Post Office Department makes the mail couriers fulfil their contract? Mr. Speaker, if this Union Government can crown its work by placing the Civil Service of the country on a sound business basis they will earn the gratitude of the people of Canada, and there will not be the same necessity of multiplying the methods of taxation year after year.

It is also said that the Union Government is unpopular among the farmers. I would advise the members of the Opposition, and the members of the Agrarian party, not to base their hopes upon this statement. The great mass of the farmers—who think much and say little—are sound at heart, and are not to be led away by the visionary programme outlined by the new Agrarian party. There is a certain amount of dissatisfaction among the farmers, I admit. Why? Because conscription, one of the promises of the Union Government, was made broad enough, when the urgency of the war required, to include even those engaged in essential work of production. The United Farmers party of Ontario, as a political body, was born on the day when our gallant friend from North Ontario (Mr. Halbert) led his band of discontented ones down to Ottawa protesting against the Order in Council cancelling the exemption granted to the sons of farmers. Like a famous warrior of old he led his army up the hill and led it down again. Previous to tthat day there was no farmers' organization for political purposes in the province of Ontario; it was born on that day and delivered out of that occasion. It has been nurtured and fed by the Liberals in the hope that they might climb to power because of this movement and because of this discontent; but the Liberals in Ontario have found, and the Liberals of the Dominion too will find, that they have created a Frankenstein which they cannot control. It does not appear at all, Mr. Speaker, to the disinterested observer that this Government, or the governments of the past, have been neglectful of the interests of the farmer. On the contrary it would appear that they have been extremely solicitous that injury should not come to that industry. We cannot afford to have that industry injured. It has been built up at so much cost, so much expense and so much labour, and we—in Eastern Canada, at least—are so proud of its growth and the dimensions which it has reached, that we look with suspicion and distrust on any movement, or any action, that has even the appearance of disturbing it. I am one of those who believe that Canada's surest and safest road to greatness is through the development and promotion of the agricultural industry, that we have travelled far along that road and in that direction. Therefore, I would denounce with vigour anything that had even the appearance of disturbing that industry. Through the intelligence and efforts of our farmers, and the educational, experimental and demonstration work of this Government and the governments of the past, that industry has been raised from the plane of an occupation to the plane of a profession.

The best asset that Canada can have is a prosperous, contented and intelligent agrarian community. But it cannot have that unless the industrial life of the country keeps pace with the agricultural life, unless the growth of industry keeps pace with the growth of agriculture. The two must go together, must advance together, must proceed hand in hand; the life, the success and the prosperity of the one depend upon the other. It is therefore with extreme regret and apprehension that I view the efforts of irresponsible agitators to instil in the minds of our farmers the idea that Canada can rise to greatness on steps made out of the debris of other industries. I have noticed that lawyers who become politicians lose their clients; that doctors who become politicians lose their patients; and that merchants—as I know from personal experience—who attempt to become politicians lose their customers. That economic law must extend to the farmers as well, and those of them who become politicians, will eventually lose their farms.

I view with alarm, then, this new movement which seeks to build up one industry by tearing down others. The members of the Farmers' party disclaim any desire for class legislation, but they are so insistent in their disclaimer that we become suspicious of its sincerity, especially when they are so peculiarly solicitous of their own interests and so callously indifferent to the interests of others. I have under my hand their political creed as set out in this pamphlet, a copy of which, I believe, was mailed to every hon. member. The Farmers' party seem to be very proud of this document, but I do not know why, for as a literary effort it is a beautiful piece of plagiarism. As a platform it contains very little that is new, and what is new is vague, visionary, impracticable.

As the first plank in their platform they call for the formation of a League of Nations. Do they not know that that is already an accomplished fact? Do they not know that the members of this Government took a prominent and an active part in promoting that League? Every member of that party who has spoken has advised the formation of a League of Nations, and yet not one of them has commended this Government for the active part it took in the promotion and formation of the League that is now functioning. The second plank in this platform reads as follows:

> We believe that the further development of the British Empire should be sought along the lines of partnership between nations free and equal, under the present governmental system of British constitutional authority. We are strongly opposed to any attempt to centralize imperial control. Any attempt to set up an independent authority with power to bind the Dominions, whether this authority be termed parliament, council or cabinet would hamper the growth of responsible and informed democracy in the Dominion.

What do they mean, Sir, by that? From what old speeches, books, or pamphlets have they culled those beautiful sentiments? My recollection is, Sir, that I have been listening to similar sentiments for the last thirty or forty years. Where is the danger of "centralized imperial control"? Where is any effort being made "to set up an independent authority with power to bind the Dominions"? Why should this new Progressive party set up a very beautifully clothed figure of straw simply for the pleasure of knocking it down again?

The third item in this platform—this wonderful platform—is the tariff. Recriminations are useless, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to indulge in them, but I cannot resist the temptation of saying that every hon. member who sits in the seats allotted to this new party was a strong and ardent supporter of the tariff policy of the Liberal Government which held power between 1896 and 1911—a tariff higher than the present tariff which they are condemning and which they say they intend to vote against.

11 p.m.

What is their policy? They are demanding under clause (a):

> An immediate and substantial all-round reduction of the customs tariff.

That is vague to say the least. Why cannot they come out boldly and say definitely what their policy is? "A substantial and all-round reduction of the customs tariff." Do they mean by that that they want free trade? Or do they not? Let me tell them that in the country their lieutenants and henchmen are not talking about "a substantial all-round reduction of the customs tariff;" they are talking of absolute free trade, of nothing but free trade.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): No, Sir.

Mr. CASSELMAN: They did in my county.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. CASSELMAN: The Minister of Agriculture in the new Provincial Government of Ontario in his first speech in the Legislature spurned with scorn, it is true, the accusation that the Farmers' party should be called free traders, and yet in the election

campaign which returned him and his party to power all tariffs were roundly condemned. The "iniquitous tariff" was the theme of every U.F.O. speech. The farmers were being oppressed by the tariff, it was said. "Give us free trade," demanded the members of the Farmers' party, "and a new era of prosperity will dawn on Canada." I know that not many hon. members profess free trade in this House, but I am in a position to state that at their meetings in the country school houses and at their clubs the lieutenants of the Farmers' party are not talking about a substantial reduction in the tariff, they are demanding absolute free trade; that is what they are preach- trade; that is what they are preaching to the farmers of Canada. In the country they talk free trade; in the House they talk any old thing. Why play fast and loose with this important matter? Why have one policy in the country and another policy in Parliament? This much can be said for the much-abused Union Government, that it has and always has had a definite tariff policy; that the Government believed in that policy; that it has the unanimous support of the members back of it, and that those members preach that policy in the House and out of it. The new Minister of Agriculture of Ontario, the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the new Agrarian party have too much intelligence not to know that free trade would ruin Canada's prosperity; that it would be a disaster and a calamity for Canada, a disaster which they have no intention of precipitating. So, while they try to cater to whatever free trade ideas, whatever discontent with the tariff, may exist in Canada in the hope of benefiting politically thereby, they are careful, when they come into positions of responsibility, to guard their utterances so that they shall not find themselves committed to practical foolishness. Our free trade friends on the other side of the House suggest wiping out our chief source of revenue, but they have not made a single suggestion as to what we should and must do to raise a revenue. We should all like to see such an ideal, Utopian condition of world affairs develop as to make free trade possible, so that there could, to the advantage and safety of all, be a free interchange of all commodities. But the world is not yet a Utopia; much water must pass over the wheels before it becomes such. We must have a revenue and a large one; will the Opposition suggest where, with free trade, that revenue will be found? Until they do that, it is most futile and foolish to speak of abolishing the customs duties. But we get from them not a single adequate, practical suggestion how that revenue, lost by free trade or by an all-round modification of the tariff, is to be secured. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) very candidly and honestly admitted in his speech the other night that free trade was designed only to get into power by; that it was not practical; that it was simply a trap to catch votes. I admired his courage and honesty, while I could not admire his consistency.

The Farmers, however, are a little more constructive; they suggest fields from which revenue may be drawn. I do not know who is the author of this pamphlet; but I have read and re-read it very carefully, and I cannot help coming to the conclusion that its author first read the history of Union Government, studied carefully what Union Government had done and what it was doing, and then with that history fresh in his mind, sat down and wrote this pamphlet. My hon. friends yonder suggest a tax on unimproved land. A tax on unimproved land has a fine sound; but it is not in accord with the wishes of the farmers of Eastern Ontario at least, because in Eastern Ontario the farmers themselves are the principal holders for speculative purposes of unimproved lands. If, unfortunately, the control of power in this Dominion falls into the hands of the aggregation yonder—I love my native country; I want to see Canada become a great and good country, and because I do so, I pray that that event will never occur, but if it does this promise will be kept in the same way that this U.F.O. promises to abolish patronage in Ontario was kept.

Union Government has carried out or is carrying out most of the demands made in this small pamphlet. If this document means anything, if it is a true expression of the wishes of the United Farmers of Canada, then at the next general election, the United Farmers of Canada should rally round the standard of Union Government and see that again Union Government is returned to power. If this document does not mean anything, then I say to this new party: Get a definite policy; formulate some new plan which promises continued and renewed prosperity to Canada.

Let me say, just in conclusion, that Union Government has the record of daring to keep its pre-election promises. It has dared to do unpopular things, because those things

were necessary for the good of Canada. Let me apply to Union Government the historic saying of one of Ontario's greatest statesmen, the late Sir James Whitney:

> This Union Government has been brave enough to be bold and bold enough to be brave.

I believe the people of Canada, when this period of carping criticism passes, when this temporary brainstorm recedes, will do justice to this Government which has brought Canada safely, honourably and gloriously through the war and safely and prosperously through the period of reconstruction following the war.

Mr. THOMAS MacNUTT (Saltcoats): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the small group which has received so much attention lately and which has been christened and rechristened with so many names that we hardly know what to call ourselves, I wish to offer some observations on the Budget. I think our party was first of all called the Farmers' party, followed afterwards by the Agrarian, then the Progressive party, and I think to-day we were called the Levites. I am not certain but I think the hon. member for Algoma East (Mr. Nicholson) indirectly likened us yesterday to "the hydra-headed monster of class privilege and Bolshevism" which he would fight as long as he had breath in his body. Well, I daresay we shall be able to survive it all, for we believe we are standing for a very great principle, and judging by this debate I am afraid that we stand very much alone, but I think are fully justified in our attitude, which I will endeavour to point out.

The hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Casselman) has stated that this little party with the many titles stands for immediate and absolute free trade. I do not think he is quite right. We recognize that protection has existed practically since Confederation, to a greater or lesser extent, and we do not wish to abolish it all at one fell swoop; but we believe that in connection with certain articles the time has come for abolishing it and that this should have been done a long time ago. I wish to read just three paragraphs from the Canadian Council of Agriculture platform, which we stand behind:

> (f) That all tariff concessions granted to other countries be immediately extended to Great Britain.
>
> (g) That all corporations engaged in the manufacture of products protected by the customs tariffs be obliged to publish annually comprehensive and accurate statements of their earnings.
>
> [Mr. Casselman.]
>
> (h) That every claim for tariff protection by any industry should be heard publicly before a special committee of Parliament.

That, I think, goes to show that we do not ask that the tariff be immediately abolished. If it can absolutely be shown that it is in the interest of the country that there should be some protection, probably that might be granted. The hon. member who has just sat down complained that none of this party had commended the Government for anything they have done. Well, then, I am going to be the first. I commend the Finance Minister for having at all events placed before the House and the country our actual financial condition, secondly, for not having left us in any uncertainty as to the methods by which the Government intends to raise the revenue to carry on the affairs of the country. I think I might also commend the Government for having recognized the importance and advantage of direct taxation, although I do not think they intend to apply it in the right direction. We know where we are, at all events. This Budget maintains the principle of protection to a very large extent, except that the super-war tax of 7½ per cent is going to be abolished. That tax was an increase to the tariff for certain purposes. It was supposed to be entirely for the collection of revenue, but at the time it was imposed, I remember very well, the Financial Post in commenting on the tax congratulated the Government and the manufacturers, as it would enable them to reap larger profits, and it hoped the tax would be maintained. I am glad to know that the Government in that respect are not carrying out the will of the Financial Post, which represents the manufacturers, but I do not know that they should take very much credit to themselves for abolishing this tax, because, after all, it was not a part of the normal tariff. With this exception, there is no change whatever in the tariff This was perhaps to be expected from a Government composed principally of protectionists, and supported principally by protectionists—men who have been avowed and consistent protectionists and who therefore cannot be blamed for supporting the Government's proposals. It is rather surprising, however, to find supporting the Budget, with its absence of tariff reductions hon. members on the other side of the House who were Liberals before the war, and who joined with their Conservative brethren in order to assist in winning the war. It was assumed that they would retain what we understood were Liberal principles in connection

with the tariff. As evidence that some of these hon. members are supporting the Government's protective plan of taxation I shall quote from the speech made by the hon. member from Fraser Valley (Mr. Stacey) a few days ago. He said that he himself "in his earlier years breathed a political atmosphere that was charged, if not surcharged, with anti-protectionist gas," and that he was elected as a Liberal Unionist. He stated emphatically the other evening: "To-night I stand for the principle of protection." Not, be it observed, for a tariff for revenue with incidental protection, but for straight protection. He gave special reasons for his position and he appealed to the House to practise the old club spirit. But evidently the benefit to the British Columbia apple growing industry from protection is the main reason for his change of heart. In another part of his speech he maintains that the "four western provinces constitute the natural and legitimate market for British Columbia apples." If he had said "the natural and legitimate prey" he would have been nearer the mark. He believes in interprovincial trade, evidently when it pays. He said:

Our people, year by year, buy from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000 worth of stuff, especially from the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. That may not be very much, but it is a big thing for us, especially under existing conditions.

You will observe that he does not say that it is a good thing for Alberta and Saskatchewan, but a "big thing for us," that is, British Columbia. That is not the club spirit. He does not ask that the farmer of the western provinces alluded to should receive protection, something which however they themselves do not ask. He appears to have another reason. In a somewhat paternal manner he spoke as follows:

What we object to, and what we have persistently objected to, is the unfair, unreasonable and unneighbourly policy of dumping third-rate stuff—

Meaning, from the United States:

—upon the poor prairie people and forcing the higher quality fruit off the market.

Meaning, the British Columbia fruit. I may inform the hon. member who takes this very kind attitude that the poor prairie people are not in the habit of purchasing third-rate stuff, apples or any other commodity, when they can obtain a higher quality. They are quite willing to pay the difference. We would be willing to pay at least a dollar a barrel more for British Columbia apples of first quality than for third-rate American apples, and consequently there is no necessity for a tariff of 90 cents a barrel. I can bear testimony to the fact that the British Columbia apple is fully equal to any other apple we can obtain, both in appearance and in quality. There need be no fear of third-quality apples being brought in and forced upon the "poor," unfortunate farmers of the West. The hon. member says that it costs them more to grow apples, but he rather gives it away when he refers to the higher cost of containers. These are the hon. member's words:

They had a better organization than we had and beat us at buying.

Well, there is only one thing which they can do, and that is to organize in such a way that they can buy their containers on equal terms with the Americans, and there is a good example set them by the grain growers of the provinces to which the hon. member refers. What is still more surprising is to find that notwithstanding the strong stand taken by the Liberal party on several occasions in opposing protection, especially at the August convention, with a few exceptions the speeches of hon. members of that party indicate that they are in favour to a considerable extent of a protectionist policy. There was an excellent opportunity for them to assert themselves, but the amendment moved by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) fell far short of their former professions; and the speeches so far made, with a few exceptions, are not even in line with the present amendment, being indefinite and disappointing, to some of us at any rate. Last August the delegates of the Liberal party from all parts of Canada met at Ottawa and framed a good low tariff policy which very largely minimized protection. It was a good second to the platform to the Canadian Council of Agriculture, and all the members of the Liberal party pledged themselves to abide by it. I will quote that part of the platform relating to the tariff. It is late, but I trust that the House will bear with me while I read the passage:

That the best interests of Canada demand that substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance first, diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; second: reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is

essential to the progress and prosperity of our country.

That, to these ends, wheat, wheat flour and all products of wheat; the principal articles of food; farm implements and machinery; farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and repair parts thereof; rough and partly dressed lumber; gasoline, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils;—

I wonder how the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) would take that item. I can remember very well, that when we were canvassing some years ago for what was called the Oliver resolution, which was couched very much in these words, the hon. member for West Lambton was very much annoyed because we would not exclude the different oils, which I believe were manufactured in his constituency. If I recollect aright, he refused to vote for the resolution on that account, and I do not know what stand he would take in regard to that matter now if he had an opportunity of expressing himself definitely on it. The platform continues:

—nets, net-twines and fishermen's equipments; cements and fertilizers, should be free from customs duties, as well as the raw material entering into the same.

That a revision downwards of the tariff should be made whereby substantial reductions should be effected in the duties on wearing apparel and footwear, and on other articles of general consumption (other than luxuries), as well as on the raw material entering into the manufacture of the same.

That the British preference be increased to 50 per cent of the general tariff.

And the Liberal party hereby pledges itself to implement by legislation the provision of this resolution when returned to power.

They have not yet been returned to power and that may be the reason for the present amendment. At the session before last the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) moved an amendment, and it seems to me that that amendment was very much along the same lines as the platform I have just read. Probably the platform was based upon it. I will not take up the time of the House reading the amendment because it is rather lengthy; but it was an excellent resolution, containing very little protection. It was brought before the House at the wrong time, however, that is to say, on a motion to go into Supply. There are a large number of hon. members who approved of that resolution but they were reluctant to oppose the Government. They could not honourably oppose any of the Government's measures without cause, and the Government had had no opportunity of disclosing themselves with regard to their tariff policy—no government does until the Budget is brought down. The consequence was, that a great many sympathetic members opposed the resolution at that time. This had another bad effect, namely, that it precluded the introduction of the same principle at that session. When the Budget was brought down a very mild resolution with regard to a lower tariff was, very leniently allowed by the Speaker; because at that time, in my opinion, mild as it was, it was out of order, the principle involved having been already disposed of at that session. At all events, there was one clause that was definite and there were some twelve Liberal-Unionists who voted against the Budget on that account. Others, for some good reason, best known to themselves, did not do so. The definite clause to which I refer, which I may say induced me to favour the resolution, reads:

That to relieve the present situtation the tariff should be so framed as to free the food of the people and the machinery used in the development of the natural resources of Canada, together with the raw material entering into the manufacturing thereof.

There were good reasons why what is known as the first McMaster amendment could not have been moved at that time, but there is no reason why it or something similar to the August platform could not have been brought forward on this occasion. What is the amendment that we are called upon to vote for or reject? I will read a part of it:

That in view of the continued increase in the high cost of living, of the greatly increased burden of taxation, of the hardship which many of the people suffer from these causes, and the unrest naturally arising therefrom; and in view of the desirability of adopting measures to increase production and effect such relief to consumers and producers as may be within the power of Parliament, the House is of opinion that, pending a wider revision of the tariff, substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation should be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance; first, diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; second, reducing (not freeing) the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country.

The amendment, it will be seen, is of a very general and indefinite nature. In speaking to his amendment, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's plainly indicated his reasons for not taking advantage of the splendid opportunity to confirm the former anti-protection attitude of the Liberal party in a more definite manner. His speech might just as well have been delivered by one of the members on the other side, who claim to be supporters

of moderate protection, which, like the word "substantial" so often used, may mean anything. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's made the following remarks:

I do not even think we can expect to get a sound and safe tariff policy by a too rigid adherence to every line and every letter of the Liberal tariff platform. I think myself that we will find that we are all prone in framing platforms to put things perhaps a little more strongly than is wise and we all find when we come to the responsibilities of office that we may have to modify our views.

The impression left by the hon. member's remarks can be indicated by quoting from the speech of the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce who, during the course of his long public service, has always stood for high protection and who is now apparently satisfied that he has a colleague in the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. Referring to that hon. gentleman he said:

Now my hon. friend went on to the tariff question, and there I sat in perfect amazement. I felt almost like saying, "Look over the thirty years that have passed and the controversies that have taken place between my hon. friend and myself, and between his party and the party on this side of the House." I felt almost like saying, when he had finished, "Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace," and the question forces itself upon me "Has the millennium come?" The whole party behind my hon. friend never squeaked opposition to what he said; they could not; they dared not. They do not like to say what in their hearts they know to be the truth—that is repugnant to them; yet if they were all as honest as the ex-Minister of Finance they would get up and say the very same thing. Now, after these confessions—not of an opium eater, but of a virile, experienced public man—after this candid confession, let me say to hon. gentlemen opposite: "Do not let us hear anything more of the camouflaged debate from that side as to free trade being the doctrine which is dear to your hearts and embodied in your policies. You cannot put it into your policy now. I do not think you ever meant to put it into your policy to carry out as a reality if you ever got into power."

And further on he says:

We have the ex-Finance Minister standing for an anti-dumping clause—when circumstances require it; standing for a substantial aid to industries—when circumstances require it; standing for mergers—when circumstances require it; aye and even more, standing for the infant industry while it was an infant industry, until it had attained years of maturity; standing for all these—when the circumstances of the case seemed to require it. Where is the free trade doctrine, and where is the difference in principle between myself as a moderate protectionist and my hon. friend as a now avowed protectionist, the principle to be adapted and adopted—as circumstances require it? That was always the doctrine on this side of the House. We never worshipped protection as a fetish; can the same be said by hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to free trade? We have always believed that the circumstances of the time should dictate the financial and tariff policy of the time. And my hon. friend's confession to-night has amply justified the policy advocated during thirty years by Liberal-Conservatives in all parts of Canada.

The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce was so overcome by his emotion that he shortly afterwards concluded his speech abruptly—

Judging from further speeches made by members of the Liberal party, so far, with one or two notable exceptions, I think we are quite justified in taking the stand that the present Liberal party, as a whole, was not sincere in its former professions of free trade with regard to the implements of industry, the necessaries of life, and low tariff on other articles. I must, however, except the western Liberals, who, I believe, are honest in their desire for low tariff and I can hardly imagine the Hon. Frank Oliver delivering a speech such as I have quoted from, made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's.

Now, what effect will the Budget proposals have in increasing the revenues and in reducing the cost of living?—the two most important matters with which the House must deal; apart from the care of our disabled soldiers and the widows and dependents of those who have fallen. That it will attain the first object is probable, although the proper means are not taken, in my opinion, for the taxes payable by the different classes of citizens, or rather whose occupations are different, will be disproportionate; and there is a certainty of an increase in the cost of living now almost unbearable. The part relating to the taxation of luxuries is, I consider, a proper direct tax. But we must be sure that the articles taxed are really luxuries, and it is very questionable whether this principle has been carried out. For instance, a pair of boots at $9 cannot now be considered a luxury, or a suit of clothes or a woman's dress at $45, or a $5 hat; neither can a bottle of pain killer or other patent medicine be considered a luxury, and there are many other articles that could be mentioned. I received several telegrams to-day and I will read one as a sample, leaving to other hon. members who have been receiving similar telegrams and letters, all relating to the same subject, to bring them to the attention of the committee. The telegram which I shall read is as follows:

Protest very strongly any tax increase on patent and proprietary medicine; whole district requests your best endeavours.

If the tariff of 25 to 35 per cent were abolished or reduced, to be followed by a lower cost to the consumer, many goods costing the prices mentioned might then be considered luxuries. Otherwise, as at present, they must be classified as necessaries. But I trust that this may at least be partially remedied in committee.

The one per cent wholesale tax paid by retailers on all but food products, and passed on to the consumer, will yield some revenue, but will most decidedly increase the cost of living; the reduction of the excess business profits tax will decrease the revenue and not affect the cost of living; the only change in the tariff, the abolition of the balance of the super-war tax of 7½ per cent, will decrease revenue, and it is the only item that will tend towards lowering the cost of living. Here is an example of how the abolition, or reduction, of tariff affects this cost. The Finance Minister states that it will mean over $30,000,000 less revenue, but it also means as much, and probably twice as much more, that will not be paid by the consumers to Canadian manufacturers, for which, I claim no adequate equivalent has heretofore been given. Having saved that much, probably $75,000,000 or $80,000,000, the public will be the gainers to that extent. The Government can acquire a large proportion of the money thus saved by direct taxation; the public will then be no worse off, and the revenue will have gained by that much. If this immense saving can be made by abolishing 7½ per cent, what would it mean if the duties of fifteen, twenty, thirty or thirty-five per cent on various articles were abolished or materially reduced? Although the revenue from customs duties would be reduced, the people would be far better able to make up that reduction in other ways and have millions to spare. The manufacturers, of course, would lose by such a policy, but is the public bound to continue bolstering them up everlastingly, especially when they claim that American goods are higher in price than the articles which they produce —an inconsistent stand because if the contention were true no protection at all would be required by them, Canadian goods would protect themselves by their cheapness, but there would be no revenue as articles would not be imported from a higher-priced market. The contention, however, that American goods are higher in price than Canadian is refuted by the large revenue obtained through the customs duties on imported goods which it is expected will reach $167,000,000 this year, but will represent fully $200,000,000 more which will be paid to the manufacturers by the consumers with very little to show for it.

With reference to the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) it is not even as specific as the amendment to the last Budget, and, as before remarked, it has been practically repudiated by many of the Liberals themselves who have spoken in the debate with at least one outstanding exception, the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), who has qualified for a seat at this end of the Chamber and might now very well sit with the hon. member for Assinboia (Mr. Gould) the views of both hon. gentlemen, after all, being very much alike on tariff matters.

The remarks I made during the debate on the Address have been fully justified. Eastern Liberals are not unanimous in their low-tariff professions if we are to take them at their own words. It is regrettable that a second amendment cannot be made to the Budget. The only one allowed has been monopolized by the Liberal party and with us it is therefore a case of Hobson's choice. My only recourse—by way of protest against what the Budget does not contain with respect to the tariff—is to vote for the amendment; I would do so with much greater enthusiasm had it been of the nature that I have indicated.

It has been claimed that direct taxation is not practicable, and that the payment of direct taxes is evaded. So far, experience to some extent probably justifies this statement. Mr. Breadner, Commissioner of Taxation, however, informed the members of this House a few days ago that he was getting his organization in such shape that before very long not a single man to whom the taxation applies would escape. Naturally it will take some time to apply a new principle, but there is no reason to doubt that if proper methods were used sufficient revenue would be obtained in this way and the people themselves would save money; they would know what they were paying and would naturally take more interest in observing how the expenditures were made.

With regard to a land value tax, the present municipal organizations could be utilized to a large extent for collection purposes. All the municipalities obtain their revenues by means of direct taxation and do not appear to experience any great difficulty in collecting them.

I intend to follow the example of the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Stacey) in one respect, and to state where I stand

on the tariff. That hon. member has declared himself for protection; I am for low tariff; and, in the case of the necessities of life, and the tools, implements and machininery required for production and the development of natural resources, I advocate that there should be no tariff at all. The revenue should be made up by a direct levy on land values, and where that is not possible recourse should be had to a tax on incomes, excess business profits or any other direct means considered advisable. The taxes should be proportionate to the financial standing of the citizens of the country—who are in duty bound to meet their share of the public requirements—and to their ability to meet the demand made upon them. In other words, I support the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, which is not a farmer or class platform, notwithstanding what has been said about it. Although it has emanated from the farmers' organization it does not contain a single clause asking for special privileges for farmers, but is wholly national in its character.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, from the very inception of this debate, hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have vied with each other in bestowing their congratulations on the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) in connection with his Budget speech, which was also his maiden speech in this House. I cordially join with my hon. friends on this side in paying my tribute of admiration and esteem to the hon. Minister of Finance, in doing homage to his great powers of exposition, and in complimenting him upon his rapid advance towards the highest summits of the administration. He had to plead before us a most difficult and thankless case; he had to win approval for the financial position of the country, which an extravagant and unpopular Government had created through nine years of improvident and reckless administration. He acquitted himself admirably, and if the arguments that he has put forward failed to force conviction on the minds of every one in this House or in the country, he has none the less succeeded, by dint of hard work and dogged pertinacity in discharging his duties in connection with the Budget in such an able manner as to cause his friends and admirers on the Government side spontaneously to say "that he had courage."

I may pass over in silence the obligations to which we are committed through our participation in the war and which must be lived up to by Canada. Our people have given an admirable example of sacrificial devotedness and heroism, both on the battle fields and in the many domains of war charities. Now, a most sacred duty is devolved on the Government of paying off the enormous debts that have been piled up within the last few years, and bridging over the yawning chasm of our obligations, so as to allow our young nation to steer its steady course towards future progress and prosperity. I shall make no comment on the extravagant and useless expenditures incurred through the enforcement of that unforgettable conscription policy over which such sharp contests have occurred. I know that we must accept accomplished facts, and it behooves us now to bend all our energies, our goodwill towards the supreme duty of the moment, the payment of the heavy war debt under which we are staggering.

The predecessor of the hon. Minister of Finance, the great finance minister of 1919, had taught us that in order to reach that goal, two things were required: production and thrift.

The people nobly responded to his call. A hurried glance taken at the speech of the Minister of Finance and at the inventory of our national wealth would convince us that great activity is being displayed in all our industries, agricultural, manufacturing, mining and others. The Canadian people might have dispensed with such advice, and their daily achievements in the field of labour, their intelligent efforts, their traditional qualities, energy, industry and thrift are examples which the Government might well have taken inspiration from. Instead of making eloquent speeches, instead of lecturing the people, the Unionist Government might have improved the efficacious examples of sound administration, and made their policy tally with those practical doctrines of production and wise economy.

In none of their departments did the Government practise economy. I charge the Government with having squandered public moneys in appropriating, since the armistice was signed, for the upkeep of an army in Canada, and in order to make a display of militarism a sum of $12,000,000. We were under the impression that the war, since it was brought to a triumphant conclusion by the Allied armies, would once for all rid the world of the plague of militarism.

Let us forever crush that combative and barbarous nation whose creed was that pernicious doctrine that "Might is Right,"

and, whatever be the extent of the sacrifice, let us emblazon throughout the Christian world those grand words of Christian civilization which shine in blazing letters upon the motherland's flag: " Dieu et mon Droit."

Hon. Mr. A. BELAND (Beauce): Hear, hear!

Mr. FORTIER (Translation): That is the ideal for which the sons of Canada crossed the seas and shed their blood on the plains of Flanders. A British statesman said recently: "Our rulers have failed to notice that the reason why our soldiers so gallantly fought was that they meant to kill war itself forever."

There can be no less justifiable an expenditure of public money than this enormous sum for a permanent army. If there be any expenditure censured by public opinion that is the one. Why, it is in a young country like ours, having scarcely 8,000,000 of people, covering an immense territory, in a country abounding in all kinds of ntaural resources, but remaining unproductive until the genius and labour of mankind do develop them, it is in this country that has almost ruined itself through its sacrifice of men and of money to crush the monster of militarism that we are to encumber the annual budget by the useless expenditure of $12,000,000, in order to keep up a standing army?

The finest movement made by our soldiers returned home from the battlefields was that of seeking their civil re-establishment, of laying aside the old uniform to put on the workingman's livery and to set themselves to those useful occupations which go to create the country's prosperity. I cannot really see a finer example given to the whole world of that loyalty to the great anti-militarist principles which fill the souls throughout the Allies' countries than the one given by the two highest generals of both Canada and the United States. Indeed recent history tells us that, when the commander-in-chief of the American army returned to his country, his brow crowned with glory, he immediately laid down his sword. The next day following his landing, he threw off his glorious insignia to resume among his fellow-citizens his usual share of labour and of activity and to beneficially serve his country in the walks of peace. Recently the Canadian press gave us the welcome information that the chief commanding officer of the Canadian Army, Sir Arthur Currie, had also laid aside his arms to endorse the honourable toga of Principal of McGill University. By such an admirable behaviour, these generals and privates who, once returned home, become the masters in useful and practical enterprises, these high servants of true prosperity, should win the approval of our statesmen. The Government should take its cue from General Currie, who declines the position of chief of the army in days of peace in order to accept that of being the principal of an university.

Moreover, this spectacle of our generals and of our privates recall a fact of ancient history. In the days when Rome was waging war against the Æqui, in the 5th century, B.C., fortune was adverse to the Roman armies; Consul Minucius' troops were surrounded in the mountains; their destruction was at hand. In her dismay, Rome thought of Cincinnatus. He was then retired upon his small not of some 4 acres, where he lived most frugally. Rome's envoys found the hero bent upon his spade. He put on his Roman toga to receive the Senate's orders; he was made dictator; he returned to the old city of Romulus; he organized a new army. He flied to the battlefield, crushed the Æqui, saved the consul and his army, exalted in power and in glory, Rome, his fatherland; then he returned to his plough.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. FORTIER: That was the action of a great soul. History admired it and has taken pleasure in relating it to the following centuries. Indeed it seems to me that the spirit of Cincinnatus still lives in the minds of our soldiers. After 4 years of bloody and freedom-giving warfare, they have melted their cannons into ploughshares and, after distinguishing themselves as liberators, they have set themselves to the task of producing the daily bread for their country.

Another expenditure, improvident, useless and contrary to the interests of this country, is that brought about by the nationalization of the railways. Such a policy is false in principle; it is, moreover, disastrous in its sequel. That which in our country contributes to render this nationalization impracticable, is the very same cause which has made of such a policy the greatest failure of our neighbours of the republic to the south of us. It has been demonstrated here, through an experience acquired at our own expense, that Government operation of a railroad system, such as the Canadian Northern for instance, among other lines operated by private companies, constitutes an almost unwieldy ineffective and most expensive public service.

Did not the Minister of Railways corroborate this theory recently by imparting to the House the surprising information that the first year's operation of the Government-owned railways leaves us with a deficit of $47,000,000.

Nowhere in the different departments has the Government practised the same doctrine of economy it has been preaching to the people. The Ministry has spent money lavishly for undertakings of a public nature for which no urgent necessity was shown, such as the shipbuilding programme and the regrettable adventure in state ownership of railways. The taxes levied by the new Budget, rendered necessary by the Government's extravagance, are odious to the entire people, who, with one voice, roundly condemn them. It is with the most heartfelt sincerity that I bring my support to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). I note with pleasure that this amendment expounds the same doctrine as that espoused by the Liberal party in the resolution adopted at the great convention of August, 1919.

The fiscal policy of the Liberal party, responsible for Canada's prosperity during the fifteen years of Laurier's administration, is alone capable of correcting the many evils with which we are beset—the high cost of living and the social unrest which has followed in the wake of the late war. This policy, adopted unanimously by the entire Liberal party at the most representative, the most imposing, the most enthusiastic convention that ever has been seen, that perhaps ever will be seen, in our political history, composed of delegates from every part of the country, is the policy that the voters of this country will shortly carry to triumph at the polls, since an election must be held in the near future.

I cannot keep expressing my deep conviction that this Government will very shortly be forced to go to the people. This is very likely the last session of the present Parliament. At all events, one thing is certain: the people want this session to be the last, and they want a general election this year. My opinion that an election is coming in the fall is not the result of any ministerial pronouncement; it is rather the effect of an official denial. In the course of the present debate the hon. Minister of Marine said:

"Speaking for the Government, it has been said before, but I will state it again now, there is no reason why we should go to the country until the full term of this Parliament has expired."

This statement reveals the ardent wishes of certain members of the Cabinet and of their faithful friends on the Government side; their attitude, however, is not justified by present conditions; they are flying in the face of public opinion. Moreover, the exact date of an election has always been guarded with the greatest secrecy by those in power, up to the very day of dissolution. Such is the custom followed in our political life, so there is nothing to be astonished at if the Government choose to make an official denial of its intentions in this respect the better to mislead the Opposition.

But the people have their rights. We have had no election, no domestic policy, since 1911. The 1917 election had only one object: carry on the war. The people were promised that Union Government would be instituted for that sole purpose and that once its special mission accomplished Parliament would be dissolved and a policy of reconstruction and peace-time administration submitted to the country.

The unionist idea was borrowed elsewhere. Did we get it from the United Kingdom? At any rate it was on his return from England that the Prime Minister announced his intention of forming a Union Government since he had failed in his attempt to bring about a coalition Ministry in this country.

Shortly after the armistice the British Government went to the polls. The war was over and Lloyd George did not wish to sit at the Peace Conference until he had redeemed his pledge to the British people.

Here in Canada, after November 11th, 1918, the Union Governement declared that it was in duty bound to carry on until after demobilisation, until the soldiers were returned to their homes. An election, said the Governement, should not be held until the soldiers were back from the trenches and were able to have their say on public questions. We arrived at this state of things some time ago and still the Governement despite its former promises and solemn pledges, insists on staying in office.

However, this stupid resistance to public opinion cannot last. The people have their rights and they will see to it that the Government is shamed into keeping its word. To-day the most important Cabinet offices have no incumbent; the Eastern Provinces are practically unrepresented at the Council table. Not one of the new ministers is willing to risk a bye-election.

During the numerous bye-elections which were held lately, people everywhere condemned the policy of the Union Government. The administration do not inspire confidence any more and is in duty bound to break up Parliament now and to appeal to the people.

Mr. DUFF: On behalf of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) I beg to move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. (Saturday).

Monday, May 31, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

MUNITIONS RESOURCES COMMISSION.

FINAL REPORT PRESENTED—COMMISSION DISSOLVED.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I beg to lay on the Table the final report, together with a number of interim reports, of the Munitions Resources Commission. I understand that there is a sufficient supply of these reports to enable each hon. member to obtain a copy. I also beg to lay on the Table copy of an Order in Council dissolving the commission, which has now completed its work.

COPY OF ORDER IN COUNCIL TABLED.

P.C. No. 1005, dated May 20, 1920, respecting engagement of seamen in the Royal Canadian Navy.

NORTHWEST GAME ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 151, to amend the Northwest Game Act.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amendment is merely to change the seasons for the hunting of certain animals in the Northwest Territories, in one case to make them comply with the advancing sun, and in another case to make them the same as in British Columbia.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

[Mr. Fortier.]

YUKON PLACER MINING ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 152, to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The purpose of this amendment is to enlarge the opportunities of placer mining in the Yukon. The Yukon has been pretty well developed to its capacity, or rather, I should say, as that might be a dangerous statement, that it has been developed so far that now the prospect of the placer mining worker is not so alluring as it was. This Bill enlarges the area on new creeks and old creeks over which the miner may prospect and enlarges also the rights for which he may record.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SENATE BILL.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 148 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lockhart Pierce Sutton.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

THE WEST INDIES CONFERENCE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): May I ask my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, what is the object of the present conference in Ottawa between the delegates of the West Indies and the Canadian Government? Is the object purely a commercial one, or is there something else?

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The object is briefly as follows: In 1912, a conference was held which resulted in the arrangement of a ten years' reciprocal trade agreement between Canada and the West Indies. That agreement has still two years to run. Transport and cable facilities were also arranged for at the same conference. It has been considered wise that we should meet together a little in advance of the time when the old arrangement would expire, to take into consideration exactly the same subjects, so what is being considered, and what will be considered, at the present conference is, first, the trade relations of the two sections of the Empire as regards preference and objects or lists of preference; second, the improvement of transport facilities, both as to passengers and freights, making them

more uniform, and, if possible, more widely distributed, and more commodious; third, the improvement of cable facilities, which have been very poor during the past year or two, and which it is necessary to have improved in the interests of trade and communication. Those are the three matters, and those alone, which are under consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to be allowed to implement my question. I see by the press that there is quite a campaign in favour of the political annexation of the West Indies to Canada. Could my right hon. friend give the House any information he may have on the subject, or has he given us all the information?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I thought I met my hon. friend's question when I explained the three objects of the conference, and said that those, and those alone, were the objects of the conference. The Government is not responsible for individual or associated campaigns, real or fictitious, for annexation.

NEWSPRINT SUPPLY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): May I ask the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) whether he has received any communication from the United States Government relative to the appointment of a commission to inquire into the matter of newsprint, that is to say, into the pulp and paper question, and, if so, whether any action has been taken, and whether any papers which there may be in connection with the matter will be brought down?

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I may inform my hon. friend that I have no information in the matter apart from what has been reported in the public press.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 128 (from the Senate), for the relief of Francis Charles Dean.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 129 (from the Senate), for the relief of John James Garrison.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 130 (from the Senate), for the relief of Dora Lumsden MacLaurin.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 133 (from the Senate), for the relief of Edith Sarah Bell.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 134 (from the Senate), for the relief of Albert Graham Elson.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 132 (from the Senate), respecting the Army and Navy Veterans in Canada. —Mr. Blake.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 136 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Lyon Lincoln Cobbin.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. W. B. COLE.

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Is W. B. Cole employed in the Civil Service Commission or the Organization Branch of that Commission?
2. If so, who were his antecedents?
3. Was he previously engaged in any department in the Civil Service?
4. If so, what were his duties and what were the reasons for his leaving said department?
5. Through what medium did he become an employee of the Civil Service Commission?
6. What university or college, if any, has he graduated from, or what educational training has he received?
7. What duties does he perform in his present position, what special qualifications has he to fit him for the position he occupies, and what are his responsibilities?
8. What remuneration does he receive from the Civil Service Commission?
9. Has he anything to do with the classification of any department or departments?
10. If so, what departments or branches?

Rt. HON. Mr. SIFTON:

1. Yes.
2. English parentage.
3. Yes.
4. As leveller with the International Boundary Commission; map compilation in the Chief Geographers Office, and correspondence, auditing and progress charts in the Superintending Accountants Branch, Department of the Interior; loaned to the Civil Service Commission as a helper on classification work, and as ability to perform the required duties was demonstrated, the transfer of Mr. Cole to the staff of the Civil Service Commission was requested.
5. By temporary loan, trial and transfer.
6. Educational training has consisted of public school course, matriculation and a course in Civil Engineering with the International Correspondence Schools, followed by intensive reading and study on the ground in connection with organization classification and efficiency methods.
7. Under supervision, assisting in making investigations and surveys and preparing reports thereon. His special qualifications

consist of twenty years' office, business and engineering experience, several years of which was spent with various departments of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and understudying the Industrial Engineers employed by the Civil Service Commission for the purpose of classifying the Canadian Civil Service. At present employed, under direction, in maintaining the work of the Organization Branch in connection with the departments assigned.

8. $1,600 per annum plus such cost of living bonus as may be paid according to law.

9. Yes.

10. Under direct supervision the classification of parts of:

(a) Board of Pension Commissioners.

(b) Department of Marine.

(c) Department of Naval Service.

COMMONS CHAMBER—CENTRAL FLOORING.

*Mr BROUILLARD:

1. Of what material is the flooring in the centre of the new Commons Chamber composed, and where did it originally come from?

2. What price was paid for the said flooring per unit of measure, or of weight?

3. What material was used to fill in the spaces between the boards in the said floor, and where did this filling originally come from?

4. What price was paid for the said filling per unit of measure, or of weight?

5. What was the total cost of the said floor laid in position, and before being covered by a carpet?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Teak with small ebony strips; the teak is imported from India; the ebony cannot trace origin of this particular lot, the tree is found in India, Burmah, South Africa and West Indies. This floor was purchased in the regular manner from wholesale lumber dealers by the contractor who manufactured and laid it. It is impossible to state the exact origin of the materials.

2. $1.74 per superficial foot.

3. Ebony, as answered by answer to question number 1.

4. Average cost of ebony is 20 cents a pound or 4.2 cents per lineal foot which is included in unit cost of floor as given in answer to question number 2.

5. $2,955.

TOWER OF PARLIAMENT BUILDING.

*Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has the attention of the Government been drawn to a despatch from Ottawa which appeared in the Montreal Gazette on May 10 last, as follows:—

"Cylinder for Tower.

"Ottawa Masonic Event Given Historic Significance.

"Ottawa, May 8.—The visit of Zetland Lodge, A.F. and A.M., Toronto, to the Lodge of Fidelity here has taken historic craft significance. Following a visit to the Parliament Buildings yesterday morning, when the members of the two lodges were shown through the buildings by Mr. J. B. Hunter, Deputy Minister of Public Works, and Mr. John Pearson, the architect, it was arranged that a record of the visit should be placed in a cylinder and be deposited in the masonry of the tower of the building. This cylinder will contain the names of the officers of Zetland Lodge, of the visitors, and of the officers of Fidelity Lodge, whose guests they were while in the city."

2. With whom was the arrangement made to deposit Masonic records in the masonry of the tower of the new Parliament Building, and who authorized the making of such an arrangement?

3. Will other societies in Canada be accorded a like privilege?

4. If so, with whom should the necessary arrangements be made, and when should the records be ready for deposit in the masonry of the tower of the said Parliament Building?

5. If other societies will not be accorded the privilege mentioned, on what ground is discrimination made in favour of the Masonic Society?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.

2. No arrangement has been made and there was no such suggestion.

3, 4, and 5. Answered by answer to question No. 2.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS ON INDIAN RESERVES.

Mr. JOHNSTON:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to erect any new school buildings on Indian reserves this year?

2. If so, how many, on what reserves and in which federal constituency?

3. Are the new buildings to replace the old buildings?

4. If so, when were the old buildings erected?

5. Is it the intention of the Government to erect a new school building on Gordon's Indian Reserve, Saskatchewan, this year?

6. Is it a fact that an amount was placed in the Estimates in the year 1914 for the erection of a new school building on this reserve?

7. Is it a fact that the present school building is not large enough to accommodate nearly all the Indian children applying for admittance?

8. Is it a fact that the present building is unsanitary, without proper drainage, water supply, heating and ventilation?

9. Is it a fact that there were fifty-three cases of influenza amongst the pupils of this school during the winter of 1918-19, resulting in three deaths; that they have since had typhoid and other infectious diseases, and that there is not a spare room in the building for taking care of sick pupils?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes.

2. Two. Peguis Reserve, Selkirk, Man.; Walpole Island Reserve, Kent, Ont.

3. Perguis Center—a new school building. The other to replace an old building.

4. Walpole Island, 1882.

5. Final decision has not been made.

6. Yes.

7. A larger school building would be more serviceable.

8. The present building was erected in 1894. Modern methods of drainage, etc., would, undoubtedly be more satisfactory.

9. Only two deaths from influenza occurred during the winter of 1918-19, and two cases of typhoid were reported upon during November of last year.

BOARD OF PENSION COMMISSIONERS' EMPLOYEES.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. What is the nature of the employment, the respective salaries and war records of the following gentlemen who are employed by the Pensions Board; K. Archibald, J. J. Patton, W. O. Gliddon, W. H. Measures, F. C. Baker, R. Belanger, J. C. Germain, J. Brown, C. Hagan, J. Little, J. B. Lewis, F. C. Knowles, L. King, J. Sleeman, J. Williams, A. C. McAnulty, J. Miller, C. Belton?

2. Was the minister, during last session, asked as to whether the service of the said gentlemen could be dispensed with and their positions filled by returned soldiers?

3. If so, why has such procedure not been carried out?

4. How many female clerks are there in the said board who (a) receive a salary of less than $900, per annum, and (b) receive over $900 per annum?

5. Could not the services of said female clerks be dispensed with and these positions filled by returned soldiers?

Mr. HUGH CLARK:

1. K. Archibald, director and departmental solicitor, salary $4,800 per annum. No military service. Twice rejected, certified physically unfit by Standing Medical Board, Militia Headquarters, M.D. No. 4, Montreal, 25-10-16; J. A. W. Paton, assistant secretary, salary $2,900 per annum. No military service. Three times rejected; Dr. W. O. Gliddon, assistant medical adviser, salary $4,000 per annum. No military service. Neurological expert; W. H. Measures, principal clerk, salary $1,800 per annum. Service in Canada, C.O.T.C. 1-1-16 to 28-1-18. Seconded for duty in War Committee of the Cabinet, Ottawa, as chief clerk. Enlisted Toronto, 25-11-15. Rejected on account of congenital disease of the eyes. Joined Canadian Officers Training Co. (University of Toronto Contingent). Taken on subordinate staff M.D. No. 2, 1-1-16, employed as orderly room sergeant, School of Musketry, M.D. No. 2, and confidential clerk to Col. Vincent Massey. Employment will cease 31-7-20; F. C. Baker, head clerk, salary $2,200 per annum. Service with Permanent Force 7-10-10 to 30-4-18. Twelve years with Imperial Army, South African war, 1900-1902. Transfer to C.E.F., refused by Militia Headquarters. Seconded to B.P.C., 1-10-16; R. Belanger, senior clerk, salary $1,700 per annum. No military service; Capt. W. L. Germaine, head clerk, salary $2,900 per annum. Service in Canada, C.A.P.C. and C.A.S.C. 27-5-15 to 28-2-17, age 49, volunteered for service overseas but was retained in Canada for duty by the Military Authorities; H. J. Brown, accountant clerk, salary $1,100 per annum. Service in Canada, England and France 1-9-15 to 25-11-18. Awarded M.M. C. Hagan, senior clerk, salary $1,400 per annum. Service in Canada, Permanent Force 2-6-15 to 30-4-18. Physically unfit; J. Kittle, senior clerk, salary $1,800 per annum. Service in Canada. Permanent Force and 72nd Battery. C.E.F., 12-6-16 to 28-12-17. Physically unfit; A. Lewis, senior clerk, salary $1,400 per annum. Service Permanent Force, Canada, 6-12-15 to 17-11-17 and R.A.F. Canada, 18-11-17 to 11-1-19; F. C. Knowles, not employed in B.P.C.; Capt. E. King, head clerk, salary $2,900. Enlisted Permanent Force 14-9-14. Discharged 23-1-17. Gazetted Captain Active Militia 24-1-17. Seconded for duty to B.P.C. Age 43; G. A. Sleeman, senior statistical clerk, salary $1,700 per annum. No military service. Age 53. Transferred from Pensions and Claims Board to B.P.C. 1-10-16; P. Williams, clerk, salary $1,100 per annum. No military service. Physically unfit; C. A. McAnulty, senior clerk, salary $1,300 per annum. Under age but served in R.A.F. Canada 20-3-18 to 28-1-19; J. Miller, senior clerk, salary $1,300. Service Permanent Force, Canada, 22-4-16 to 1-4-18; Col. C. W. Belton, medical adviser, salary $5,000 per annum. Permanent Force, Canada, 17-6-17 to date.

2. A request was made to the Government in the course of debate in the House of Commons that a careful inquiry be made into the matter of staff of the Board of Pension Commissioners with a view to replacing with men of overseas service, and who are capable, those members of the staff who had no overseas service.

3. The services of several members of the staff who were not returned soldiers have been dispensed with since last session. It is the policy of the Board of Pension Com-

missioners ultimately to retain only returned soldiers in its employ, but the work in connection with demobilization required the retention of the men above mentioned who are thoroughly conversant with pension work. None but returned soldiers are now being engaged or have been engaged during the past year.

At present the male staff of the board over the age of 18 years numbers 305. Of this number 266 saw service overseas; 17 saw service only in Canada; 5 were medically unfit; 7 were in the Permanent Force; 5 were over military age; 1 was honourably exempted; 4 saw no service at all.

4. (a) Number of female clerks who receive a salary of less than $900 per annum, 542.

(b) Number of female clerks who receive a salary of over $900 per annum, 101.

5. Any female clerks whose services can be dispensed with and their places filled by returned soldiers at a similar salary will be dispensed with. As many of these female clerks are stenographers and filing clerks their services are in most cases indispensable.

NEW PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

*Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. What was the total cost of the new Government station and heating plant on Cliff and Vittoria streets, Ottawa?

2. What was the total cost of the tunnel and pipes leading from the said heating plant to the Parliament Buildings and to other Government buildings?

3. Does the total cost of the said heating station, plant, tunnel and pipes form part of the new Parliament Building?

4. What has been the cost of the latter building to date?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. $538,921.04.

2. Total cost of tunnel, $157,166.97; cost of pipes in tunnel unknown, as they form portion of the $386,000 contract for heating and ventilating the Parliament Buildings.

3. Yes.

4. $7,361,360.56.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. LEGER:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the closing of the life-saving station at Richibuctoo Beach, in the county of Kent, N.B.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. ANDREWS:

1. What is the average cost per settler to the Government for which there will be no return from the settler in administering the Land Settlement Act to date?

[Mr. H. Clark.]

2. How does this cost compare with that of bringing Central Europeans to Canada during the Laurier Administration?

3. Is the Land Settlement Act regarded by the Government as a re-establishment scheme for returned soldiers or a colonization and agricultural scheme?

4. What amount of money has been paid by the board to the Provincial Government of Manitoba for land purchased under the Soldier Settlement Act?

5. What amount of money has been paid by the board as purchase price for land through the firm of Messrs. Kennedy, Kennedy & Kennedy, barristers, Winnipeg?

6. How many parcels of land submitted to the board by Messrs. Allan, Killam & McKay, agents, of Winnipeg, Manitoba, were purchased by the board, and how many rejected?

7. How do these figures compare with purchases through other agents at the time commission for purchases was allowed?

THE BUDGET.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON THE ANNUAL STATEMENT PRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

The House resumed, from Friday, May 28, the debate on the motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make my contribution to the debate on the Budget, let me say at the outset that I hope to detain the House for no very great length of time. We have been debating the matter now for almost two weeks and naturally there remains little that can be added to the discussion that has already taken place. Before I come to discuss the proposals outlined in the speech delivered by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), I wish to refer briefly to some of the criticisms directed against our Progressive group at this end of the Chamber by some hon. members on the other side of the House.

I have in mind particularly at the present time the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) who spoke for almost two hours in this Chamber and, during the greater part of his speech, endeavoured to describe, or to criticise, certain actions of the grain growers and the farmers, which certainly was not relevant to the subject of debate. The criticisms were, I might add, very far wide of the mark indeed.

My hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) seems to be very much exercised over the continuation of the Canada Wheat Board. He attributes the formation of that board, and the effort to maintain it, to the farmers of

this country. I believe he even suggested that some of the members who sit behind me were desirous of seeing this board continued. Well in that regard, I am expressing my own personal opinion, and I think the opinion of those who sit around me, when I say that Government control in matters of this kind is not desirable as a permanent policy. My hon. friend, however, saw fit to take a different position. He apparently is quite desirous that this control shall cease at the earliest possible moment. I would suggest to him that he consult the Government as to what their policy for the future in the matter is. It does not lie with members on this side of the House, nor does it lie with the members particularly sitting around me, to say what the policy of the Government is to be in this respect. I would suggest to my hon. friend that if he is very anxious that this control should cease he might consult the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Commons who, I understand, is strongly in favour of the continuation of the board. I would also suggest that he keep his eye on the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) and the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) because if he does he may learn that the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Immigration and Colonization are perhaps now harbouring the thought of maintaining this control as a permanent policy in order that they can appeal to the farmers of Canada with it as an offset to their tariff demands. I would suggest that consideration to my hon. friend.

My hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) also saw fit to refer to the profits that had been made by the farmers' organizations and particularly that one with which I am associated. I do not know that this is a subject that is of much interest in this debate to the members of the House. I desire to say, however, that I will be very glad indeed to give my hon. friend, at any time, all the information he desires on that point and I certainly hope it will lead him to a more correct understanding than that which he displayed in his criticism. His criticism, based upon the statement that a profit of 211 per cent was made by the terminal elevator operated by the United Grain Growers, is altogether wide of the mark. This elevator is leased from the Canadian Pacific railway and I wish to point out to my hon. friend if he wishes to be fair in the matter that back of that there is an investment of over $2,000,000 in country elevators for the purpose of gathering the grain that is sent to this terminal elevator. If my hon. friend wishes to be fair he must take that into account in any criticism he makes of it.

He also referred to the profits made by the Grain Growers Export Company of New York, a subject which also furnished a fruitful topic to the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). It is true we have an export company in New York. It is organized under the New York state laws. It is true that with a capital of $100,000 the company earned $500,000 in 1915. But the explanation lies in this, that the company enjoyed exceptional privileges of credit. Our bank loans ran very high and the total amount of grain that was handled and which furnished the profit mentioned, was over 86,000,000 bushels. I ask my hon. friend if less than one-half of one per cent on the turn-over which was the fact in this case is an excessive profit. If my hon. friend wants to be fair I would suggest this other consideration, Mr. Speaker: I do not like at any time to parade before the public my patriotism or the patriotism of my friends but I think it may be interesting to my hon. friend to know that when the stress and trouble in connection with food supplies came upon us, when the Allies centralized their organization in Europe and extended their organization in America to handle grain, the Grain Growers Export Company, these profiteers whom my hon. friend described, turned over for absolutely nothing in return, their whole organization to the Wheat Export Company representing the British Government in New York, and for twenty-two months we served that organization with no return save salaries and expenses. We purchased and forwarded on ocean vessels for them over 197,000,000 bushels of oats and as I have said, we got not one cent out of it.

My hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) also had something to say the other night. He, at any rate, spoke with a certainty of knowledge that leaves no doubt of conviction in his own mind regardless of whether he is able to successfully convince other members in the House.

An hon. MEMBER: Not much.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend seems to think that I am the abettor and the backer, and the supporter of the One Big Union idea in Canada. He even charged me with being responsible for sending Mrs. Rose Henderson to Timiskaming in order to assist in the election of my hon. friend from that

constituency (Mr. McDonald). I may say, Mr. Speaker, that it was practically the first time I ever heard of Mrs. Rose Henderson—I have not the privilege of the lady's acquaintance. My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) states that she is a very estimable lady although he does not agree with her views. On the face of it I think I would be prepared to accept the judgment of that hon. member in preference to that of my hon. friend from Algoma. Be that as it may, it was rather a cheap, shall I say, rather a small effort on the part of my hon. friend from Algoma. If he knows anything of my record in the public life of this country he knows that I do not do the sort of thing he described. I will tell you the probable reason for my hon. friend's attitude. He went himself into the constituency of Timiskaming to aid the Minister of the Interior, and others of the cabinet ministers, in preaching the gospel of Union Government, and I rather think that when he was there he contracted, or rather developed, an attack of political delirium tremens, and since then he has been imagining things. Well, that is not a very profitable business for my hon. friend. Personally I think the members of the O.B.U. are entirely misguided—it is a misguided movement. But I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness: The O.B.U. movement in this country is largely the product of unjust conditions in the life of the country. If my hon. friend desires to see it removed from the sphere of influence in Canadian affairs, let him direct his attention to the removal of the causes that led to the movement rather than indulge in criticism of those who have nothing whatever to do with it.

Now I come to the Budget. I am free to say that the Finance Minister did a useful piece of work for Canada when he frankly disclosed to the House and the country what the actual financial position of the Dominion is. Bearing in mind the vast stretches of Canada, and the fact that our people have been unaccustomed in the past to closely study national affairs, it takes a little time for this outstanding fact to be driven home to us: that the net debt of this country is over two and a quarter billions of dollars. My hon. friend, I think, also displayed some courage, in fact a great deal of courage, in imposing new taxation —he displayed a great deal of courage because much of his taxation is bad instead of good. Nevertheless it was perhaps an honest effort to get the money necessary to carry on the business of the country. Now my hon. friend stated that the Estimates already submitted for the year—as indeed the House was aware from information already in its possession—called for an expenditure of $550,000,000, and the Supplementary Estimates have yet to be presented. Against that he proposes to raise this year $381,000,000 by taxation of various kinds. As hon. members can see at a glance that leaves a very coniderable difference, and my hon. friend, the Finance Minister, hopes to make this up in large degree by balances that are due from the Motherland. Well, this simply emphasizes, more strongly than anything else could, the rather serious financial condition that Canada is in at the present time. We will require to raise probably at least $350,000,000 a year, for several years to come, and the amount may easily reach $400,000,000.

Now, as my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) pointed out, there are two aspects of this question: You can have expenditure and you can devise ways and means of taxation to meet that expenditure; but you will accomplish the same purpose, Mr. Speaker, if you cut down your expenditure, and I claim that is what we should endeavour to do in this country. I say that absolutely the first essential for the Government of Canada to undertake is to bring our national expenditure within the limits of our national income. We cannot go on borrowing; and when you contemplate raising $400,000,000 a year from the Canadian people for federal purposes it certainly emphasizes the necessity of reducing our expenditure in every possible way. We find in the Estimates large items for public works, for harbours, and for the Militia. Many of these—some of them at any rate—are in excess of what the Estimates were in the pre-war period. If we are to get right on this matter, the Government must economize. We must drastically prune our expenditures down to the very last point; we must do simply what an individual has to do in similar circumstances.

My hon. friend, the Finance Minister, has imposed some new taxation, and I am bound to say that this taxation will press most heavily upon the people of this country who are least able to bear it. The Minister of the Interior rather endeavoured to convey the impression that this new taxation was altogether in the way of luxury taxes. It is not a luxury tax; it is as much, and even more, a tax upon the necessaries of life than it is on luxuries. A $45 suit of clothes

a luxury! Why, with the increased cost of living that represents not more than $20 in value before the war, and even then it would require a very great stretch of imagination to conceive that a $20 suit was a luxury. But these taxes weigh heavily in other ways. In the case of a $45 suit a tax of ten per cent on the full value; in the case of a cap costing more than $2, ten per cent on the full value. Well, we have a cold climate in the West, and we require caps there for several months in the year, and I want to tell the Finance Minister that you cannot get a cap that will protect you from the rigours of a western winter for $2 or anything like that sum. Consequently every farmer who has a family, and every working man who has a family and struggling hard, it may be, to clothe and feed them when he goes out to purchase these necessary supplies for himself and his children has to pay this additional tax. Is that lessening the cost of living? Is it not rather imposing an additional heavy burden upon those who are already finding it extremely difficult to make both ends meet? But in these proposals we find that the same rate of taxation is imposed on velvets, silks and silk embroideries, cut glass and ivory handled knives as is imposed on such actual necessaries as woollens, cottons, and boots and shoes. That seems to me to be rather an unfair discrimination against the man of limited means.

Now, my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) has reduced the business profits tax. I think there is something to be said against the principle of such a tax as a peace measure; but there was absolutely nothing to be said against it as a war measure of taxation. The fact of the matter is, however, that we have collected since the outbreak of war not one-quarter, yes, not one-tenth the amount of business profit tax that should have been collected from those who had the opportunity to make excessive profits during the war.

In regard to the income tax, the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) takes considerable credit to himself for increasing it. What is the actual increase under the proposal he has brought down? The man with an income of $5,000 will pay $6 more tax that he does at present; the man with an income of $10,000 will pay $29.50 more; the man with an income of $20,000 is burdened with an additional tax of $99.50; the man with an income of $50,000 will pay $459.50 more than now, and the man with an income of $100,000 will have $1,559.50 more extracted from his pocket. Is that a substantial increase in the income tax? Let us compare our figures with the relative figures under the British income tax law. In Great Britain a man with a $5,000 income is taxed $750, as against $126 under our system; a man with an income of $10,000 is taxed $2,250 in Great Britain, while in Canada he is taxed $619.50; the man who is favoured with an income of $20,000 pays in Great Britain an income tax of $6,812.50, but in Canada he pays $2,089.50; and the man enjoying an income of $100,000 in Great Britain pays $47,187 by way of income tax, compared with our rate of $32,749.

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) took a great deal of pleasure the other evening in presenting to this House the fact that on a $500,000 income we imposed a heavier tax than did the British authorities. But, Sir, we have very few people in this country whose incomes are $500,000 or over; while we have a great many whose incomes range from $10,000 to $100,000 a year. The new income tax proposal that the Government brings down places practically no additional burden on these people; the whole purpose and tenor of its Budget is to make the man least able to pay pay more, while the man best able to pay goes comparatively free. And then my hon. friends wonder at the unrest in this country!

Mr. COPP: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: Another very important announcement in the Budget was the Government's policy on the tariff question. For a long time there had been considerable doubt in the public mind as to where the Government were eventually going to land in the matter of a tariff policy; and there was a good deal of heart searching and anxiety on the part of a good many of my hon. friends opposite—the member for Simoce North (Mr. Currie) for instance, and several others. But whatever struggle may have gone on behind the scenes, the matter is now settled; at any rate, we must accept the declaration of policy made by the Minister of Finance. Undoubtedly there were two conflicting elements among the Government's supporters in regard to this question: There were those who believe in a low tariff policy; there were those who believe in a policy of adequate protection.

And I can well conceive the difficulties of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) and my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) in reaching a decision upon the question, for during the period

that has elapsed since last autumn, when a declaration of policy was looked for, considerable water has run under the bridge. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) has made some speeches throughout the country in an endeavour to feel out the public on this matter. Down in Quebec he told the shoe manufacturers: "We must have a policy of adequate protection for Canadian industries." In Kingston a little later he was speaking in favour of "moderate" protection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman excuse me? I would ask him to quote what I said in Quebec. I did not use the word "adequate" at all. If he is ascribing to me certain statements, much the fairer way would be for him to quote exactly what, I said, particularly if he is endeavouring to distinguish between what I said in one place and what I said in another. As a matter of fact, there was no distinction whatever.

Mr. CRERAR: I was relying on press reports of what my hon. friend stated. But at Kingston I think he said that he was in favour of a system of moderate protection, while in Winnipeg apparently he was in favour of a tariff for revenue. I shall read to the House what my hon. friend said on that occasion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said a tariff for revenue and also for protection.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend when in Winnipeg is reported by the Winnipeg Telegram to have stated:

> I am not a high protectionist; I never was; and I do not believe it appropriate to this Dominion. The reason why I will give you in a minute. I am not a free trader, I never was, and I am perfectly convinced that it is not appropriate to this Dominion now. I believe in a moderate tariff. I believe in a moderate tariff for purposes of revenue, especially at this time.

That is the statement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Go on.

Mr. CRERAR: I will continue the quotation:

> I believe in it as well for the purpose of assuring the maintenance and expansion of industry.

But my hon. friend believes in a "moderate tariff" for the purposes of revenue. I would like to know where my hon. friend stands on this question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Exactly there.

Mr. CRERAR: Well, if my hon. friend stands "exactly there," he gave a most remarkable performance in this Chamber the other night when he decried the fiscal policy of Great Britain; and if anything was lacking to make clear the policy of the Government on this tariff question, it was furnished in the speech made by the hon. Minister of the Interior during this debate. But, I say, the Government have finally cleared the decks for action; they have come out for the old National Policy of protection.

An hon. MEMBER: Who?

Mr. CRERAR: The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) has declared himself—my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Henders) has not yet declared himself; I would not just at present ally him with that proposition. The Government's policy, I say, has finally emerged from the clouds of doubt and suspicion and mistrust that enveloped it, and it stands revealed before the country. What is it? It is the old National Policy of protection.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: Nothing more. My hon. friends opposite applaud; they appreciate the fact that it is. I can well imagine the relief that comes to the minds of a good many of my hon. friends opposite because of this declaration of policy on the part of the Government; the matter is now clear. Well, Sir, I for one, welcome that declaration. The little group here which has the distinction of being called the Progressive group in this Parliament—there is no doubt where they stand on this tariff question. It is a question that we want to have discussed in Canada free from doubts and suspicions and mistrusts, and I welcome the emphatic declaration of the Government, made the other day, that they stand for the old National Policy, because now we know where we are at, and some of my friends on the opposite side who in the past have held low tariff views, also know, I take it, where they are at in this matter.

I now wish to deal at some length with the speech delivered by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) the other evening—one of the most remarkable performances, I am free to say, that has ever been made in this Parliament. My hon. friend set out to establish that free trade, so-called, in Great Britain had been a total failure. I think I am not incorrect in stating that summarized, his proposals practically fall under three headings. He sought to establish: first, that free trade had really retarded instead of helped British industry and British foreign trade and had made of

Britain a nation of remittance men; second, that it had made the lot of the British workingman worse instead of better, and third, that it had seriously injured, in fact, had almost ruined, British agriculture. I do not think I am doing my hon. friend any injustice when I state that that was the position he took. Well, I certainly admire his courage in undertaking the job that he did. I have a great respect for the debating ability of my hon. friend; on a good many occasions in the history of the Canadian House of Commons he has had to defend doubtful cases and he has done it with much ability. But I really do not think, Mr. Speaker, that he ever tackled as hard a proposition as he tackled the other night.

The Minister of the Interior talked a great deal about the balance of trade. He argued that a country that had an adverse balance of trade was in a very bad way, and he cited the fact that British trade practically since 1850, when the change in their fiscal policy took place, had been on the wrong side; and this was evidence of the deterioration of Great Britain. He particularly stressed the point that at the present time Great Britain was importing seven billion dollars' worth of goods a year and selling only three billion dollars' worth and that the United States was exporting eight billion dollars' worth of goods and importing only three billion dollars' worth. Well, these abnormal trade figures are unquestionably largely due to the war and to the conditions arising out of the war. Trade all over the world, industry, business, have been paralyzed, have been disturbed to a greater extent than ever before in the world's history; consequently I submit that an argument based upon the trade figures for 1919, for instance, is not sound. It is true that the balance of trade has been against Great Britain for a number of years, but it has also been against Germany, against France, against Italy, against Russia — all protected countries. I do not wish to weary the House with the actual figures, but if my hon. friend will examine them he will find that such is the case. For instance, take the figures for 1895,—I have not the figures later than 1900, but it is well known that the same thing ruled in respect to Germany and the other countries right up to the beginning of the war. In 1895 the imports of the United Kingdom were £356,000,000 and the exports £226,000,000. But what was the condition of Germany, that highly protected country, held up by protectionists the world over as an example of the benefits of protection? Well, Germany imported in round numbers, £206,000,000 worth of goods in 1895, and exported £165,000,000 worth, and that continued all through the time of peace, right up to the outbreak of war, with every one of these countries except in the case of the United States.

4 p.m.

An hon. MEMBER: And Germany.

Mr. CRERAR: I have not the figures for the years immediately prior to the war, but I am informed that the imports of Germany exceeded her exports.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Practically even.

Mr. CRERAR: Practically even; I am quite willing to take my hon. friend's statement. But it is not the adverse balance of trade that counts in the prosperity of a nation. How has England prospered—because she has prospered, despite all that my hon. friend says—in the face of an advese balance of trade? We find the facts very clearly stated by a noted British economist, no less a person than the editor of the London Economist, which is regarded as the leading financial journal not only of Great Britain but of the world. He says that the balance has been made up in this way:

First: Shipping freights. Our ships carry goods to and from them all over the world.

If Britain had been following a protectionist policy for the last seventy years, would her ships be going into every harbour and port of the world? Without any question they would not.

Second: Interest coupons. The American securities held by English investors yield a constant income in interest, to meet which the United States has to send goods.

My hon. friend practically stated that the other night, but he made this other remarkable statement: that it was the accumulated wealth of Great Britain prior to 1850 that had enabled her to make these investments in foreign countries and thus to overcome the handicaps that free trade had brought to her. There is one other item that helps to make up the balance:

Third: Insurance facilities. The English insurance companies and firms do a large business in the United States and draw thence a regular income in premiums.

Another result of the free trade policy of Great Britain. Then, banking facilities. Why, it is a well known fact that London was the international clearing house for the business of the world; that there was not a bank or a broker in London who did not take toll in some form

of the business of the world. The United States a protected country! If the United States wanted to pay for goods bought in China, she invariably did so by a draft on London; and it was the toll thus taken, the commissions and premiums earned on these transactions, that adjusted the balance of trade. I cannot for the life of me understand why my hon. friend bases his argument on the adverse balance of trade of Great Britain. We have a good example in Switzerland. I am told that Switzerland has nearly always had an adverse balance of trade, yet it is one of the most prosperous countries in Europe. Therefore, the argument that an adverse balance of trade is necesarily bad for a country does not hold water.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Switzerland has tourist traffic.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend also made the statement which I referred to a moment ago, that Great Britain was living on the accumulated wealth she had made prior to 1850, and his picture of the United Kingdom in a state of decay and senility was certainly the strangest caricature I have ever listened to at any time or in any place.

What are the facts in respect to the trade of Great Britain? The domestic exports of Great Britain for the five years ending 1805 were £39,000,000, and for the five years ending 1850 £61,000,000, or an increase of about £22,000,000 in fifty years. That was under the policy of protection which Great Britain had pursued up to that time. But what happened immediately a change took place in her fiscal policy? For the five years ending with 1900 the total domestic exports of Great Britain were £253,000,000, or an increase of no less than £192,000,000 in fifty years under free trade, as against an increase of £22,000,000 in the fifty years preceding under a policy of protection. This great increase of £192,000,000, I repeat, took place under free trade, after the change had been made in Great Britain's fiscal policy. Why, it is all nonsense to say that the change in the fiscal policy of Great Britain was not the one essential factor in her prosperity.

As far as investments abroad that Great Britain has made are concerned, those investments have been made for the most part in the last forty or fifty years, comparatively few being made prior to 1850. The fact of the matter is this: It is not the balance of trade that counts, but the total volume of trade. If we are buying more goods than we are selling, how can we pay for them? We cannot always ship gold, and if we sell more goods than we buy, how are we to be paid for them? My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) pointed out a very true fact when he said that Canada for many years to come will have to export about $200,000,000 more every year than she imports. What is that for? It is to pay the interest on the moneys we have borrowed abroad, but once that is cleared off, the position will be changed.

My hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) also spoke of the tinplate industry in the United Kingdom, and he lauded the example of the United States which imposed a high tariff in 1891 on tinplate coming from the United Kingdom. He argued, as I believe the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) argued, that that was a good thing for the United States, and they held it up as a good example for Canada. But was it a good thing for the United States? I do not think my hon. friend could have taken a worse example than tinplate to illustrate his argument. What happened? Prior to 1891, when the United States was importing tinplate practically free of duty, the canning industry in the United States had grown to large dimensions. They were canning fruits and vegetables and fish, and were selling them to all the markets of the world. But what took place immediately the United States Government imposed a heavy duty on tinplate from Britain? It is true that it gave employment to 15,000 people in the United States, but on the other hand it made it difficult for 2,000,000 people to carry on their business. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior smiles, but he will get the argument if he follows me closely, because his mind is pretty acute. The cost of tinplate by the duty, which the American Government imposed, was raised to the canning industries of the United States to the point where they could not profitably make their goods and ship them abroad, and immediately there arose an agitation in the United States for a reduction of the duty, and it was reduced. But that did not meet the case. Later on, the United States Government introduced the drawback principle in respect of tinplate imported into that country, and they said to the canning industries of the United States: "If you buy tinplate, pay a duty on it and re-export it in the shape of containers of canned goods,

you will get a drawback of 99 per cent of the duty." What happened? The American canning industries bought Welsh tinplate, paid the duty on it, made it into cans, and canned their fruits and vegetables and shipped them back to London, England, and got the drawback of 99 per cent. The result was that the British consumer in London was able to buy canned goods made in the United States cheaper than the people of the United States were buying the same goods. If we study this example there is large room, very large room, for a difference of opinion as to protection being a sound method by which to build up industry. What has happened in the United States and what has happened in this country under protection, is that a small number of people employed in the industry protected have benefited, while the large mass of the people have suffered through the increased cost of living. That is the inevitable result of the system.

My hon. friend was in his happiest mood, I think, when he spoke of the poverty that existed in Great Britain. He quoted figures and statistics, and extracts from books, to show what a hapless and luckless position the poor workingman in Great Britain was in. He quoted from an authority, Gray and Turner, I think it was, and he stated that Mr. Gray was an economist of considerable note who had done investigational work in Canada and in the United States. As a matter of fact, Mr. Gray was a clergyman interested in social questions; he was not an economist any more, I was going to say, than my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior is an economist. He was a clergyman, and naturally he was interested in social questions. My hon. friend also quoted Sir William Booth. I do not know whether he was referring to General Booth, the leader of the Salvation Army or not, but I take it that he was. Then he quoted Mr. Rowntree. Who is Mr. Rowntree? Mr. Rowntree was a great temperance reformer in Great Britain, and the whole argument and purpose of the book upon which my hon. friend based his argument was this: It was designed to show that the evils of drink in Great Britain were leading the people of that country into hopeless poverty. Now it requires some skill and ingenuity to base an argument against free trade upon a book that was written to condemn the liquor traffic. My hon. friend appealed to my hon. friend from Timiskaming (Mr. McDonald) and asked him to note what had happened in Great Britain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman refers to Sir William Booth. Is he aware that upon actual investigation Mr. Booth in his report asserted that 57 per cent of the poverty was due to unemployment?

Mr. CRERAR: There was a Sir Charles Booth, I know—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Sir Charles.

Mr. CRERAR: But my hon. friend referred to William Booth.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was wrong.

Mr. CRERAR: There was Sir Charles Booth who carried on some investigations of a private nature in that regard, but the fact nevertheless remains that the purpose of the book from which my hon. friend quoted was to disclose the bad social conditions that existed in Great Britain, which the writer attributed largely to the intemperance of the people; and on a work of that character my hon. friend based his argument against free trade and appealed to my hon. friend from Timiskaming. Now my hon. friend from Timiskaming is a Scotchman, and he is not an ordinary Scotchman, but a Glengarry Scotchman, and a Glengarry Scotchman, I am told, has always a very keen nose for facts. But fancy my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) proposing an argument to my hon. friend from Timiskaming (Mr. McDonald), a Scotchman, that he should turn his eyes away from the evils of free trade because some one in the United Kingdom had written a book condemning Scotch whiskey! That was rather a peculiar argument for my hon. friend to make, and I cannot help thinking that the Minister of the Interior must have slept the night before with the President of the Privy Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell) and assimilated some of that hon. gentleman's theories. And I think that quite possibly my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) was in the same bed. If he was, and the three hon. gentlemen had put their heads together, they could not have devised a more preposterous argument than that advanced by the Minister of the Interior. My hon. friend also speaks about the decline in agriculture in Great Britain, and he attributes that decline to the fact that Great Britain is a free-trade country. Now, I have talked to many farmers in Western Canada who have been engaged in agriculture in the Old Country, and in every instance in which I asked the reason why any man had left the Old Land to come here, the answer was that he had done so in order to escape the exactions of the landlord, who was tak-

ing in rent practically everything the farmer was making. If my hon. friend seeks a reason for the decline in British agriculture, if there has been a decline, he will find it in the land policy of the Old Country and not in the free trade policy that obtains there.

But, as a matter of fact, has there been a decline in agriculture in Great Britain? My hon. friend says that there are now only a million people engaged in agriculture in Great Britain. Well, the London Economist of a recent date, December 29, 1919, after a survey of the agricultural conditions of the United Kingdom, states that the total number of males engaged in agriculture was, in 1881, 2,362,000; in 1891, 2,249,000, and in 1901, 2,109,000. It is true in those decades there had been a decline, but that was the period when Western Canada was opening up and when we were carrying on the most active immigration propaganda possible in Great Britain, inviting the farmers of the Old Land and all agricultural labourers to come to Canada because there was cheap land available here. But in the next ten years the number had risen in Great Britain to 2,142,000. I take it that these statements are correct. I do not know from what source my hon. friend was quoting, but at all events this is my authority in regard to the total number of males engaged in agriculture to-day. The total exports of pure-bred breeding stock from Great Britain in the five-year period from 1871 to 1875 amounted to £287,000; and for the period from 1911 to 1915 inclusive it was £1,517,000, a very considerable increase. And if you study the statistics of Great Britain in regard to cereal crops, you will find that the average yield per acre has gone up steadily. Does this show any signs of a decline in agriculture in Great Britain? The tenant system of farming in the Old Land has undoubtedly made it difficult for the individual farmer, who rents land at high figures, to make much headway; but when my hon. friend says that agriculture is declining in Great Britain because a free trade policy has been in operation there for the last seventy years he is unquestionably very wide of the mark. There is another phase of the labour situation in Great Britain as compared with the United States. The stability of labour conditions in Great Britain is much greater to-day than is the case in the United States. What is the condition in regard to labour in the United States? I desire to quote an extract from the British Weekly in respect to the steel strike that took place a few months ago at Pittsburg. The British Weekly is a pretty reliable journal, which obtains its information from dependable sources, and it makes the statement that Judge Gary, at the time of the inquiry into that strike, said that there were over 69,000 employees in the United States Steel Corporation who were working twelve hours a day.

An hon. MEMBER: Who is Judge Gary?

Mr. CRERAR: He is head of the United States Steel Corporation. Now, what is the condition of labour in Great Britain? I venture to say that Great Britain has the finest factory laws in the world. She has the greatest system of co-operation in the world, and nowhere has labour achieved the distinction and the place in parliamentary government that it has in Great Britain. There is no comparison between the United States and Great Britain in that regard, and when my hon. friend argues that free trade has had the effect of bringing poverty and distress to the British labouring man he is altogether astray. My hon. friend also quoted land values and the decrease in the agricultural population of Great Britain as an evidence of decline in the industry over there. It is true, according to his statement —and I have no reason to doubt it—that when free trade was adopted in Great Britain 49.8 per cent of the population were agricultural, and in 1913 this was reduced to 21.3 per cent. That is a very considerable reduction, but it is worth while to note that in Canada in 1881, immediately after the adoption of the National Policy of Protection in this country, the percentage of rural population was 78.9 per cent, and in 1911, after thirty years of protection, it had declined, according to the statistics furnished by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, to 45.5 per cent.

Mr. SMITH: The farmers were starving in the early years.

Mr. CRERAR: The figures I am giving were furnished me by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I know that my hon. friend in his speech gave different figures. He said that the decline had been from 62 per cent to 54 per cent for the last ten-year period; but I repeat, the figures I have from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics state clearly that from 1881 to 1911 there was a decline from 78.9 per cent to 45.5 per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I obtained my figures from the same source, and I fancy that if my hon. friend inquires into the matter he will find that the difference in the figures is due to the fact that the towns and the villages are taken on a different basis.

Mr. CRERAR: I directed my inquiry personally to the Dominion Statistician, and he gave me the figures as I have cited them. Now, the hon. gentleman also speaks about the decline in the value of farm lands in the United Kingdom, and he compares that country with the United States and Canada during the last seventy years. Of course, there has been a tremendous increase in the total value of farm lands in the United States and Canada during the last fifty years. Why? The country was opening up and new lands were being brought under cultivation, with the result that the aggregate increase in wealth in this respect was very marked. But that is scarcely a fair basis of comparison to take for the United Kingdom. Canada and the United States are new countries and they are not finished countries. Although agriculture may not be very prosperous in Canada we have added to the sum total of the value of cultivated agricultural land because we have new people coming and opening up new land all the time.

My hon. friend also quoted the values of farm lands in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia. I do not know from what source his figures were secured but they did strike me as being rather high. He tells us that in British Columbia farm lands have advanced from $74 in 1910 to $174 per acre in 1919, and if I remember his statement aright, in Nova Scotia there has been a considerable increase in farm land values also. I am free to say to my hon. friend that there has been an increase in value in the farm lands of the Prairie Provinces and possibly of British Columbia and the Maritime Provinces as well, but one of the factors in producing that increase is that we have had opened up to us the United States market for Canadian farm products. The argument was advanced, and I think it was advanced with reason, that the reciprocity arrangement suggested in 1911 would add $5 an acre to the value of our farm lands in Western Canada that were producing grain. Well this is one of the reasons for the increase. If my hon. friend goes to the Maritime Provinces he will find that they have a free market in the United States for their potatoes, for their apples, for all classes of agricultural products, whereas, a few years ago, they had to climb over a high tariff wall to get into that country. The result has been to increase the prosperity of the farmers in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Is the hon. gentleman in favour of making apples free?

Mr. CRERAR: Certainly, I am in favour of making apples free. My hon. friend from Annapolis is badly mistaken if he thinks he is putting a poser to me in that regard. My hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) also quoted very largely from the reports of the special committees that were appointed by the Asquith Government to investigate trade conditions in the United Kingdom. It is true these committees were appointed in 1916 and that they were appointed by a Government of which Mr. Asquith was the head. But it was a coalition government; it was not the old Liberal Government in Great Britain. A coalition had been formed in 1915 and there were in that government quite a number of people who had held conflicting tariff views just as I fancy there has been in the Government of Canada in the making of the present Budget. But the fact that these committees brought in these reports, I submit, is no substantial evidence to support the contention of my hon. friend that free trade has been a failure in Great Britain. Take the committee on iron and steel that he referred to. The report of that committee was dissented from by Sir Hugh Bell, who is one of the greatest iron masters in northern England and who is at the head of one of the biggest iron and steel firms in the United Kingdom. If Sir Hugh Bell took the position that duties on iron and steel coming into the United Kingdom were not desirable, why did he do so? He is a manufacturer; only he could benefit. When that question was put to my hon. friend he said in effect, in reply, that Sir Hugh Bell was wedded to tradition, that he could not get over his old free trade ideas and that in order to stick to them he would rather sacrifice his own financial benefit. I have done business with business men in the United Kingdom and I have never met a harder headed lot of business men any where than I have found in Great Britain. When my hon. friend suggests that the greatest iron master and manufacturer in Great Britain refused to do a thing that would be beneficial to his business simply because he was wedded to tradition his argument rests upon a ridiculous basis. The fact is that Sir Hugh Bell knows that in the long run, duties on iron and steel coming into the United Kingdom would not be in the interest of the iron industry.

I am free to say there is one respect in which the United Kingdom has perhaps lagged behind. It has lagged behind in the matter of technical education. The superiority that Germany and the United States acquired in some fields of manufacture was

due not to their fiscal policy but due very largely to the fact that they had provided in these countries the very finest technical schools that could be found anywhere. They applied chemistry and science to their manufactures in a way that the British manufacturer and business man did not do. But now the tale is changed; Great Britain, as a result of the war, certainly realizes the advantage of technical education and I venture to say will soon bring it within the reach of her people.

I submit again that these committees were appointed at a time of war fervour. The resolutions passed at the Paris conference, I think, in 1916, laid it down as a principle that the Allies would not renew trade with Germany when the war was over. But they have seen the futility of that position and it is not a fair or sound argument to take the reports of these committees that were appointed at that time as evidence of a need of protection in Great Britain. But what has happened to these reports? Where have they gone? These committees were appointed in 1916 and they brought in their reports in 1918. Since that time Mr. Austen Chamberlain, the son of the only British statesman who ever endeavoured to fasten protection in a limited form on the British people in the last seventy years, has brought in two Budgets. Has he made any reference to the reports of these committees? Has he suggested a duty on iron, steel or textiles? He certainly has not. I think we are well aware that in 1918 shortly after the last British election, an effort was made to introduce into the fiscal system of Great Britain anti-dumping duties. What response did it find? There was not a reputable statesman in Great Britain who would take it up and the result was that nothing has been heard of it and I venture to say nothing will be heard of it. I want to read to the House the concluding statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) in his disquisition on the fallacies of free trade as found in Great Britain. This, to my mind, is an amazing statement; I cannot characterize it in any other words. What does he say?

> We are at a stage now where we cannot mistake the teachings of experience. We have seen the result through seventy years in the Old Land. It is traced in the history of their trade returns that turned in 1850, the last decade year when they had a balance in their favour, and every decade year since a balance against them. Free trade has depopulated rural England; it has filled the emigrant ships with fugitives from her shores; it has scattered the manhood of Great Britain through the fields and workshops of the United States; it has starved and repressed and dwarfed the nascent industries of Ireland; it has reversed the supremacy that Britain held through centuries in the industrial life of the world, and caused her to concede the place to other great competing nations that adopted a different policy. Such is the history of free trade.

To my mind—and I say it in the best of good temper—the Minister of the Interior has never made a more amazing statement than the one I have just quoted. Why, Mr. Speaker, we have just come out of a war that has stressed and tried every country in the world, and what is the result? Where is protectionist Germany to-day? Where is protectionist France and where is protectionist Italy? Where are they—where are they financially? Where does their currency stand in the exchanges of the world? To say that Great Britain is decadent, in the face of the fact that she not only financed her own part in the war, which was teriffic, but loaned to her Allies over $8,000,000,000 during the war—why, Sir, the thing is beyond belief. If the war has proven anything it has proven the efficacy of the fiscal policy of Great Britain and her financial stability. My hon. friend talks about the depopulation of Great Britain, and the people fleeing from her shores to new pastures! Why, the population of Great Britain increased between 1850 and 1911 from twenty-seven millions to forty-five millions,

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: —and at the same time she sent 12,000,000 of her sons in emigrant ships—

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Peopling the Empire.

Mr. CRERAR: —to Australia, Canada, South Africa and India, peopling the Empire, as my hon. friend from Red Deer states. During all that time when, as my hon. friend says, her industries were dying, when she was pursuing this decadent policy when she was relying on the remittances she was receiving from abroad to keep her going, her trade advanced by £193,000,000 as against £22,000,000 in the preceding fifty years; her population increased from twenty-seven millions to forty-six millions; and she had the greatest trade in the world when the war struck it. Then she financed her Allies to the tune of $8,000,000,000, and financed herself and—differing from the policy that my hon. friend, the Finance Minister follows in Canada—proposes to pay off and will pay off this year a billion dollars of her debt. I can call other witnesses. There is not a prominent British

economist whose testimony cannot be brought. Take Adam Smith—some of my hon. friends opposite may scoff at this—take Ricardo, and take John Stuart Mill, the greatest economists which the Anglo-Saxon race has produced, whose text-books are in every university. What is their opinion on this very question? I commend these authorities to the study of my hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior. Take British statesmen from Peel down to the present time and what do we find?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Does my hon. friend say that John Stuart Mill did not favour a protective tariff if opposed by a protective tariff in other countries? If he denies it, I can give him the quotation in a few minutes.

Mr. CRERAR: Mill was in accord with the free trade policy of Great Britain, and I think my hon. friend would have great difficulty in establishing the contrary.

Mr. SMITH: Did he not go further?

Mr. CRERAR: I will quote other witnesses. Let us take the great statesmen of Great Britain—

Mr. SMITH: I ask the hon. gentleman did Mill not go further?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CRERAR: First I will take Gladstone. Was Gladstone a protectionist? Did he believe in protection? Did Campbell-Bannerman, Asquith and Lloyd George believe in protection? My hon. friends opposite may say, "These were Liberals and nothing else was to be expected of them." Well, we will take Conservative statesmen in Great Britain, and with the exception of Joseph Chamberlain, and even he made it clear, in his tariff reform propaganda in Great Britain about seventeen or eighteen years ago, that he had no use for protection as protection; his campaign and arguments were based altogether on creating Imperial preferences in order to hold the Empire together. I think he was mistaken in that, but nevertheless he is on record as saying that he did not believe in protection for protection's sake. What about Peel, the Duke of Devonshire, and Lord St. Aldwyn. The last named, as Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, was one of the great English chancellors. What about Lord Salisbury and Lord Robert Cecil and Lord Hugh Cecil? Were these men carried away by the glamour of protection? No, they were absolutely against it. What about the Right Honourable A. J. Balfour, perhaps the brightest intellect in the Conservative party in Great Britain? He refused to follow Chamberlain in his protectionist propaganda and policy. What about Disraeli, the creator of the modern Tory party in Great Britain? His judgment on protection was that so far as Great Britain was concerned it was not only dead but damned.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. CRERAR: I hope I have not offended the tender susceptibilities of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. gentleman has been quoting authorities in favour of free trade, but is he himself in favour of free trade for Canada?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Make an argument.

Mr. MORPHY: It is all very well for my hon. friend from Red Deer to say, "make an argument."

Mr. CRERAR: I will say this, that the fiscal policy for Great Britain, in my judgment, would be a very admirable one for Canada.

Mr. MORPHY: Will the hon. gentleman answer my question? I want an answer to the question, from my hon. friend, if he pleases.

Mr. CRERAR: The tariff policy of the Canadian Council of Agriculture does not call for absolute free trade, as some hon. gentlemen opposite have stated. As I have previously stated in the House its policy is that the tools and implements of production should be made free, and the cost of the necessaries of life should be reduced.

Mr. MORPHY: That is being done to-day under this very Budget.

Mr. CRERAR: In Great Britain, the Minister of the Interior tells us, they are raising a billion and a half dollars this year from customs taxation. I think he is mistaken in the figures, but at any rate they are raising a very large amount in customs taxes. We can still get a great deal of revenue from the tariff in Canada, and at the same time eliminate the principle of protection in industry, which is bad. That is the thing we should do. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have continued at much greater length than I intended, but I have yet a few further observations to make.

Mr. CALDWELL: Give them more of it.

Mr. CRERAR: I submit that the whole argument, as far as the fiscal policy of Great Britain is concerned, confirms absolutely, unequivocally, and beyond successful contradiction, that that policy has been in the interests of the United Kingdom, and I submit that a similar policy in Canada could do nothing but redound to the benefit of this Dominion. What have been the effects of protection in Canada? We have a perfect right to ask what benefit has it been to the country? Is it a sensible thing to develop artificial industries and make it difficult for the natural industries of the country to develop? We say we want to develop agriculture. Would my hon. friends opposite say that we should protect agriculture by way of giving a bounty to the wheat producers of Western Canada?

Mr. MORPHY: Yes, if it needs it.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know where, in the end, my hon. friend would get the money. Agriculture is the basic industry of this country, and it is the part of wisdom to free the tools of production that are necessary for the development of this great industry, and the development of our forests, our mines, and our fisheries as well. I have never been able to see the sense of creating, for instance, a cotton industry in Canada—which I shall refer to in a moment—and which is entirely an artificial industry in this country We do not produce the raw material that enters into the manufacture of textiles in this country, but we have to import every ounce of that raw material. Is it not in every sense a better thing to produce the articles that we can best produce in this country, and that are natural to the country, and trade them off to others for things they can produce better than we can? That is the sensible policy to follow.

Now, what is the position of agriculture in this country? The farmers of Western Canada are producing two staple commodities, grain and livestock, and the basis of value upon which they sell their productions is fixed in the markets of the world. You will have to have protection in Canada for a long time before you can have a market capable of consuming all the wheat our farmers produce. But they are not afraid to sell their wheat against all comers; and the same holds good in regard to livestock.

Mr. MORPHY: Will the hon. gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. CRERAR: I am sorry, but I do not wish to be interrupted. You are putting a penalty on agriculture when you say to the farmers: "You must have the cost of your implements of production increased by the operation of this Customs tariff." You are making it more difficult for agriculture to succeed, and to that extent you are hampering and handicapping an industry that is natural to the country. We talk of Canada being an agricultural country. Of course it is. And eventually it will become a great manufacturing country; there is not any question about that. But if we develop agriculture, if we can put 2,000,000 farmers on the land, will not that be a good thing for our manufacturers? I can conceive of nothing better for creating a home market.

But the fact is that to-day agriculture is carried on under conditions of disadvantage. I will admit that during the last few years where farmers have secured good crops they have made money. But go out and speak to the farmers of Southern Alberta, who have had three successive crop failures; go out and speak to the farmers of Southern Saskatchewan, who have had the same misfortune; go out and speak to the farmers of Eastern Canada who have been handicapped by bad crops, and ask them what their opinion is of having the cost of the tools and implements of their industry added to by the operation of the Customs tariff; it will not take you long to get a reply.

During this debate we have heard some comment on our textile industry, and my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) placed upon Hansard some figures in connection with the development of that industry in this country. But he did not supply all the information on the subject at that time. The Dominion Textile Company, Limited, is our leading concern manufacturing cotton goods, and is a combination of four textile companies that were merged in 1905. At that time—and this is taken from the evidence given by the General Manager of the Dominion Textile Company, Limited before the Cost of Living Commission a year ago—his company issued $5,000,000 of common stock for which they paid $500,000, or $10 a share, thus four and a half millions of that common stock was pure water. What happened? Under the shelter of the tariff, enjoying protective duties ranging from 30 to 40 per cent, the Dominion Textile Company, Limited, was able to so extract profits from the people of this country that this stock last year was quoted as high as $125 a share. I ask my hon. friend the Minister

of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), who, I believe, stated at Quebec that the tariff should not be used as a place of shelter by industries that could stand on their own feet, what he thinks of that condition of affairs?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman want an answer? I understand that in that case the profits were made largely out of export trade as a result of the war.

Mr. CRERAR: Well, we can go back to 1914, before the war, and we shall find that this $5,000,000 of common stock, or rather $4,500,000, that in 1905 had no value whatever, in 1914 was selling as high as $86 a share. If my hon. friend will study the figures of our exports at that time he will find that very litle business was done in Canadian textiles. And yet that $4,500,000 of common stock, of pure unadulterated water, had attained a value of over $3,000,000! Is that building up useful industry in this country, or is it not enriching the few at the expense of the many? But by way of contrast, what are the wages paid to our textile workers in Canada? According to figures from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics 7,946 males and 7,654 females, or a total of 15,618, are engaged in the cotton textile industry in this country. Now I wish to direct the attention of the House to this illuminating fact, that the average yearly wage of those 15,000 employees is only $538.23. Is that what protection has done for the workers of our textile industry?

Mr. STEVENS: What is your authority for those figures?

Mr. CRERAR: A report of the Dominion Statistician published last month.

Mr. STEVENS: There must be a basis for that average.

Mr. CRERAR: It is based on returns supplied by companies covering all the textile industries in this country. Will any one argue that that is a reasonable condition of affairs? If my hon. friends want a moderate tariff for revenue only, and if the Government desire to wipe out special privilege in this direction, why did they not start on the tariff schedule in respect to cotton goods when arranging their Budget? On the contrary, these cotton duties are maintained. And the same condition applies not only to the textile industry, but to many other industries as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the tariff views of this little group are well known. As I have stated before, we stand broadly on this principle,—that the implements of production for the development of our agriculture, our forests, our mines, and our fisheries should be made free, and that there should be a substantial reduction in all other duties under the general tariff. That is a specific plank in the platform of the Council of Agriculture. I want to know what are the views of my hon. friend opposite on this question. I would like the Minister of the Interior in his next speech, or the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, to state his views as to what duties should prevail on, say, agricultural implements, on textiles, and on iron and coal.

We have read a good deal in the papers recently about the British Empire Steel merger. Mr. Grant Morden who is a member of the British House of Commons but Canadian born, I am told at a meeting in this city recently made the statement,—that this merger, when completed, would be in a position to compete with the world. Well, if that be the case, would it not be a good thing to remove the duty on coal and so help the manufacturers and other consumers in the province of Ontario who are using coal, and would it not be a good thing to take the duty off iron and steel as well? I cannot for the life of me, Sir, see the advantage of supporting a policy that develops mergers, such as the British Empire Steel merger, which is practically cornering all the coal and iron ore in sight in the Maritime Provinces and with the inevitable result of an effort being made with the assistance of the tariff to pay dividends on large amounts of watered stock.

I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that one of the most effective ways in which he can combat this growing tendency to combine various companies into huge combinations is by using the weapon of the tariff. The tariff has been used not only in the industries I have mentioned, but it has been used in many others that could be mentioned by company promoters simply for the purpose of taking additional profits out of the Canadian people. I make the statement in all seriousness that the protective tariff has been the greatest agency for exploiting our people that was ever devised.

I want to give the Minister of Finance further evidence. For instance, moulded rubber goods are used largely in this country. I gave this statement to the House on a previous occasion but I repeat it again because it is pertinent to the matter we are discussing. The following is taken from a prospectus issued by the K. & S. Canadian Tire and Rubber Company, Limited, of Toronto, circulated privately for the pur-

pose of getting additional money to put into their business—and I am using this quotation because it is direct evidence, not hearsay; it is from a prospectus issued by these people themselves:

> At Weston, Ontario, we have the only plant in Canada for making moulded rubber goods exclusively. Our capacity amounts to 3,000 pieces per day. This class of goods in the past has been imported principally from the States. It would not be policy to state our margin of profit, but believe that we are able to manufacture at United States costs.

Now, note this:

> There is a protective tariff of at least 35 per cent (and up to 42½ per cent) in our favour. We are thus able to sell at a lower price than any foreign competitor and still have a good profit.
>
> The quality of our rubber sundries is admitted to be the equal of the best imported goods.

Will any of my hon. friends opposite argue for a moment that the K. & S. Canadian Tire and Rubber Company, who, on their own admission, can manufacture as cheaply in Canada as they do in the United States, are selling these goods at prices any lower than the prices of similar goods imported from the United States? I will tell you more. The Minister of Finance will probably find an effort being made one of these days to mergerize the rubber companies of this country who are manufacturing rubber goods; they will capitalize their earning power and issue a lot of common stock against it, which will represent no value, and in order to do it more effectively they will get under the shelter of the protective tariff. I would commend these considerations to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance.

Now, I have spoken somewhat longer than I had intended. Our views on the question of tariff are well known; I have already stated them. I want to say a word about the amendment that my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has moved. I quite agree with the member from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) that the amendment has considerable milk and water. The plain fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker is, that the time has come when we should get away from all make-believe on this question of tariff. We are entitled to know where every one stands in this matter. I have every respect for the man who honestly holds the view that protection is necessary for this country. But we want a clear cut discussion of the question, and I hope that my hon. friends opposite, when the time comes that the tariff is discussed in the open forum, will debate the question on its merits and not seek to cloak and cover it up with various other appeals to racial and religious prejudices, as has so often been the case in the past. What we want is to get a clear, definite expression of opinion from the Canadian people upon the question. In this period of reconstruction, when we are confronted with gigantic problems, questions of tariff and of business administration certainly call for closer study than has ever been the case in the past. We can only overcome, I am convinced, the financial difficulties which confront us and lighten the financial burdens that the Canadian people have to carry, by an intelligent development of the resources of this country, and I again submit that of all these resources the one that lies most readily to hand is that of our agriculture. Let us, Mr. Speaker, direct our policy in the future to the development of these industries instead of seeking to create artificial industries that have to live under the sheltering wing of a high protective tariff. Let us seek to develop the industries that are natural to the country; if we do, the development of other industries will follow as surely as night follows day. By adopting a policy of this kind; by adopting a policy of special privileges to none—because I submit that the tariff is a special privilege to those who have the benefit of it—we shall lay firm and broad the foundations of a great and prosperous country.

5 p.m.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (Oxford South): Mr. Speaker, before attempting to follow the arguments of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House (Mr. Crerar), I would like to say that the Budget presented to Parliament this year reminds us that although the war is ended, war conditions are to some extent still with us. A crisis in our history has been reached and safely passed. But we have still great obligations to meet, and I am sure that the people of Canada will prove themselves capable of dealing with those obligations. I listened with a great deal of interest to the first Budget Speech delivered by the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), and I must congratulate him upon the manner in which he delivered it, upon the conciseness with which he dealt with the various matters connected with it, and upon the frank and open manner in which he revealed to the people the exact financial situation as it is and as it has to be dealt with.

That Canada is a difficult country to govern I believe everybody realizes. Under ordinary conditions, in the absence of such problems as have to be dealt with at the present time, the Government of Canada, is most difficult. But the present situation is much less serious than it was two years ago. I am particularly pleased to know that we have with us again the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) who carried on during the whole period of the war; the man who, by his wonderful foresight, endeavoured to have Canada prepared as well as was possible when the terrible war broke loose upon the world. He carried on during the early years of the war and year after year as the war continued. We were, however, put to a crucial test in the fall of 1917, when the question arose whether the people of Canada would uphold the policy of the Prime Minister and his Government. Notwithstanding the fact that 400,000 Canadians had gone overseas; notwithstanding the fact that there was a casualty list of over 125,000, the mandate which he received and which the Government received on that occasion was to carry on. He carried on, and he saw the war brought to a successful conclusion. He has been subjected to considerable criticism, not only by hon. members opposite but from other sources outside of this House, because he was not day in and day out on the job here in Canada. We welcome him back to the forum of Parliament. We are pleased indeed to know, and the people of Canada rejoice in it, that Sir Robert Borden is again able to carry on, and likely to do so for many years.

We have listened for about an hour and a half to an hon. gentleman who was a member of the Cabinet when Sir Robert Borden and his Government received that mandate in the fall of 1917. A year ago we heard him address this House and endeavour to explain to the people why he had broken with the Government. There has been a good deal of speculation in regard to that matter, not only by hon. members here, but by the people throughout the country. Now he appears in the role of leader of a party in this House, and if under those conditions I have something to say that he may consider as rather unkind it is because of the fact that the situation is a very peculiar one and not from any personal motive, it is absolutely necessary and in the public interest that we should have a united people to deal with the task which lies before us as one whole people with a common ideal, and not in sections, not divided into classes and factions. We must unite the whole people of this country, and when we do that, we shall overcome the difficulties we have to contend with so quickly that in a few years from now I venture to state that the people will wonder how it was that there was any alarm felt in this Parliament or outside of it over the debt now confronting us.

I was somewhat startled to hear the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Trahan) in his speech in this House on the 28th instant, referring to the debt which we have on our shoulders, protest against the policy embodied in the slogan which was adopted in the last election that we were in the war "To the last man and the last dollar," till our efforts were crowned with victory. He went on to state that the policy adopted by the Government was to place British interests first and Canadian interests in a secondary position. Now I want to take strong exception to that statement. We are a part of the British Empire. We have not yet reached that stage, nor do we intend to reach it, when our connection with the Empire will be severed. It was well known that at that time the fate of the Empire was almost hanging in the balance, and it was realized we were a part of the Empire. The hon. member then went on to compare our debt with that of Japan, and he quoted figures to show that our obligations were much heavier than those of Japan. He even suggested that Japan had acquitted herself and rendered a service during the war equally as great as did Canada. I take exception to any statement of that kind. I am not one of those who believe in continually referring to what Canada did in the war. Canada's part in the war is a matter of history, and is well known. I believe that the consensus of opinion throughout the world is that Canada acquitted herself in a manner to which no one could take any exception, and the obligations which we have to face as a result of our effort in the war are no greater than could be expected.

I wish to refer briefly to some of the statements made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). For about an hour he spoke on the tariff. He laboured long along that line, and practically advocated free trade until almost the concluding sentences of his address, when, questioned from this side of the House as to where he stood, he hesitated, and then referred to the platform of the United Grain Growers—

Mr. GOULD: No.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: —to the platform of the Council of Agriculture. I was also surprised to see, immediately after the Minister of Finance had concluded his Budget speech, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) spring to his feet as if he were afraid some one else would catch the Speaker's eye. In concluding the address he delivered, following that of the Minister of Finance, he moved an amendment which was evidently prepared before he had heard or knew anything about what the Budget speech contained. That was quite evident to every one who heard him, and it is little wonder that he has been taunted by some hon. gentlemen opposite as to the small quantity of milk his amendment really contains compared with the water. But the most remarkable feature of his address was that he advocated protection, advocated the dumping clause, and also favoured mergers. He cautioned the people of this country to take little stock in the platform of either the Liberal party or that of hon. gentlemen on the cross benches. He cautioned the people of this country not to be led away with any idea that the Liberal party were likely to put into effect the platform they had adopted. He said that the responsibility of office had a sobering effect, and consequently the people need not be frightened by what the Grain Growers are likely to do should they come into power, and as he spoke I could not help feeling that while there may not be any very good team work on this side of the House there is considerable between the two Oppositions we have represented in this House. My hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's, whose speech has been so severely criticized, judging from his past history, might well caution the people of Canada not to take those platforms too seriously but I say that this is a time when we should take politics, seriously in this country, I am very much mistaken indeed, and I am inclined to think that some of these hon. gentlemen, old and experienced in political life as they may be, will find they have made a great mistake if they think the people can be fooled along that line much longer. I do not want to do the hon. gentleman an injustice. This is what he said:

> I do not think myself, as things are going now, that we can look to that party—

That is the party led by the hon. member for Marquette.

> —for a sound tariff policy. What then? I do not even think we can expect to get a sound and safe tariff policy by a too rigid adherence to every line and every letter of the Liberal tariff platform. I think myself that we will find that we are all prone in framing platforms to put things perhaps a little more strongly than is wise and we all find when we come to the responsibilities of office that we may have to modify our views. If we are to get a sound and sane tariff policy where shall we look for it?

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) in his address in this House the other day quoted from a speech made by the leader of the Liberal party previous to the elections of 1896. He quoted Sir Wilfrid Laurier as saying:

> I submit to you that the ideal fiscal system is the British system of free trade.
>
> I come to expose to you the policy of the Liberal party. Let me tell you that the policy may be summed up in the good Saxon word "Freedom," in every sense of the term—freedom of speech, freedom of action, freedom of religious life and civil life, and last, not least, freedom in commercial life. I denounce to you the policy of protection as bondage.

Those were the statements made by the leader of the Opposition of that day, in giving his policy with regard to the tariff. A short time afterwards he got into power, he later on delivered a speech in the manufacturing industrial city of Toronto in 1906, in which he is reported by the Toronto Globe to have said:

> Everybody will agree with me, the business men of Toronto more than anybody—that in a fiscal policy such as we have, where we derive our revenue chiefly from customs duties, it is absolutely essential to the capitalist, to the workingman, to the businessman, to the industrialist, that he should know exactly the conditions under which he invests his capital; that he should know that it will be invested under a condition that will not be lightly altered.

These would appear to be the words of a man who was conscious of the responsibility of office which had been placed upon his shoulders. He then went on in his speech to deal with what he characterized as the tinkering with the tariff which had been done by the Conservative Government previous to 1896, when the Liberal party came into power. I could give the number of changes he referred to in that address, but I will not delay the House to do so. After having done that, he said:

> Well, sir, when there were so many changes the manufacturer dreaded the day of the Budget Speech. He was always anxious lest he find himself the following morning a ruined man. But I am proud to say that under our regime the manufacturers always sleep soundly and never fear interference with the tariff. We have made very few changes in the duty.

It goes on to bear out the statement that was made by the hon. member for Mar-

quette (Mr. Crerar) that we have and have had in this country, under both the Conservative party and the Liberal party, the old National Policy. There is no getting away from that. The National Policy was amended time and again before Sir Wilfrid Laurier came into power, but he admits in that speech delivered in Toronto that very few changes had been made in the tariff by his party. Changes are continually necessary, Mr. Speaker, because conditions change in a country as time goes on; and a tariff that might be suitable to the requirements of the country at this stage might not be suitable a few years hence. But I think that every one will agree that under the extraordinary war conditions such as we have experienced, what we required was stability and confidence on the part of every individual; and it will be conceded, I think, that we required also that the greatest possible effort should be put forth by all the people, and it was not by any such means as have been alluded to this afternoon by the hon. member for Marquette that the condition which we desired could be brought about.

Now, Sir, I am coming to the time when the hon. member for Marquette, who I regret is not in his seat, saw fit to break with the Government, and I shall deal briefly with the reasons which he gave for parting company with them on that occasion. I have here a copy of the letter which he sent to the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) in reference to the matter, in which he states:

OTTAWA, June 4th, 1919.

You will observe, before I proceed any further, Mr. Speaker, that the Budget Speech was delivered the following day. The hon. member remained in the Government until the moment when the Budget was to be introduced. Apparently, the matter had been settled. The hon. member wrote as follows:

My dear Sir Robert,—The Government in its consideration of the Budget to be placed before Parliament to-morrow has reached, I take it, definite and final conclusions as to the form it will take. As you are aware, I am not in accord with it and therefore cannot support it either in the House or in the country. Having reached this decision, there is only one course for me to follow, and I therefore tender you herewith my resignation as a member of the Government. The reason for my decision shall be given more fully when the subject is under discussion in the House.

It was the question of the tariff upon which the hon. member for Marquette broke with the Government. Let me remind the House that the tariff was not an issue in the election of 1917. So far as I am aware, there was no discussion in connection with tariff issues in any part of the country at that time. It was recognized that men of different views concerning the tariff had joined together and that we had established a union or coalition government to carry on during the war and throughout the reconstruction period afterwards. It is true that changes were made in the tariff in 1919. When the Budget was brought down it was found that in regard to the very things that have been advocated by the hon. member (Mr. Crerar) to-day as items that should be placed on the free list, a fairly generous concession had been made in that direction. The tariff had been reduced on a great many agricultural implements from 17½ per cent to 12½ per cent, and the surtax of 1915 of 7½ per cent had also been removed. Better rates for shipment of machinery over the railways of the country so far as Western Canada was concerned had also been obtained, and the Government had done the very thing which hon. gentleman had been advocating. Notwithstanding that there had been no reference to the tariff in the election of 1917, the Government conceded to hon. members from Western Canada something along the line which they have advocated. The Government met them more than half way, but the hon. member (Mr. Crerar) found even then that he had to devise some excuse to leave the Government. I do not think his explanation has satisfied the members of this House, nor do I think it has satisfied the people of the country. The hon. member is leader of a political party in this country to-day, and consequently we are justified in examining his actions and his words and also in endeavouring to arrive at some understanding as to what his motives are and the influence which controls him. The statement has been made by a member of the Government—and it has not been denied by any one—that the Government were agreed to go on as they were without any reductions in the tariff; but after having made these reductions the remarkable thing is that the hon. member for Marquette decided to get out of the Government in any event. The hon. member, while he was a member of the Government of Canada for, I think, about a year and a half, occupied another position in this country. He was also President of the United Grain Growers, Limited. He was in the pay of the United Grain Growers, Limited of Canada, from whom he

was receiving a salary in excess of what he received as a member of the Government and a member of Parliament combined. The United Grain Growers, Limited, Mr. Speaker, has a system of recall embodied in their regulations; it is a part of their constitution. That is where the system of recall really originated in Canada. It is an American institution that has been brought over here, and it has been adopted in the regulations of the United Grain Growers, Limited. Let me point out this fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have the sworn evidence of the General Manager of the United Grain Growers, Limited that they endeavoured to put the recall into effect. Now, how did they put it into effect? How did they withdraw the president of their company from the Government? I will tell you how they did it. I do not say that what I am about to state was the sole object of the hon. gentleman in deserting the Government. I say "deserting," because he assuredly did desert them before the task for which he was elected had been accomplished. There is no question about that. In September, 1918, the directors of the United Grain Growers, Limited passed a resolution or by-law whereby they increased the salary of the president, a member of the Government, from $10,000 to $15,000 a year, to go into effect when he withdrew from the Government. Apparently it was a very effective way of putting the recall into operation. Hon. gentlemen on cross benches opposite are subject to the recall, they may advocate a different kind, but this one evidently was quite effective in its operations, for it accomplished the object at which it aimed. I want to make some further reference to the hon. gentleman. The amalgamation of the Alberta Elevator Company and the Manitoba Grain Growers' Company into the United Grain Growers' Limited took place on the first of September, 1917. The hon. gentleman, the president of this company, was sworn as a member of the Government on the 12th October, 1917. He resigned from the Government on the 4th June, 1919. The hon. gentleman claims to have a particular interest in the farmers and that interest was shown on a number of occasions during the short time that he was Minister of Agriculture. A matter came up which was not of special interest to the grain growers of Western Canada as they were more interested in grain growing than anything else, but which was of vital interest to the Dairymen of Eastern Canada as well as the West. An Order in Council was put through shortly after he became Minister of Agriculture permitting, strange to say, the great and wealthy corporations the packing houses on his license to gather up the dairy produce of the farmers of this country, mix it in their factories and sell it under another name. It lost its identity once it went into their factories and it came out as oleomargarine. I have referred to this matter in the past and I defy any one to say that I have ever objected to the importation or manufacture of oleomargarine. What I have objected to, what I do object to and I will continue to object to, is the great dairy industry being made a basis for the manufacture of this stuff and of secondary consideration to the big packing houses, and permitting them to gather up dairy produce and to treat it in such a way as to lose its identity the high standard which took so many years of industry to build up and to merge it with that of an inferior article. This was the first evidence that the hon. gentleman gave of his interest in agriculture.

But during all this time we had evidence that he was busy in another direction. In the province of Ontario the Provincial Government had been endeavouring to organize the farmers into clubs for co-operative purposes. There were also a few men who had been identified with farmers' movements in the years gone by. We have had many farmers' organizations in this country, political and co-operative, that it is not easy to recall them all. We have had unrestricted reciprocity, commercial union, the patrons of industry and Dominion grange and others. A number of the old patrons of industry which was destroyed or absorbed by the Liberal Party in Ontario got together and endeavoured to prostitute or pervert the farmers' clubs. We have evidence published in a farming magazine that the hon. member for Marquette was a frequent visitor at the offices of those who were furthering this movement in opposition to the farmers' co-operative clubs and the statement is also made that had it not been for the generous assistance in money and advice which this organization received from the grain growers of the West and the hon. member for Marquette they would not have succeeded in their efforts. That has been published throughout the country by one of the original organizers of what is known as the United Farmers of Ontario. I often wonder whether this much lauded Grain Growers Limited had some ulterior object in view in endeavouring to destroy the co-operative spirit which was being created in Ontario.

It is absolutely impossible to divide the people of this country, to get people to organize themselves along class lines politically in opposition to the interests of the people of Canada generally. You may get a few designing ambitious individuals who regard their own interests more that they do those of the class they claim to represent to take that stand, but I venture to state that inside of five years there will not be a vestige of that party left in this country. Why do I make such a statement as that? Because I believe I know the farmers of this country as well as does the hon. member for Marquette and I know that in so far as the province of Ontario is concerned the case has been misrepresented to them.

That hon. gentleman in some of his addresses suggests to the farmers that they have not had a fair deal in the past, that they have not the representation in Parliament particularly in the House of Commons to which they are entitled. He even says that their representation is less than ten per cent of the whole. The hon. gentleman is not always correct in the figures which he gives us. If you analyze the figures which the hon. gentleman put before the House a year ago when he endeavoured to justify his attitude, and if you inquire into many of the statements which he has made in public you will find that you can discount them generally by about fifty per cent. I make the statement that the farmers have received generous treatment at the hands not only of this Government but of other governments in the redistribution of constituencies; representation has been in the farmers' favour. City constituencies have two and three times the population of rural on the whole.

What is going to be the upshot of this movement that is on foot led by the hon. member for Marquette? Do you suppose that the people of the towns and cities are going to sit back and allow this condition to continue? The farmers of this country are organizing themselves into a political body and if that is the case and if they are going to separate themselves from other classes of the community there will only be one thing to do and we must have "representation according to population." This is the attitude that will be adopted. As far as the farmers of this country are concerned, they have had generous treatment at the hands of all governments with regard to parliamentary representation, I think that will be admitted by everybody. I know of counties which had three representatives in this House and other constituencies which have only one representative although they have more votes than the county with three representatives. Is that fair if we are to have class representation because it happens to apply largely to rural districts? I represent a constituency myself where the vote is pretty evenly divided. There are a few more farmers than there are townspeople but I do not believe the people of my constituency have ever made any discrimination in that respect. I have received generous support from the people in the towns and I regret exceedingly that these hon. gentlemen opposite are not fair and do not give these people credit for having so acted in the past. If the farmers have not the representation in this House which they claim they are entitled to, they have nobody to blame but themselves. It is absolutely their own fault. They have often refused to vote for a candidate because he happened to be a farmer.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: An hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." Yes, we will divide this country into classes in order to get the farmers to vote as a class but you are making the greatest mistake you ever made in your lives if you think the farmers are the narrow-minded, bigoted class you take them to be. The policy that you are advocating, class representation, may be adopted in some places but you will find that it will be spurned with indignation by the broad-minded farmers of this country. It was during the most critical period in the history of this country—at a time when our eyes were fixed on the western battlefront, which was being day by day bent back, when every Canadian was almost afraid to read the morning papers for fear news of the line breaking—there were persons endeavouring to organize the farmers of Canada into a political organization, and some of them came trooping down to Ottawa asking that the farmers should be exempt from military service, and by their actions cast odium on the farmers of Ontario. But the people of that province were not responsible for what occurred at that time in connection with the question of military service. Hon. gentlemen opposite know full well that the executive which met in the city of Toronto, before coming down to Ottawa, were not honest with the people whom they claimed to represent. They claimed that they were coming down here to endeavour to secure exemption from military service only in cases of extreme hardship, which would have been a very

reasonable request and justifiable. Instead of that, however, they asked that total exemption should be granted to all farmers; and the man who is now sitting in this House as the representative for North Ontario, after having heard the Prime Minister state what the views of the Government were in regard to the matter, insisted upon coming before the Bar of the House of Commons in order to make a statement there. I will venture to state that under the circumstances no such proposition was ever dreamed of before. The men behind this request endeavoured to make it appear that a similar privilege had been granted to Mr. Gompers, the United States labour leader, and to Mr. Viviani, the ex-Prime Minister of France. But, Sir, on both those occasions the House had risen and was not actually in session when the distinguished men referred to addressed the members of Parliament. These are some of the things as to which the people of the province from which I come have been misled and misformed. These men went back from the city of Ottawa and raised the cry, "Oh, we were turned out"; but the significant thing is that the Minister of Agriculture in the neighbouring province of Quebec was one of the chief figures in that movement. In co-operation with some men who now have seats in this House the effort was made to make it appear that Ontario was responsible for the whole thing. Yes, there were a great many men from the western part of Ontario who were surprised when they got here at that time to find that there were so many delegates from other provinces.

Now, I must proceed to the consideration of other matters.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): I would like to correct the impression that was given to the House that there was only one member from the West—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member would certainly not be in order in doing so, at the present time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am quite willing to be asked a question as to any matter arising out of my remarks.

I want briefly to refer to something that took place previous to the elections of 1917. There is in this country a publication known as the Canadian Annual Review, and I think every one will concede that it gives a very fair and impartial review of all matters of importance which transpire throughout Canada. This work, I believe, has now been conducted for about twenty years, and it certainly fills a want which was long felt before that time. I want to quote from the Canadian Annual Review of 1917, page 594. Reference is there made to the attitude of the then leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) during the negotiations which led up to the formation of the Union Government, which he did not see fit to join, and in conclusion the following statement is made:

> With it all the Liberal chieftain maintained his hopeful outlook, fought earnestly for his cherished convictions of a life-time, believed that he had a chance to win, and was convinced that if he did so the personal qualities and influence which had settled the Manitoba problem of 1896 could adjust those of 1917. If he did not win, his supporters, combined with the Liberals behind the Unionist Government, might be strong enough to revolutionize political conditions when the war was over.

Now, it may be possible that the right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier had some idea that that would happen. I think the events of the last few days would go to bear out the fact that he did show a good deal of foresight in that respect. We have found member after member—elected in support of Union Government—going over to the Opposition, and the excuse they make is that it is by reason of the tariff. Well, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that if any member of the House would be justified in breaking with the Government on the Tariff issue it would be those who are in favour of the old protective policy—that policy which has been departed from by the Government in order to meet the demands or the requests of hon gentlemen on the cross benches. In order to carry on, and in order to insure that there should be harmony in this country, the Government have conceded a good deal along this line. I am not saying that they have gone too far. I am not an extreme protectionist, I believe that a policy of moderate protection is necessary in this country; but I think the Government were entitled to some consideration from those hon. gentlemen to whom I have referred when in response to their wishes they conceded what they did in the matter of a reduction in the tariff. For example, two hon. gentlemen spoke in this House last week, and they took the ground that they were changing their political allegiance because of the fact that the tariff policy was now established and they could not see any hope for a reduction. Now the Government have made no such intimation either to the House or to the country. The Finance Minister has intimated—just as his predecessor intimated a year ago—that inquiries would be made into industrial

and other conditions after which the tariff would be readjusted to suit the conditions shown to exist. What more could be done than that? Of what use would it be to conduct an inquiry into Canadian conditions if you had settled upon your tariff policy before hand? The Government's tariff policy will depend upon the result of the inquiry which is to be made, and I am strongly of the opinion that if it had not been for the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite in the last Parliament, we would now have had a tariff commission that would have been able to place evidence before the Government, and this matter would have been dealt with ere this. However, that is the condition in which we find matters with respect to the tariff to-day. The tariff is the sole and absorbing topic of discussion by hon. gentlemen opposite. They are now endeavouring to justify the stand which they have taken. They are attempting to disorganize the Government of this country and make it impossible for the administration of public affairs to be carried on. The members of the so-called Agrarian party refer to the amendment of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) as a milk and water amendment, and they say that if he could have heard the Budget before he framed that amendment he never would have worded it in such a way. However, they were going to vote a want of confidence in the Government anyway, and so it did not matter much what the amendment contained. To those hon. gentlemen to whom I refer it does not matter what an amendment may contain so long as they can express a want of confidence in Sir Robert Borden and his Government. But that is not what the people are asking for; they are asking my hon. friends to be consistent. The hon. member for Marquette spoke for an hour and a half this afternoon, and the greater portion of his address was devoted to pointing out the ideal conditions hat exist in England, and then he suggested that agriculture should be looked after in this country. The hon. member has had the opportunity to acquire an intimate knowledge of Canadian agriculture, and if he takes the same interest in that industry which he claims he does he would have noticed that only within the last week efforts were being made in Great Britain to import into that country breeding stock from Canada, but the British regulations will not permit it. It was admitted in the discussion which took place that the regulations with regard to cattle, which ostensibly were adopted in order to prevent foot and mouth disease reaching the cattle of Great Britain, were really uncalled for because there had never been a single case of the disease in Canada; which went to show that the imposition of those regulations was mere camouflage, that in reality it was admitted a form of protection. But the farmers of Great Britain came to the conclusion that in special cases it would be advisable to permit the importation of cattle from Canada; they found from our dairy records that the butter fat production of some of our cows exceeded the best records of the cows of the Old Land by over 10,000 pounds per head.

Why don't they frankly admit that they have adopted protection so far as the farmers of Great Britain are concerned? The revenues collected there will indicate that in many instances they have protection. Look at the methods adopted to check the importation of American automobiles: in order to enable the British automobile industry to get on its feet again the Government of Great Britain imposed what amounted to practically a prohibition on the importation of American automobiles. Those things have taken place in a country which for many years had a protective tariff, until Great Britain obtained undisputed supremacy as a manufacturing country, and the people felt that they could remove the tariff and compete with the world. Their conditions were most favourable, for their manufacturing industries were well established and their commerce held undisputed sway on the high seas. But are conditions in Canada similar to those in Great Britain? When the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) says that we should have a fiscal policy identical with that which prevails in the Old Land, I would ask him if he would allow protection for some agricultural products, if necessary, such as has been adopted in Great Britain? I would point out, Sir, that people learn by experience, but the experience that costs something is the experience that is the most valuable to us.

Mr. GOULD: Hear, hear.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: For a number of years we had a reciprocity agreement with the United States, but it was suddenly abrogated without any apparent reason, and our channels of trade, which had been developed north and south, were abruptly severed, with the result that we had to develop other channels. And the people of

Canada set about that development with a resolute spirit that commanded the admiration of the world. They built canals, harbours, elevators and railways, and in the process they laid the foundations of a great nation. They were determined that they would be no more at the beck and call of any other nation, and never again will they be placed in the position they were in in 1868. Undoubtedly the recollection of those days was a strong factor in deciding the election of 1911. And yet some hon. gentlemen to-day are prepared to permit such a highly protected country as the United States to compete with our manufacturers on an even footing. Why? Simply because some goods could be bought cheaper in the States than in Canada.

The duties on agricultural implements are held up as one of the oppressive handicaps that the agriculturist has to contend with. While the hon. member for Marquette was speaking I could not help thinking of some evidence given by the general manager of the United Grain Growers, Limited, a year ago to the effect that they had a great number of subsidiary companies. The hon. member for Marquette referred to one of those subsidiary companies this afternoon, which he stated on an investment of $100,000 had made profits in 1917 to the tune of $500,000. Surely a pretty good record. He endeavoured to remove the impression that that statement had made on the minds of a good many people by referring to the volume of business which the company transacted. The hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Reid) also referred to that company in his speech the other night, and stated that the United Grain Growers, Limited, the parent company—he used the words "parent company" when referring to these profits of $500,000—had returned those profits into the pockets of the farmers. I want to take issue with the hon. member on that point. The United Grain Growers, Limited, is an incorporated company on exactly the same footing as any other company, and it has not divided up its profits with the farmers. Nor is it doing so in connection with the profits of many of its subsidiary companies. The hon. member for Mackenzie may know, because he is a director of the United Grain Growers, Limited, and he doubtless had good reason for qualifying his statement when he asserted that the parent company paid those profits back to the shareholders in dividends and cheaper machinery and so forth. As a matter of fact the shares of the United Grain Growers, Limited, were quoted at $25 a share, and I think the number any one shareholder can hold is limited to ten shares.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman is not stating the facts correctly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The statement made by the hon. gentleman does not refer to the hon. member for Mackenzie personally; therefore there is no question of privilege.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: During the war years the United Grain Growers, Limited, undoubtedly made enormous profits, ranging from 44 to 65 per cent, and in this particular instance 500 per cent. I do not know what some of their other subsidiary companies may have made. But I want to point out that the United Grain Growers, Limited, do not hand those profits back to the farmers, the farmer who has no shares in the company gets exactly the same treatment as the shareholder does, with the exception that the latter receives a dividend of 8½ per cent on his shares for which he paid $30, and his holding is limited, I believe, to ten shares. Many of the shareholders hold only one or two shares merely in order to have a vote. But there is this to be remembered, that the United Grain Growers, Limited, have reaped enormous profits from the fact that they are doing business with the farmers of Western Canada.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): Hear, hear.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The tariff is the terrible bugbear of the farmers of the West we are told. Why did not the hon. member for Marquette and the hon. member for Mackenzie, the president and one of the prominent directors of the company, tell this House that the United Grain Growers, Limited, with their president a member of the Government, had purchased enormous quantities of American machinery a year ago and were holding them in bond expecting a reduction in the tariff at that time? Why was that statement not made to the House? A member of the Government president of the United Grain Growers, Limited, with inside information—his company profiting to that extent! I placed some questions on the Order Paper this year with a view to ascertaining what amount of machinery had been so held by these people without result. But the evidence of the general manager of the United Grain Growers, Limited, shows that

the profits they made on the machinery which they imported into this country, I think it was in 1917, was 22.6 per cent. They do business with their customers on a spot cash basis. They have no agents. They have warehouses, and if a farmer wants a machine he can go there and get it, but he has to plank down the cash before he gets it,—and they simply charge him 22.6 per cent. He buys a binder for $250; the tariff at 12½ per cent would be $31.25,—because a considerable reduction has been made in the tariff in order to meet the demands of such unreasonable gentlemen as the member for Marquette. I consider him unreasonable in that the pressure which was brought to bear on the Government a year ago, when they conceded these things to him, should have been sufficient to cause him to carry on and not try to disrupt and disorganize the Government at that time. Well, it is well known that binders and other like implements will with reasonable care, last fifteen years, so that the amount of duty when spread over the life of the binder is not very much,—$31.25 on a binder costing $250. But the hon. member for Marquette did not point out that the United Grain Growers, Limited, want $52.87 profit on that binder from the farmer who is he claims benefited by the profits made by this company. Where do all these surplus profits go? And there are other subsidiary companies as well. I am afraid that I shall not be able to get through before six o'clock, but I want to assure you that other matters in connection with the administration of the Department of Agriculture while the president of the United Grain Growers, Limited, was in the pay of that company and a member of the Government will require some investigation before this Parliament prorogues—an investigation to which the people of Canada are entitled.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (resuming): When the House rose at six o'clock I was making some reference to the profits on agricultural machinery made by the United Grain Growers, Limited. Whereas the duty on agricultural machinery is 12½ per cent the company shows a profit on the agricultural machinery handled of 21.6 per cent. This is borne out by the evidence given by the General Manager before the Cost of Living Committee. I was also proceeding before the House rose to refer to another branch of the business carried on by this company. There has been a good deal of controversy between grain men and others, with regard to the manner in which the profits of the company have been disposed of. I think I have shown conclusively, and no evidence to the contrary has been submitted to the House, that the only advantage the shareholder receives is a dividend of 8% per cent on the stock that he purchases. That has been the average in recent years, and in no case has he received more than 10 per cent on the capital invested, which is limited to a few shares. I noticed in the Winnipeg papers of January 15, 1919, an article with reference to the profits from overages. I shall quote one paragraph of the article, which is signed by W. J. Christie.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): What paper is the hon. gentleman quoting from?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The Farmers' Telegram and Family Magazine. The article is as follows:

> In the above year—
>
> That is 1917,
>
> —the company made from overage, which was the rightful property of the farmer, much more than they paid the shareholders in dividends. From information received from one of the officers, the Grain Growers, Ltd., have from 30,000 to 40,000 stock subscribers, who are principally the farmers of the prairie provinces, and if properly operated on protected lines it could be of great benefit to the farmers of Canada. The average individual holding is about $50. The management and directors seem to use the 30,000 or 40,000 shareholders to sing their praises, for which they pay them a dividend of 10 per cent, or an average of about $5.00 per year each, and they actually took a greater amount from the farmers by way of excessive dockage on grain shipped through them, for which they give no value. This is certainly a cheap system of advertising their company, but expensive to the farmers.
>
> The farmers of Canada cannot expect much assistance from the United Grain Growers, Limited, either by legislation or in any other way, while they take from them the grain overage, which is the property of the farmer, sell it and apply the proceeds to their own use. If the president of the United Grain Growers' Limited, who is a cabinet minister at Ottawa, advocated any change in the tariff on agricultural implements, would not the question be asked him: "How can you conscientiously ask for any further protection to the farmer when the company of which you are president accepts the grain overage that is the rightful property of the farmer, and applies it to the use of your company?" It would be like the freckled-faced man selling a concoction to remove freckles. The United Grain Growers, Limited, have repre-

sentatives on their board who are members of the Federal Parliament.

The article also points out that in that year the wheat overages of the United Grain Growers' elevator amounted to $66,744. Since a certain date, it has been legitimate for these companies to retain the overages, but I understand that regulations were passed to enable them to claim this overage legally. The article goes on further to state:

> Webster's definition of the word "stealing" is the act of taking the property of another without his knowledge or consent.

There is another matter I want to refer to, and that is the screenings from the grain at the terminal elevators. The quantity of screenings is something enormous, and strange to say, while the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) was a member of this Government the Department of Agriculture of which he was the head, entered into a contract whereby they undertook to purchase the whole of the re-cleaned screenings at the terminal elevators, and the price which they paid, was $35 per ton. After the farmers had had some experience with the stuff the Government found themselves unable to dispose of it, and before the hon. member for Marquette resigned from the Government this stuff was disposed of at a loss to the Government of something over $96,446.26. I endeavoured to ascertain from the General Manager of the company before the Cost of Living Committee the quantity that the Grain Growers' Grain Company had disposed of, and he agreed through counsel for the company to supply the committee with the quantity and how it had been disposed of. However, he did not do so, and consequently I am not in a position to give the amount that was purchased from this company by the Government while the hon. member for Marquette was Minister of Agriculture. I have already pointed out that the loss to the Department was $96,446.26. The General Manager intimated that he thought the Grand Trunk Elevator Company had purchased the screenings from the United Grain Growers, Limited. In answer to a question I put on the Order Paper this year I received information as to the elevators from whom this stuff was purchased and the price paid, and I find that from the Grand Trunk Pacific Elevator Company—I am not sure that that is the one the General Manager meant, but presumably it is—the Government purchased 2,514 tons at a cost of $87,990. The Government also purchased some from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and from the Saskatchewan Elevator Company, of which I believe the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) is the president, or at least a director, 1,616 tons at a cost of $46,560.

I have frequently directed the attention of the House to the business that was being conducted in screenings in this country. As far back as 1912 I brought the matter to the attention of the Government, and I have repeatedly endeavoured to have the Government realize the danger that was incurred in having this stuff sent broadcast throughout the country. Provision was made that this stuff might be ground at the elevators and sold to farmers in the ground state, but as a matter of fact it was nearly all shipped out unground. About 10 per cent of it was wild oats, and contained mustard seeds in abundance and other noxious weeds. The result is that those who were misled and foolish enough to purchase this stuff that was unloaded on the country by the president of the United Grain Growers, Limited, are now cursing the day they ever purchased a pound of the stuff and had it fed on their farms.

I want to refer to the price formerly paid for screenings. The General Manager says:

> The average price of screenings during the three years before the war was $4.91 per ton, and the average price for the last six years, including one in which they sold at higher than $20 a ton, has been $8.84 per ton.

The price was $4.91 before the war and $8.84 while the war was on, and this stuff that was purchased through that medium was sent broadcast all over this country with the result that a crop of noxious weeds has been scattered throughout the length and breadth of Canada, in order that this corporation might have big profits on their business. In connection with screenings and overages, I may say that when the grain is received at the elevator the farmer is entitled to anything in excess of 3 per cent dockage while anything amounting to 3 per cent or under the company that handles the grain retains for itself. The farmer also has to pay the freight on the shipment of this stuff to the head of the Lakes. I am unable to give the amount of profits received from this source, but it is certainly very great indeed. In this connection I might refer to something that was dealt with before six o'clock. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) made the statement that in connection with the New York Export Company the profits had been $500,000 on an actual investment of

$100,000. As a matter of fact, the general manager states that the profits amounted to $530,000 on an investment of $100,000. Now, we have had charges thrown across the floor of the House that some hon. members on this side who have expressed their approval of the Budget proposals were profiteers, and that some of them had profited during the war to a very great extent. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Elkin) was charged by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. J. F. Reid), I believe, with being a profiteer who had made considerable money during the war. I do not like to make personal references to suspicions as to what people did during the war. Undoubtedly some people have made profits while others have not. But there is one thing that stands out prominently, and will stand out for all time to the credit and the glory of Canada, and that is the fact that we had over half a million men who were prepared to answer the call of duty and, if need be, to surrender their lives in the defence of their country; and the mere bagatelle which they received in the way of pay would not begin to pay their expenses under ordinary conditions. For $1.10 a day those men who did not fall in the struggle carried on day after day and year after year, winning a glorious name for Canada. We have in this House objecting to the present Budget two Oppositions, one, the recognized Liberal party, and the other what are termed the cross-benchers, or Agrarian party, the party led by the hon. member for Marquette, and I should like to know what the leaders of those two parties did during the whole period of the war, when the Prime Minister of this country (Sir Robert Borden), the leader of the Government, was devoting every ounce of energy he possessed, and all the time he could possibly place at the disposal of his country, to the end that Canada might play its part in the struggle, he himself eventually becoming a casualty of the war. What was the record of the two hon. gentlemen? I have already pointed out that the hon. member for Marquette, not satisfied with having the high and distinguished honour of being a member of the Government, retained his position as President of the United Grain Growers, Limited. In this connection, I may remark in passing that the other director of the United Grain Growers, Limited, the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Reid), does not state that the subsidiary company, the New York Export Company, contributed to the profits of the parent company. He makes a distinction between the two, and I hope that if there is not such a distinction some one who follows me will so state, because I do not wish to have anything left at the doors of this company for which they are not responsible. Now, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) on two different occasions, once last session and again during the present session, has taken up considerable time explaining to Parliament and to the country what he had been doing during the war. Well, it is a much different thing mining coal in Colorado from facing the bullets of the enemy on the western front, and other theatres of the war; and, I may add, it is also a much different thing to be carrying on as a soldier than to be filling the position of president of a strong corporation which makes profits in excess of 500 per cent in connection with what one branch of its business, a business that was rendered very profitable as a result of the war, at a salary of from ten to fifteen thousand dollars per year, in addition to being a member of the Government. We are asked to vote a want of confidence in the Prime Minister and his Government; that is what this amendment means. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) twits the mover of the amendment with having introduced such a milk-and-water resolution, which he describes as a shilly-shallying effort to meet the political exigencies of the situation. That is the situation which we have before us to-night and with which we have to deal.

Now, I want to touch upon another matter in connection with the operations of the company, as well as of the department of which my hon. friend (Mr. Crerar) was head. While the war was on it was deemed advisable by the Government to commandeer the butter that was being manufactured, and not that which was already manufactured, as they had done in the United States. They left in cold storage in this country something over 27,000,000 pounds of butter, and commandeered every pound that was being manufactured in the creameries throughout the country. They also placed an embargo on the exportation of milk and cream in excess of quantities that had been exported previous to that time. The amount in cold storage at that time was 27,091,254 pounds. The price at which it was commandeered was 46½ cents a pound for No. 1, 46 for No. 2, and 45 for No. 3.

What have been the results of these attacks that have been made on the dairy industry? The reports that were given out from month to month show that there has

been an enormous falling off in dairy produce for the last two years. Ending February this year there was a decrease of 45,000,000 pounds in cheese, an increase in butter and in condensed milk, but in the aggregate a falling off of 24,075,779 pounds. That is the situation that this country is up against and in the face of all this we had the regulations that were enacted by the Board of Commerce that was turned loose on this country at the last session of Parliament. The facts are already in evidence, and they demand immediate attention on the part of the Government. It is the duty of the Government to see that something is done because I will venture to predict that during the present year you will see, month by month, evidences that the policy that was inaugurated under the hon. member for Marquette when the Minister of Agriculture supplemented by the Board of Commerce is going to prove a very serious one indeed.

The hon. member in endeavouring to justify his withdrawal from the Government went on to deal, as he has dealt this afternoon, with the tariff. The tariff was responsible for all the ills that this country was suffering from and it was necessary for him to get out of the Government although the Government had conceded a good deal to him along the line which he had been advocating. The ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) whom I am glad to see in the House to-night, will have a fairly good knowledge of what took place in the Government in connection with that matter. The hon. member for Marquette availed himself of the opportunity of that time to refer to the province of Ontario to state how agriculture had become decadent and that it looked to him as though it might very soon be that agriculture would become a lost art in that province. He asserted that production was not as great as it was thirty years ago. That was a bold statement to make and a statement which can not be substantiated. It was a statement which was absolutely without any justification. He stated that:

> The Prime Minister invited me to join this Government, in a sense representing that body of organized public opinion to which I have referred.

Organized public opinion? The United Grain Growers, Limited is the organized public opinion which the hon. gentleman represented when he went into the Government. His subsequent conduct would lead you to believe that he had proved faithful to the company with which he was and is connected. He says:

> Furthermore—and the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) knows it—he can travel through Ontario as I have travelled through it, and he will find, not hundreds, but thousands, of abandoned farms in that province.

Poor old Ontario with her thousands of abandoned farms!

> Within the last two years I saw myself in a twelve-mile drive in the county of Huron, one of the best counties of Ontario, six vacant farms, and I have no reason to doubt the statements I have made.

I will venture to state that he cannot find an abandoned farm in the county of Huron. It is true many farms are much larger than they were and it is also true that the agricultural population is not as great as it was a few years ago. There are reasons for that. Western Canada was opened up durthat time, and the sons of the farmers of Ontario have gone west by tens of thousands, taken up homesteads and become citizens of the West. But there are opportunities in Ontario that there were not thirty years ago and I am proud of the fact that we have industrial concerns in Ontario where our young men can go and that there are opportunities for them to engage in business and the professions if they do not wish to carry on farming operations, whereas, before that, they had to go to the United States or some other country to do so. We have these opportunities in Canada to-day and that condition is much preferable than that our young men should have to go to some other country to find openings in commercial life. Agriculture has been dragging in Ontario for a number of years. Why? The young men on the farms in Ontario volunteered just as well as those in other walks of life considering the conditions surrounding them. I have in mind three farmers, neighbours of mine, with only two sons each. All these boys volunteered and went overseas. How could you expect their fathers to carry on as well under these conditions? Yet we have a party in this province that are endeavouring to libel the farmers and to cast odium upon them by saying that they were favourable to being exempted from military service during the war. That is not the case because during the war they carried on as well as they could although they were badly handicapped by reason of the fact that the men who had formerly sought employment on the farm had gone to the war. As a rule they were among the newcomers to this

country, they were British born, they were the first to answer the call and they rushed to the colours but they are again coming back, they are coming into Ontario in large numbers and we will soon overcome the conditions we have had to face during the past few years.

It would be unfortunate at this time if it were instilled in the minds of the people that there is a possibility that we were going to upset the fiscal conditions of this country. That same old agitation was going on previous to 1896. There was a feeling of unrest and uncertainty previous to that time by reason of the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite but once they came into power the manufacturers, and those who had money to invest, realized they were going to adhere to the old, stable policy which had been in force in this country. The result was that capital obtained confidence, people put their money into industries and we had prosperity by reason of the fact that uncertainty had been removed from the minds of the people. It is up to the people of Canada to-day to put those who are endeavouring to stir up trouble and discontent where they properly belong. It is a remarkable thing, it is very significant, that it was only a few days after the hon. member for Marquette severed his connection with the Government that there broke out in his native province what you might call an insurrection. You all know what happened in connection with the strike in the city of Winnipeg and it is not necessary to refer to it here. You know how the eyes of the people were turned in that direction and it was well known that there was a determined effort being made to bring about a condition in this country similar to that which they have in Russia. The O. B. U. was in evidence at Winnipeg at that particular time. I do not refer to these things with any degree of pleasure but it is just as well to call a spade a spade and be done with it and get rid of some of this camouflage.

Yes, the province of Ontario, as the hon. member says, suffered during the war by reason of the scarcity of farm labour. The farmers in that province have had a good deal to contend with, but they are not the only people that have had to encounter difficulties in that respect. This movement that is on foot is not confined to Canada or the United States, it has been general throughout the world—the movement from the country to the cities and towns has been a world-wide movement. Two weeks ago I noticed in the Detroit Free Press an article referring to what was taking place in the state of Michigan, which is similar in many respects to the province of Ontario. This is what Mr. G. W. Dickinson, manager of the Michigan State Fair, had to say with reference to the Lansing official report which dealt with this matter:

"The public does not half realize the importance of that report," said Mr. Dickinson. "We have a tremendous housing shortage here in Detroit, but out in the state there are 30,300 vacant homes. In Detroit, they would take care of at least 150,000 people, and considering the ample size of most country homes and the congestion here, they probably would accommodate close to 250,000 persons.

"Information in this report is not altogether new to the Fair personnel. Our county agents have been sending in isolated reports showing the same tendency for several months.

"It is not poor land that is idle. Great portions of it is right at our doors in Oakland county—which is not only the most fertile of soil, but is also practically a backyard garden for the great manufacturing cities of Detroit and Pontiac. Next winter we may have our pockets full of money, but without food and coal."

That is the condition of affairs in the state of Michigan. Mr. Harry R. O'Brien, writing in the Canadian Farm and quoting in an article from the Saturday Evening Post, states:

One of the questions discussed by this writer is the housing problem in cities. He cites case after case of empty houses in the country, while the people in neighbouring towns are forced to crowd together two, three, four and more families in a single dwelling. In a country town in Kentucky of 6,000 souls there are but two houses that are not homes of at least two families, and in some cases in this town as high as six families are living in one house. On five of the main roads leading out from that town, within a radius of less than ten miles, there are, at least, twenty-seven vacant farm houses—standing idle with no one living in them. This is only one of the particular instances cited. They could be multiplied many times over in every State. Cities and towns are overcrowded, while thousands of farm houses all over the country are vacant.

That is the condition of affairs in the United States. Why, then, does the hon. member single out the province of Ontario and try to make things much worse than they really are. We have this good excuse for being short of farm labour in that province that the farm labourers and the farmers' sons were at the Front doing their duty. I say it ill becomes any man who had the distinguished honour of being chosen a member of the Government to break faith with the people who sent him here, because it is nothing else than that. If those hon. gentlemen who have crossed from this side to the cross benches find

that it is necessary for them to vote against the Government on the tariff question which was not an issue at the last election there is only one consistent thing for them to do, and that is to go back to the electors who sent him here, and say, "I can no longer support the Government." Let them do that instead of endeavouring to form the nucleus of a party with the object of wrecking the Government. I am satisfied that I am right in my views as to what is contemplated because of the prediction made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier before the Union Government was formed, and which I have already given to the House. Hon. Gentlemen opposite are hoping to wreck the Government by bringing small detachments of members from this side over to their ranks—some of whom might be characterized as the hon. members on the cross benches have characterized the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding): If I cannot support the Government on a measure such as we are considering to-day, especially when an amendment has been moved which means a vote of want of confidence in Sir Robert Borden and his colleagues, there is a certain consistent course for me to pursue, and that is to hand my resignation to the people who sent me here. That and no other course should be followed by those who have any regard for the confidence which was placed in them by the people under the peculiar conditions which existed in the fall of 1917. I believe that breeding counts for something in the long run. We have on this side descendants of Blakes and Mowats, and I venture to say you will not find men with blood of that kind in their veins doing such a thing in the case of a Government elected as this Government was in 1917.

I have already spoken at greater length than I intended but there are a number of other matters to which I would like to refer. At this critical period, when public confidence is so necessary, no one should do anything to unduly agitate the public mind. Undoubtedly there is unrest in the country, and it is quite natural that there should be. Then, too, the cost of living is a very serious matter indeed. Hon. gentlemen opposite ask: Are these taxes that are levied going to benefit the consumer? Who are the consumers, let me ask? Is not every citizen of this country a consumer, and will he not find it necessary to deny himself of something in order to meet the demands that are being made upon him? The hon. member for Marquette complained that the income tax imposed in Canada was not as high as that levied in Great Britain. In his speech the hon. member could not get away from Great Britain. That is his ideal in regard to the tariff, and fiscal matters of every kind; but it must be remembered that Great Britain is an old country, with long established industries. Why did not the hon. gentleman refer to the income taxes that are being levied in the United States? Had he done so he would have found that the income taxes collected in Canada compare very favourably with those levied in the country to the south. The opinion of the people of the United States with regard to Canada is evidently a good deal better than that entertained by the hon. member for Marquette. In this connection let me quote a few paragraphs which appeared in the New York Tribune of December 19, 1917:

Canada "Carries On".

Last April on the shell scarred slopes of Vimy Ridge Canada at the front gave proof of her courage, her devotion, her strength. The "maple leaf" planted on one of the great bulwarks of German tyranny in France was a final evidence of the attitude of one-half of North America to the Boche threat to civilization.

Before Vimy the Canadians had borne their part nobly. It was soldiers of the Dominion who broke the first weight of the German thrust after the gas attack in the Second Battle of Ypres. The British Empire will long remember gratefully the sacrifices of the "Little Black Devils" and the "Princess Pats" on that blood soaked ground about Ypres where the veteran army of Britain—the "old contemptibles"—found their glory and their graves in October and November, 1914.

Of the Canadians at the front there was no question. They had seen the German thing as it was. Their comrades had been "gassed" and crucified. Their fellow Canadians had fought cleanly and bravely against a barbarism which expressed itself in methods and in tricks which were beneath the contempt of white men and below the level of savages. Canada at the front knew the German—but what of Canada behind the front, three thousand miles away—would that line hold, too?

Well, the world has its answer now. The politicians doubted. The weak, the weary, the conquered and the disloyal spread their forecasts and proclaimed the outcome. They are answered; so are doubting politicians and faint hearted patriots the world over. As the American democracy found itself by re-electing Lincoln in 1864, the Canadian democracy has justified democracy and itself in 1917 by re-enlisting for the war, by accepting the man and the methods which alone promise victory.

It is a stirring thing, this victory of democracy in Canada over all the forces which make for surrender and for worse than surrender. The voice of the first Allied electorate to be heard in many, many months is a sign for all Allied statesmen to observe and heed. Canada has sent 400,000 men to Europe; Canada has borne more than 125,000 casualties; but to the call of duty Canada's response is immediate and unmistakable. It is a response which will be heard the

world over. It is a response which will be noted in Berlin as well as in London. Is it too much to suspect it may even be heard in Rome?

The United States will congratulate and pay just tribute to its neighbouring democracy for its decision. In a time of momentary pessimism Canada has cheered all of us. In an hour of depression and weakness Canada has shown the road of courage and victory illuminated by the spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion. She has been faithful to her dead; to those of her sons murdered as well as those slain in fair fight.

That was the opinion of the better element of the people of the United States with regard to our attitude during the war.

Canada will continue to carry on, and she is not going to be divided into classes. Any one who endeavours to set class against class in this country is doomed to failure, for our people have too much good sense to be led away by any such false cry, the folly of which is apparent to every right-thinking person. As the inheritors of a great country we have a duty that we must perform, and the eyes of the world are centred on us to-day largely by reason of the sacrifices and record made by our gallant soldiers at the front. The need of the hour is great, but if we do our duty by ourselves and by our country, if we remain true to ourselves, during the next few years we shall see an unparalleled and undreamt of development of our resources. United States capitalists are anxious to invest money and to establish new industries here in order to develop our resources; in our great western country, where as yet we have merely scratched a little of the surface, we have unlimited resources which, when developed, will be a reproach to those who now would advocate a departure at this critical stage of our history from the old established policy upon which has been laid the foundations of our national prosperity. Are we going to take chances again, as we did years ago when we were young and weak on a change of fiscal policy after having laid down a truly Canadian policy, in order that somebody, somewhere, may make a try out with some fantastic theory? And, Mr. Speaker, I may say that if no stronger arguments are advanced in support of that theory than we have heard this afternoon from the leader of the Agrarian party, I am inclined to think that that party has reached its meridian and is already on its decline.

In conclusion I want to again emphasize the fact, that over 80 per cent of our agricultural produce is now consumed at home, and I would again draw attention to the importance of the home market, which is the most valuable that our farmers can have, and I would warn them that if the policy now being advocated by the Agrarian group ever goes into effect agriculture will be the first to suffer, for it is not only our industrial interests that need a protective policy let us get full credit for the quality and standard of our products.

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) says that protection is the greatest fallacy that was ever dreamt of. I can remember when the leader of the Government some years ago was endeavouring to put a vote through this House in order to strengthen and render more efficient the British Navy, my hon. friend from Red Deer contended that even although it would cost more money to build ships in Canada, the policy for us to adopt was to have the wheels of industry turning here, to have our workmen employed, and that better wages for Canadian workmen meant better living conditions for their families. So my hon. friend has not always been a consistent advocate of free trade. On that occasion, notwithstanding his great admiration for the Mother Land—which we all feel just as strongly as he does—he advocated Canadian ships built by Canadian workmen.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, we have a country which nature has endowed with everything that a man can desire, and which holds the promise of a mighty future. And, if we cannot make a country with such material it will be because we are not true to ourselves and if we are not true to ourselves be sure our sin will find us out.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for the United Farmers' party, and I will not assume to-night the responsibility of answering the violent attacks made by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) on the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Halbert). Several hon. members of the United Farmers' party have yet to speak, and I am sure that when the opportunity is given to them they will fully answer the hon. member who has just taken his seat.

Before discussing the Budget, however, I think it is my duty to answer a statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford to the effect that when a delegation of the farmers of the various provinces came to Ottawa to try to force the Government to keep its promises to exempt their sons from military service, that movement originated with the Minister of Agriculture of

the province of Quebec. Sir, My hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland), who represents a farming constituency, and who probably would not be sitting in this House if that promise of exemption had not been made before the election, knows very well that his statement is not based on fact. It is true that some of the farmers of the province of Quebec joined the farmers of the other provinces in the delegation, but they did not expect any result from the interview with the Government. The farmers of Quebec did not resent the cancellation of the exemption as much as did their brothers in Ontario and the other English provinces, for those of Quebec knew very well that the promise made by the Government was purely an election promise, and in the light of that knowledge they took good care to vote unanimously against the Government.

Let us come now to the Budget Speech. Mark Twain, in one of his books, tells the story of a devout believer in Christianity who, on hearing that an appeal for funds was to be made on behalf of his church, provided himself with a fair amount of bank notes with the idea of giving generously in aid of the church. As he entered the house of God he took out of his pocket ten one dollar bills and put them to one side with the intention of giving them at collection time. The preacher started his sermon, and of course the subject of the sermon was an appeal for funds. Our generous friend listened to him very carefully. The preacher started to expose, first the liabilities of the church and the comparatively heavy debt, and as he went on giving details of expenditure the generous member thought that some of that expenditure was uncalled for and extravagant, and it had the effect of cooling a little his generosity. Stretching out his hand he took up one of the dollar bills and put it back in his pocket. The preacher went along and set forth what he thought should be a fair assessment of the members of the church, and the assessment proposed was so unjust and biassed, inasmuch as it put the heaviest burden of the taxation or the collection on the poorer members of the community and was very lenient towards the wealthier members, that one by one the bills found their way back into our well-disposed member's pocket; and at the end of the sermon, when the collection came on, he gave a dime. Sir, on the 18th of this month, having realized the dire financial condition of the country, I came to this House well-disposed towards the ever-smiling and jaunty Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), ready to assist him in his arduous task of fixing up the finances of the country, and absolutely open-minded as to the means to be adopted. I even joined the other members of the Opposition in applauding him when he rose. But, Sir, as he proceeded with his submission of long lists of figures of expenditures and other extravagances of the Government, my good intention began to dwindle; and, when the hon. minister began to make his new proposals of taxation putting the whole burden and hardship on the shoulders of the middle classes and the poorer classes and leaving entirely what I may call the war money undisturbed, the war wealth untouched, my good disposition received another shock. But when at the end of his speech I realized that his proposal meant a retention by the wealthy of huge sums that should have been diverted to the public treasury, when I noticed that he had nothing to say regarding the high cost of living, nothing to suggest with a view to allaying the unrest throughout the country, my desire to help received such a severe shock that I could not even bring to the rescue of my previous good intentions the old Latin proverb, venia necessitati datur—indulgence is granted to necessity.

I would like to retain your attention, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments first, on the omissions from the Budget; second, on the unfair proposals of the Budget; and third, on the alternatives which I believe would have been much fairer and more efficient. I have no time to review the financial situation of the country, as has been done by some other members. But, listening to the Minister of Finance the other day and hearing him say that the net debt of the country was over two billion dollars and had increased last year in the sum of $395,000,000. I took my pencil and made some figures. I found that last year our debt increased at the rate of $32,916,666 per month; $7,000,000 per week; $1,084,931 per day; $45,205 per hour. So, if the increase goes along this year as it did last year, the net debt will have increased from the time we entered this Chamber, Sir, at eight o'clock this evening until we adjourn probably at twelve o'clock, in the sum of $180,820. I surmise that after examining these striking figures it is not necessary to dwell on the gravity of the financial situation of the country.

But granting the extravagance and carelessness of the Government, permit me, Mr. Speaker, to refer to a most important

9 p.m.

statement which was made in the House a few days ago by the member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair), commented upon by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) and discussed by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen). At page 2723 of unrevised Hansard, 21st May, the member for Antigonish and Guysborough referred first to twenty-five payments amounting to about $3,000, marked "Advances unaccounted for" in the Auditor General's Report. As no answer has been made by the Government with regard to this item, I will not discuss it. But on the same day my hon. friend made a much more important statement, reported on the same page of Hansard. He stated that there was an item of $119,546,597 in the Auditor General's Report of the 31st March, 1918, for which no vouchers had been received; that this year a similar item appeared, but increased to $121,640,016.12. He stated also that the late Auditor General, Mr. Fraser, urged the Militia Department to take action; that he demanded these vouchers in 1917, 1918 and 1919, and that they apparently have not been forthcoming as yet in 1920—the amount of $121,000,000 has disappeared and nobody knows where it has gone. The hon. member for Red Deer commented upon these facts and their importance the other day, and at last an answer came from the Government. It came from the lips of the Minister of the Interior when he was making a bid for the premiership of Canada. Let us examine this statement; let us see whether it is of the calibre that one would expect from a leader, or one who aspires to be a leader, of public opinion. We find it at page 2767 of unrevised Hansard of this year. The answer is divided into two parts. I shall read the first part first. Here is what the Minister of the Interior says, referring to the hon. member for Red Deer:

> He made mention of certain items in the Auditor General's Report that were marked in that report "unaccounted for," and large items they were. They were referred to first by the hon. member for Guysborough and Antigonish (Mr. J. H. Sinclair). I was not in my place at that time; but I would presume that the items were British or foreign credits, the accounting for which had not yet reached the Auditor General, and that consequently they appeared in the report in that form.

Notice the answer: I presume, he says, the items were British or foreign credits. He does not know what they are. What matters to him the paltry sum of $121,000,000 belonging to the people of Canada? Let us see now if his presumption is correct. It might be a good standard by which in the future to weigh the many presumptions of the Minister of the Interior. I have here volume 4, 1918, part ZZ, of the Auditor General's Report, and on page 218 I find the following:

Expenditure by the Chief Paymaster on account of pay and other expenses of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, vouchers for which have not been received	$119,546,597 93
Less refunds deposited to the credit of the Receiver General by the Chief Paymaster	4,165,354 22
	$115,381,243 71

There are no British or foreign credits there. Let us see further. In the Auditor General's Report of 1919, part ZZ, at page 228, I find the following:

Expenditure by the Chief Paymaster on account of pay and other expenses of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, vouchers for which have not been received	$129,308,233 14
Less refunds deposited to the credit of the Receiver General by the Chief Paymaster..	7,668,216 52
	$121,640,016 62

I do not find any British or foreign credits there either. Is my hon. friend still satisfied that these are British or foreign credits? Let us look further into the matter. On Friday, the 18th of May, 1917, the late Auditor General, Mr, Fraser, appeared before the Special Committee on Returned Soldiers and gave evidence regarding some accounts of the Militia Department. His evidence, which will be found on page 1116 to 1124 of that report, contains a few lines which will show you how the people's money is being taken care of by this Government. On page 1119 of the report I read the following:

> By Mr. Bennett:
> Q. That is pretty well looked after now.

He was speaking of these amounts. The Auditor General, Mr. Fraser, at that time, replied:

> I will tell you what was done. When I was over there, and discussing these things, I said: "You ought to have some system of checking with Ottawa periodically." The result of that suggestion was that cards were taken from all the ledgers, giving the man's name, identity, and so forth, with the state of his account on the 30th November, and they have sent a staff out here who are engaged in checking off the accounts with the Militia Department books.

Q. And the statement has been made that the result has been very satisfactory?—A. I do not know whether it will be satisfactory to the Committee to hear that they have found there were hundreds of thousands of dollars gone, and only a comparatively small portion of it recovered.

Further on at page 1122 the Auditor General was questioned as follows:

By Hon. Mr. Murphy:

Q. In connection with the overpayments of which you spoke, I suppose that efforts are constantly being made to recover these amounts? —A. Yes, there is a staff, I do not know how many, engaged on that work.

Q. How do these efforts result, are the moneys returned, or refunded by the people who received cheques they should not have received? —A. Those would be sums paid at Ottawa here?

Q. Yes.—A. I do not know exactly what your committee here is appointed to inquire into.

Q. Everything in connection with this subject; is there anything in that connection upon which this committee might obtain further information?—A. I certainly think there should be some inquiry into this question; I understand there have been very serious leakages in connection with these refunds.

Q. How do you mean?—A. In conection with refunds that have been made and not accounted for.

Q. Refunds made to Ottawa?—A. Yes. I am only giving hearsay now, but I would not say it unless I thought it were true. This is so vast a subject, that I cannot audit it in the way I audit other accounts, unless I create a staff such as they have or duplicate the work and keep the accounts.

Q. How does this leakage occur to which you refer?—A. Sometimes cases where the person has had a separation allowance continued after the man was discharged and when it is found out after a while, the department asks the parties to make a refund. The refund comes back in cash, possibly, or money orders, or cheques, and I understand there is a lot of that money that has never gone to the credit of the Receiver General.

Q. Have there been any reports made to you on that subject?—A. No.

Q. Would there be any reports made to you in the ordinary course of events?—A. No, they do not usually tell me those things. It is just like the paymasters, there are defalcations of paymasters, quite a lot of them, some of them from overseas. I will give you one instance of a man who was, I think it was $3,500 behind. He was overseas, he was dealt with over there and sent back to Canada. He was discharged and sent back to Canada to be dealt with here. He was dealt with here, by putting him in command of a new regiment as colonel. He is now over in France, and he has never paid up this amount. I asked them to commence deducting this amount from his pay and they said: "Oh, we can't do that, the pay is to Colonel So and So; that was Paymaster So and So, we have no authority to deduct it from Colonel So and So's pay."

Q. Was it known at headquarters that he was a defaulter?—A. Yes, certainly, it is shown on the books there.

Sir, there can be no doubt in the minds of the representatives of the people as to the ultimate destination of this $121,000,000.

[Mr. Archambault.]

But the Minister of the Interior says something else in his reply:

But the hon. member for Guysborough or the hon. member for Red Deer, knows that if there is anything he does not understand in the Report of the Auditor General, there is a standing committee of this House for the purpose of investigating every item questioned, and although we have been in session three months, that committee has never been called. If there be any reason for calling it, hon. members have it in their power to have it called, and if there be anything dark it will be revealed.

First of all let me say, Sir, that this answer does not stand on its legs. It is true we have been here three months, but although we have repeatedly asked for the fourth volume of the Auditor General's Report it was only forthcoming about a week ago. But the minister's answer means something more. It has a much more important significance. He says that if the Opposition members believe that there is something wrong they have the power to call the Public Accounts Committee and if there is anything dark it will be revealed. But suppose we do not call that committee, what then? The position assumed by the Government is this: "Let the people be robbed if the Opposition is not clever enough to see it. It is not our business; what do we care?" Well, Sir, I submit that, whether sitting on your right or on your left, every member is in duty bound to look after the accounts and to see that the people's money is not improperly expended.

Now I come to the omissions of the Budget. First of all, I wish to call attention to a matter which I have brought up every time the income tax has been discussed in this House. I refer to the exemption of $200 for every child under seventeen years of age. I believe, Sir, that the amount is far too small and that it should be increased to $500. To any one who has been blessed with children it is only too well known that $200, nay, $500, is hardly sufficient for the expenses in connection with one child. I would even go further in my request of the Minister of Finance, who I am very sorry is not in his place. I would ask him to grant total exemption from income taxation to the father of ten children, and I trust he will take up my suggestion in committee. After all, it is the Canadian-born person who makes the best Canadian citizen, and if my hon. friend refuses to accede to my request I shall perforce come to the conclusion that, instead of following the precept of the Bible, "Crescite et multipli camini," he has the same idea as is enter-

tained by a well known mayor in the province of Ontario, Mayor Booker, who is reported by the Ottawa Journal as follows:

> Hamilton, March 29: Mayor Booker announced himself an advocate of birth control and thinks the time will come when Canada will adopt the Holland system. "Some families are altogether too large," he said. "One or two children are enough for most homes."

I am sure, Sir, that this mayor of a large Ontario city must be a dog fancier, and I hope the Minister of Finance does not approve of the theories of this premier advocate of race suicide.

Regarding the income tax, I have another suggestion to make. In England they differentiate between incomes earned and incomes unearned. For instance, if a man has an income of, say, $6,000 which is derived from investments in stock, real estate, deposits in banks, he pays a larger tax than the man who derives his income from his daily labour. And that is only fair. If the man who has an income of $6,000 derives it from investments in stocks or deposits in banks or investments in real estate, when he dies or becomes an invalid his family is left with a capital of at least $100,000 and has practically the same income as when he was alive On the other hand, when a man who derives his income from his work dies or becomes an invalid his family is left penniless. I therefore submit that it is only just that such a man should be taxed to a less extent than the other, in order that he might be able either to take out insurance on his life or to put by a little money to provide for old age and the sustenance of his family when he is incapacitated.

But, Sir, the most glaring omission of the Budget Speech—evidently it is not an omission in the opinion of the minister, although it is, in mine and, I have no doubt, in that of the people of Canada—is the fact that he does not say a word about reducing the high cost of living. Nay, his proposals are rather apt to increase that cost. I should like to call your attention, Sir, to the fact that up to now not one member supporting the Government has said a word about the high cost of living; not one word has been said about the sufferings of the middle and poorer classes; not one plea has been made nor one suggestion offered to alleviate the burden which threatens to crush the taxpayer of modest means. Every member who has spoken supporting the Government has made an eloquent plea for protection, has brought forward figure after figure to prove that protection is necessary for manufacturing industries, and has stated this to be an indispensable fiscal policy. Those hon. members who spoke in this strain spoke strictly from the point of view of the privileged class, without making a single utterance regarding the consumer, ignoring him entirely in the problems we have to solve. Yet the middle and poorer classes form the great majority of the people. They are the ones who most feel the burdens of taxation and of the high cost of living. But it is characteristic of this Government that in framing their policies they take care of their wealthy friends and entirely ignore the needs of the common people. I am not surprised. I have been in this House for over two years and I have yet to see a measure brought down by the Government which carries with it an honest purpose to relieve the consumer. Am I exaggerating? Shall I be charged with making an assertion for a political purpose? Then I reply: Can any hon. member on the other side stand up and say that what I am saying is not correct? I repeat, Mr. Speaker, and I emphasize, that not only has no such measure been ever introduced, but the Government has encouraged profiteering with a fraternal care and allowed it to thrive and fatten. We had an inquiry into the high cost of living and startling facts were disclosed. The Government instituted the Board of Commerce which cost so much money to the people of the country, and which went around the country inquiring into the cost of ham sandwiches and false teeth. With what result? The chairman has resigned because he was tied down in his decisions. The Board has been in existence for over a year and though many instances of rank profiteering were brought before it, yet not one arrest was made.

Before starting the Board had enough evidence to jail some of the profiteers. The manager of the Paton Manufacturing Company of Sherbrooke stated before the High Cost of Living Committee that his company was making 72 per cent, or 176 per cent on the invested capital. He stated furthermore that his company was not made for the glory of God nor for the glory of the people, but that it was carried on for the benefit of the shareholders. He should have been arrested as they arrest that kind of people in the United States. It was also proved at the same inquiry that the Dominion Textile Company had made 31 per cent, but 310 per cent on the invested capital, as was stated by the hon. member for Marquette this afternoon. The amount put into the company originally is different from the

amount which is represented to be the capital stock now because there was $5,000,000 of common stock issued which was all water.

Has the Government taken proceedings against this company. No, Sir. Instead of taking proceedings they have done better than that. I hold in my hand a return to an order of the House of Commons dated April 19, 1920, and it is a return asked for by myself. It is sessional paper No. 147. I find that the companies controlled by Sir Charles Gordon or the subsidiaries of the Dominion Textile Company, received from the Government of Canada $958,566.77 in the last six months. Let me explain. This report discloses the following facts. My first question was:

Amounts loaned or credits given by the Government of Canada:—
(a) To Greece;
(b) To Roumania.

The answer was this:

Amounts loaned or credits given by the Government of Canada:
To Greece, $25,000,000.
To Roumania, $25,000,000.

My second question was as follows:

2. The date these loans were granted or credits given.

The answer is:

(a) To Greece, April 15, 1919.
(b) To Roumania, April 2, 1919.
These loans were granted by Orders in Council.

3. The nature of merchandise purchased by the Government of Canada and the charges in each case.

We will see later on what kind of merchandise was purchased. Now comes question No. 4, a most important question:

4. The names of commercial firms or persons from whom such goods were so purchased, specifying (a) the nature of goods in each case; (b) the amounts paid by the Government to these firms or persons in each case and also the date of these payments.

As I said before, I have taken the amounts given to the Dominion Textile Company and the subsidiary companies. The subsidiary companies are the Montreal Cotton Company and Penman's Limited. If you add the amount paid to Canadian Converters, in which I am informed the president of the Dominion Textile Company has a large interest, $111,751.20, you will find that Sir Charles Gordon, whose company was shown before the High Cost of Living Committee to have made profiteering profits, not only was not prosecuted, not only was not molested, but was given by the Government orders to the amount of $1,069,317.97 during the past six months and paid for by the money of the Canadian people.

[Mr. Archambault.]

But this document is very interesting. We have it that the Government has paid these firms with good Canadian money and charged the total amount to Roumania and Greece. Will we ever get this money back? I have very grave doubts. Roumania is bankrupt, Greece is on the verge of bankruptcy, and I am informed—and I wish some of the ministers would answer my question—that two interest instalments on the bonds that we hold from Roumania have not been met lately.

Let us glance rapidly over the return. I notice that the Department of Militia have sold the following goods in the last six months:

Woollens	$435,449 66
Boots	170,600 00
Blankets	276,750 00
Sweaters	22,500 00
Total	$905,299 66

Or nearly $1,000,000 of goods sold in six months by the Government. I submit that is a very bad piece of business. These blankets, these woollen goods, these boots, these sweaters, for which the Government will probably never be paid, should first have been offered at auction to the Canadian people.

Mr. COPP: Were they military supplies?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: These are probably military supplies because they are sold by the Militia Department. In the United States very successful sales of army supplies were made by the Government to the people, and they helped to lower the cost of living. But as we go along this document becomes more and more interesting. I find on page 3 the following item:

Welland Vale Manufacturing Company, St. Catharines, June 19, 1920	$135,214 78

In looking at a very useful little book, the Parliamentary Guide, which was copiously used last year in respect to the figures of military enlistments in the different constituencies, I find that the president of the Welland Vale Manufacturing Company is a gentleman who was heard in this House for the first time this year, a gentleman who has never spoken here before, or very seldom that I can recall. The hon. gentleman in question made a very strong speech for protection last week, and an equally strong speech in favour of the Government. Who was that gentleman? No less a person than the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin).

On page 4 of the return, I find another item which is also very interesting:

Brantford Roofing Company, Brantford, $36,200.

Upon referring to the same little book I find that one of the directors of that company is that great apostle of protection, the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt).

But let me continue. Under the title of "Nails" I find:

The Maritime Nail Co., St. John, N.B.

Am I mistaken, Mr. Speaker, in stating that a few days ago we heard a speech from an hon. gentleman who confessed he had always been a free trader but that conditions had changed, and that he was now a protectionist and a supporter of the Government? Referring again to this book I "nailed" a director of the Maritime Nail Company—to be absolutely correct the president and managing director,—in the hon. member for St. John, N.B. (Mr. Elkin).

An hon. MEMBER: How much did he get?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: He got $69,168.73.

Mr. DUFF: Very expensive nails.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The hon. member is quite correct, they were very expensive nails.

Mr. COPP: Expensive protection, I should say.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: But let me go further. On page 5 I find another item:

The Monarch Knitting Company, Dunnville.

This company got a very small amount indeed—it only received the sum of $271,-844.48. Sir, I could not find the name of the president of this company in the Parliamentary Guide. The hon. gentleman was probably wiser and more experienced, than some other hon. members. But I have here a very recent edition of the Annual Financial Review, bearing date of June 19, 1919, and I find at page 285 of that publication that the president of the Monarch Knitting Company is the hon. member from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor). I have still another item:

Mr. LAPOINTE: Do not believe in protection.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The fifth item reads:

The Sherwin-Williams Paint Company, $31,-490.

I also find this item:

Canada Paint Company, $11,332.

Mr. DEVLIN: To whom does that apply?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: At pages 345 and 346 of the same Annual Financial Review I find that the Canada Paint Company is a subsidiary company of the Sherwin-Williams Paint Company. I also find that it has been absorbed and is controlled by that company, and that the vice-president —who is also a director—of that company is no less a luminary than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne).

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If my hon. friend will make further search he will find that I am also a vice-president and director of a great many more companies than the one he has named.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I have no doubt that my hon. friend is interested in many large companies. Now, Sir, I have only rapidly glanced through this return, and there are many other items which it might be of interest to place on Hansard. There is one for instance with respect to Mr. Lloyd Harris, or rather the Canada Steel Company in which that gentleman is interested. Mr. Harris is a gentleman as to whom we are well informed. He was Canadian Trade Commissioner in London, and did not forget himself in obtaining these orders. I have no comment to make regarding the profits realized in these transactions—I do not know what they are. There is no doubt all these hon. gentlemen I have mentioned are within the law—that is, they are within the letter of the law. But are they within the spirit of the law? Let me read to the House Section 15 of the Senate and House of Commons Act, Revised Statutes, 1906:

If any member of the House of Commons accepts any office or commission, or is concerned or interested in any contract, agreement, service or work which, by this Act, renders a person incapable of being elected to, or of sitting or voting in the House of Commons, or knowingly sells any goods, wares or merchandise to, or performs any service for the Government of Canada, or for any of the officers of the Government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is paid or to be paid . . . . . the seat of such member shall thereby be vacated, and his election shall thenceforth be null and void.

Section 19 provides as follows:

This Act shall not extend to disqualify any person as a member of the House of Commons by reason of his being—(a) a shareholder in any incorporated company having a contract with the Government of Canada.

Well, "shareholder" does not necessarily mean "director," and the prohibition against a member of the House of Commons selling any goods to the Government

does not apply to such a one. That is true and those concerned will answer that the Government has transacted business with a company in which they were interested. That is also true. It is likewise true that they have transacted business not for the Government, not for the people of Canada, but for other countries. If this loophole satisfies their conscience, well and good. I do not wish to be understood as casting the least reflection on the honesty of the deals, but, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains, first, that the Government will probably never be reimbursed the moneys paid; second, that the Government bought goods from companies in which some members of Parliament are personally interested; third, that transactions of this nature unavoidably cast a shadow on parliamentary independence, and that in making such purchases the Government has done a great deal to keep "the boys" in line and to get them to put "a little pep and ginger" in their speeches.

But let us come now to the proposals of the Minister of Finance, especially to what he terms his excise luxury tax. I read in an Ottawa paper a few days ago that a large and wealthy manufacturer on reading the Budget Speech said: "Never touched me." Sir, that is the gist of the proposals. The manufacturer will consider it his right to make the consumer pay the additional charges; and Mr. Breadner, the Commissioner of Taxation, admitted that fact at a meeting in this city. There can be no doubt about the truth of that manufacturer's boast, "Never touched me." In other words, the tax will be paid by the consumer. Moreover, if the manufacturer or the merchant has to pay for the services of an extra accountant to keep track of these taxes, that cost will be charged to overhead expenses, and the consumer will have the burden passed on to him.

I will not take up the time of the House in pointing out that a $45 suit is not a luxury, nor is a $9 pair of boots—unless made out of paper like the ones that this Government bought for the army at the beginning of the war. Similarly, all kinds of electroliers, gasoliers, patent medicines —the poor families' doctor—biscuits, preserves, jam, beer, ham, breakfast foods such as corn flakes and shredded wheat, coke—the fuel of the poor,—pickles, cheap curtains, are not luxuries but necessaries of life to our working people, and that the resolution strikes, not the wealthy, but the middle and the poorer classes.

And, Sir, may I remind you how uncouth and unfair are these proposals? If my hon. friend the Minister of Finance buys a $1,000 living-room suite, or a $1,000 mantel-piece; or if my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization buys a $32 mahogany waste-paper basket, neither of them will pay any luxury tax. But if a workingman buys a $5 gas fixture or gasolier he will pay a dollar tax. If I buy an electric fan, which is a luxury, I pay no luxury tax; but if I buy an electric iron, which is a necessity in every household, I have to pay the tax. If I buy an umbrella at $4, which, as every one will admit, is very useful when it rains, I will have to pay a 10 per cent tax; but if I buy a $10 walking stick it is so useful in bad weather that I am not required to pay any luxury tax. A wealthy man can buy wallpaper at $5 a yard free of luxury tax, the most expensive china for pink teas without being mulcted for any luxury tax; but inexpensive cut glass is taxed. If I go to the Chateau Laurier I shall be getting away cheaply if I pay $5 for my meal, but I do not pay any luxury tax on that indulgence; but if I buy a box of shredded wheat or a box of corn-flakes at 10 or 15 cents I have to pay a luxury tax.

There is no doubt that the minister had to find some means of providing money to meet the financial needs of the country, every one admits that,—although the Government is solely responsible for the present state of affairs. But the Government should have derived this revenue from other sources, for instance, from the wealthy classes. Instead of that the Government reduces the excess profits tax, although in England the Government have increased it from 40 to 60 per cent. Then, too, the Government should have enacted legislation to get at the war wealth. I wish it to be well understood, however, that I do not blame the people who made money during the war helping the cause by supplying materials. But I venture to say that our soldiers having fought in the trenches at $1.10 a day, the burden of taxation should not be put on their shoulders on their return from the front, but rather that the men who made lots of money during the war should now be asked to contribute to the country's needs in a much greater degree. Why, the evidence of wealth in this country is amazing; never has there been so much money for investment; new mergers are being formed every day;—a merger was effected four or five weeks ago, and we hear to-day that another is being consummated—every one

knows that our industries are flourishing, and that profits are climbing to a scale that was previously undreamt of in this country.

In England a committee of the House of Commons was appointed to consider the practicability of taxing war wealth whereby $2,750,000,000 could be collected from 75,000 war profiteers, and that committee has reported in favour of such a tax being imposed. It is true that that report has not been acted upon yet, but it is only a few weeks old, and besides, I have the proof here that it will be acted upon. Mr. Austen Chamberlain, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in making his Budget Speech previous to the report of the committee, is reported by the Montreal Gazette of April 21, to have stated:

> The Government apparently intends to levy a tax on war profits, to divert to the Treasury a part of the gains the war gave to many people. What form this taxation may take, and to what extent it will reach, is yet to be determined, the report of a committee now investigating the matter being awaited;

In France the Government is adopting the same policy, and the New York Herald of April 17 contains the following despatch from its Paris correspondent:

> France Plans to Share in Big War Fortunes.
> New Tax is to Force Profiteers to Disgorge Large Part of Their Wealth.
>
> Paris, April 17.—War profiteers and others who have amassed millions of francs will have to disgorge a large part of their wealth, and wild orgies of spending, which have characterized French life since the armistice, will have to cease if the radical taxation now being considered by the Government goes into effect.
>
> Despite the high prices, which cause constant grumbling in all classes, it seems that the great spending epidemic which the people here developed in the last year remains and is as strong as ever. Now, however, the Government has decided to get some of this money before it is too late.
>
> Tentative proposals by the Finance Commission of the Government for a revision of the nation's financial policy, it was learned, will include extraordinary provisions with regard to revenue and increases in fortunes due to war profits, in some cases these increases in wealth amounting to as much as 60 per cent since January, 1914.

If the same policy was adopted in this country, Sir, It would not be necessary for the Government to enact such a measure of taxation as is now proposed, reaching the least capable to pay and increasing the cost of living.

I said before that the Government were doing nothing regarding the reduction of the high cost of living. I pointed out last year what huge profits were being made by some of the milling and textile companies. I could show you that the same profiteering, and even worse, is going on to-day; yet the Government is still practising the same criminal indolence and with the aid of the banks is permitting the most criminal gambling in the necessaries of life. Why, Sir, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) will not tolerate crap shooting, race track bookmaking, or poker gambling, and will even blush at a picture of the Queen of Hearts; yet gambling in the most vital and essential articles and necessaries of life is permitted. John M. Baer, member of Congress for North Dakota, introduced a Bill to prevent gambling in the necessaries of life in the United States. His remarks in introducing the Bill may be summarized as follows:

The food gambler deals with what you have to eat and wear, on margin, he does not sell what he has, but is one of the causes of the price-raising, by apparently passing the food from hand to hand until it reaches you. We have laws against crime of every sort and against criminals of every character save the criminal who gambles in the necessaries of life. There is not a bank in the country that will loan money with which to bet on a horse race, millions upon millions of dollars, however, are borrowed from banks and wagered on the market in an effort to hold up the price of commodities. Look at the recent market quotations; you will observe that the brokers are now selling meat, lard, butter, wheat, cotton and corn for October, November and December delivery. No one knows what the wheat crop, the cotton yield or the meat production of this country will be for this year and none of the commodities dealt with are as yet in existence. Let us prohibit these transactions by gamblers who do not have any interest in them except that of speculation.

These are the gist of the remarks of Mr. Baer, member for North Dakota, and the Bill introduced provides that no person shall buy or sell any necessary of life unless it is the intention to effect actual delivery of such necessary together with transfer of legal title, and the term "necessary" is held to include all products or by-products which are or may be manufactured into food for human beings, domestic animals or poultry, and includes also fuel, wearing apparel, or other commodity necessary to life. Is it not worth while considering this kind of legislation? Does the Government not believe that such legislation would decrease the high cost of living? I

do not say, Sir, that such a measure should be adopted, but I say very emphatically that legislation of this kind is worth studying and I hope that the Government will look into it.

This brings me to the subject of credits by the banks for speculation purposes and the extraordinary effect upon prices brought about by the concerted action of the banks in the United States in the curtailment of credit. It is not necessary for me to read an extract from the Montreal Gazette on this subject; all hon. members who read the papers observed the tremendous break in prices that has taken place in the United States and which began the moment the Federal Reserve Board concluded an arrangement with the banks under which credits should be curtailed to the manufacturers. This curtailing of credit was brought about by the American Government; I see no reason why the Government of Canada could not do the same and thus afford some relief to the consumers of our own country.

Now, just one word about the tariff. I was greatly amused the other day to hear the Finance Minister state that a tariff commission would commence an investigation after prorogation. Sir, since this Government has been in power—or, rather, since a Tory Government has been in power—we have had promises of commissions to investigate the tariff, but they have not been forthcoming. In order to show the House how long ago a Tory Government promised a tariff commission, I will read a few lines from Hansard of 1911. You are aware that the Tory Government came into power in September, 1911. Well, in Hansard of the 29th of November of the same year, page 530, I find the following question put by Mr. Neely:

1. Will the Government appoint a permanent Tariff Commission?

2. If so, will the labour and the farming interests be allowed to nominate a majority of the representatives on such a commission?

Here is the answer—and I am sorry that all the ministers are absent from their seats.

An hon. MEMBER: There is one.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) is here; I beg his pardon,—but he is the only one left. I read the answer to this question, as given by the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden):

Authority from Parliament will be necessary and a measure will be introduced accordingly.

That, Sir, was in November, 1911, and every year since the Government have promised commission after commission regarding the tariff, and they are making the same promise this year. Well, I can tell my hon. friends the members of the Farmers' party that if they depend upon the appointment of such a commission they will wait a long time. I can tell my hon. friends on the other side who are voting with the Government because they believe that such a commission will be appointed, that they will also have to wait a long time. As to my hon. friends on the right hand side of the House who do not desire the appointment of any such commission, they may sleep quietly; they will not be troubled with the nightmare of concurrent deflation of duties and depreciation of their bank accounts.

The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) spoke of the St. James by-election and asserted that the result of that election was a victory for protection. Sir, I took part in that election, and I am proud of it. I am proud of having contributed in bring to the House so talented a member as my hon. friend from St. James. There were two candidates in that election. The Government was not represented. Both candidates criticised the Government, and both promised that if elected they would work and vote against the Government. We talked about the tariff. I spoke on the tariff. I am not a free trader in practice; I am not a high protectionist either, but I am not in favour of the present tariff. I hate to see, for instance, the farmer paying the amount of duty he has to pay now on his agricultural implements. I hate to see the workingman and the men of the middle classes paying enormous duties on furniture and everything that is necessary for their households. That is my opinion of the tariff. I do not believe that we should take down all tariffs. Nobody who is aware of the conditions believes that, but I do say that the present tariff is too high. I stand by the platform of the Liberal party that was passed in August of last year in Ottawa.

Mr. LAPOINTE: So say we all.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: That is what I stated in the St. James election, and that is what my hon. friend the member for St. James stated, and he was elected by a tremendous majority.

Now I wish to refer briefly to a question that has been brought to my attention regarding the pay of the soldier. Some time ago I put a question on the Order Paper,

and the question and the answer will be found on page 2075 of Hansard:

1. Have the members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force who received their pay in England or in France been paid the difference in exchange?

2. If not, who received said benefit?

Sir Henry Drayton:

1. All payments in sterling to personnel of the Overseas Military Forces of Canada during the years 1914-15-16-17 and '18 were converted to Canadian currency at the par rate of exchange, $4.86⅔ to the pound and debited to their pay accounts at that rate. Payments in continental currencies were converted from such currency to sterling at a flat monthly rate of exchange established by the War Office, based on commercial rates, which in the case of French currency varied from five francs equals four shillings in 1915, to three and five pence in 1919.

2. All payments to members of the C.E.F. Overseas were made out of moneys at the credit of the Dominion Government in the Bank of Montreal, London, which moneys were received from the Imperial Government by way of advances for war purposes, at par, so that no benefit accrued to the Dominion Government by reason of exchange.

To form an idea of the tremendous amount of money involved in this question, let us examine some very conservative figures, much below the actual facts. Suppose we take the average pay of all the men, including the high pay of the officers and the small pay of the soldiers, as $48.60 a month. According to the answer to my question a man would have received for his $48.60 ten pounds sterling. Now let us take also a most conservative figure for the average value of the pound sterling during the war. Let us take it at $4.76. It went below that, but let us take that figure. On a pay of $48.60, when the man received ten pounds he only received $47.60. If he took that ten pounds, put it in an envelope and sent it to Canada to his mother or his wife, and they went to the bank to get it exchanged they would receive only $47.60 instead of $48.60, if the rate of exchange at that time was $4.76. Therefore the soldier or his dependent was out $1 a month. Let us now take also a very conservative figure as to the number of men. Let us cut the number in less than half and say 200,000 men. This would mean that the men have been done out of at least $200,000 a month. Now what does this sum total over a period of four years, or forty-eight months? It amounts to $2,400,000 a year, or a total of $9,600 000 for the four years. These figures you will admit, Mr. Speaker, are very conservative. I should not be surprised if the amount was much in excess of the figures I have given.

The answer of the Minister of Finance is very evasive. If the Dominion Government did not make a profit—and I wish to state that I did not make any accusation—did the British Government make a profit on the exchange, or did the Bank of Montreal make it? If so what steps have this Government taken to recover the profit? What steps are the Government going to take to recover that profit and re-imburse the men of the Overseas Forces? This Government made a bona fide contract with the men to pay them $1.10 per day in Canadian currency, which amount the men did not receive. The Government acted as trustee for the men of the Overseas Military Forces of Canada, and they have betrayed that trust.

I said the answer of the Minister of Finance was evasive. It is true it is evasive in regard to the parties who benefited by the exchange, but it is not evasive or uncertain or doubtful as to one thing, that is, that the men through the carelessness or negligence or wilfulness of the Government have been done out of millions of dollars they were entitled to.

I must be thankful for the patience of the House but I have just one more question to deal with, before I resume my seat. It is the constitutional question of the right of the representatives of the people in Parliament to get information from the Government regarding public affairs. This right is unquestionable. Nevertheless, Sir, it has been denied by the Government to the members of the Opposition at this session on several occasions. Let me refer to just a few instances which have come to my attention. My hon. friend the member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy) on the 21st of March asked for the correspondence between the Government and Judge Robson regarding the resignation of the latter as chairman of the Board of Commerce. It seems to me the country is entitled to know whether or not Judge Robson resigned because the Government interfered in favour of its friends, in the administration of the board. Yet no return has been made, although on the 3rd of May the Minister of Trade and Commerce stated that he would bring some of the documents down, but not all. None have been brought down yet. Another instance of the denial of our rights was exemplified when the Minister of Finance refused point blank to some hon. members on this side to answer something like seventy-four questions regarding the administration of railways. Sir, the people of Canada are en-

titled to know whether huge deficits, such as the deficit of $47,000,000 this year, are due to bad administration of the railways. Yet the Government refuses all information. Concerning the same question, I might add that non-compliance by the Government with an order of the House passed at my request last session in regard to the production of a list of shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company strengthens the belief of the people of Canada that we would find in this list proof of the speculative aspect of the deed. At the beginning of October I moved for the production of that list, and I insisted again on the last day of the session, that it should be brought down; and when the present session opened I renewed my request, and it was promised me by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I believe. The first time the answer was promised me, the Minister of the Interior stood up and said that he would cable immediately and get the list. The Minister of the Interior is not a debutant in cablegrams, and I fail to see why this list is not forthcoming. The reason which the Government gives is that it would take too much time to prepare it. I asked for the list of the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Company on the 10th of October, and its preparation would not be the work of an expert. A typist could copy the list inside of five hours, but it has not been produced yet and I do not believe it will be produced this session. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I was right last session when I said, in connection with this matter, that there was a nigger in the woodpile. The Government, in this same spirit, without consulting Parliament decided to appoint an ambassador at Washington, a novel departure for Canada; and although we were promised last year by the President of the Privy Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell) in answer to a question by myself, that legislation would be brought down before anything was decided, and that the Prime Minister would lay the whole matter before the House on his return, we are confronted this year by an announcement that the matter has been decided by Order in Council; and apart from being told that the ambassador will be named, we are refused information in regard to the duties which he will discharge.

Sir, this is the way in which this autocratic Administration who have been sticking like leeches to the treasury benches have been conducting the affairs of the country. Not content with having been elected under false pretences and through racial prejudice; not content with having burdened the taxpayers of this country with a debt that is appalling; not content with having placed that burden on the shoulders of the common people, the middle and poorer classes; not content with having done all these things; they are refusing now to the representatives of the people in this House the unquestionable right of inquiring into the affairs of the Administration, the right which was won after a bitter fight by Baldwin and Lafontaine, the men who won responsible government. I therefore can conceive no better phrase, no fitter word, no more apt sentence to apply to the conduct of the Government than the old Latin proverb: "Quos vult perdere Jupiter prius dementat."

Mr. F. B. McCURDY (Colchester): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of debating to-night the relative desirability of raising the country's necessary revenues by direct taxes or through the incidence of a customs tariff. Canada's need to-day challenges every one of every party to unite their services in a long strong pull to repay the massive liabilities that were incurred during the years of military conflict. It is quite apparent that there is needed in Canada to-day a fuller understanding and appreciation by the public of the difficulties of the national financial position.

No man dealing with his own financial troubles or embarrassments would encounter difficulty in understanding his position because he would be confronted with figures and totals with which he had long been familiar. The totals that are involved in the nation's balance sheet, however, are so unprecedented in this country that they are apt to be confusing and perplexing, if only because of their size.

The annual review of Canada's financial position as detailed by the minister in his Budget Speech will afford students of such matters a stack of information on national finance. It is doubtless wise that the Budget Speech of the minister be given the widest possible publicity in its present form, so that the contents may reach the maximum number of students of such matters. But, Mr. Speaker, do you think that such a publication is best calculated to reach the eyes and claim the attention of the public whose co-operation is so needed at present? Every one knows the fate of lengthy parliamentary documents and blue books. Probably not one out of a hundred receives attentive perusal. Would it not be well that

the salient points be condensed into a statement written in popular language so clearly that he who runs may read, and in that form given out to the public? Such a statement should contain a clear and concise presentation of the national dilemma. It should indicate a distinct goal, say the extinguishment of the deadweight debt in the life of the present generation (a sinking fund of 3 per cent per year would accomplish that) and appeal for the co-operation of all in the efforts necessary to attain the indicated goal.

During the war Canada, as did other belligerents, exhibited a stamina and exerted a united effort that no one theretofore considered possible. This effort was rendered feasible because the whole population realized that the war was a life and death struggle and that the Allied Nations must either conquer or go under. So we saw an exhibition of team play on the part of all the people, spurred on to sacrifice to the uttermost in order that victory might be achieved.

The huge task encountered and successfully overcome in the war is a demonstration that present and future difficulties can by team work be met and surmounted. Great as are the impending problems they are not so difficult as those of the war period, which happily lie behind us. I am confident that, provided the same realization of present difficulties can be implanted in the public mind, we will be afforded the same co-operation in team play on the part of the public that was exhibited during the war. In the present struggle and in that which lies before us every one has his part to play. In the immediate future there is a call to public duty scarcely surpassed at any previous period in the country's history.

It has been my observation that at all times if the need can be placed before the public in a sufficiently lucid manner there will be no lack of response on the part of the people. I am sure I am not guilty of an overstatement when I say that the spontaneous response during the late war to appeals for recruits and money far exceeded the most sanguine expectations of even our most high-spirited and far-seeing public men.

Curiously enough, the country at large has been harbouring the delusion that the whole of Canada has enjoyed great national prosperity during the past six years. What is the cause of this delusion? The proximate cause is that, measured in terms of money, prices of commodities have constantly risen until (according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics) it now requires $216.38 to purchase at wholesale the goods that might have been bought in 1913 for $100. It necessarily follows that any person owning saleable goods worth $100 in money in 1913 could, if he held until to-day sell these goods for $216.38 in money. Such a man naturally feels that he is now more than twice as wealthy as he was then, whereas the fact of the matter is that on the average he is no better off at all because his $216.38 of to-day will not buy him any more of the things he needs than would his $100 of six years ago. The upward movement of prices and the illusion of prosperity that is induced is apt to continue until inflation is checked and deflation commences.

The Minister of Finance in his statement went into the reasons for to-day's high prices, recounting the well-known effect of the removal to fields of destruction of millions of former producers, to the interference of Governments, necessary during the war, with the normal course of supply and demand, the enormous dislocation of world industry in every direction, the destruction of wealth, and the inflation of credit and currency. All these causes have been influential in increasing prices; perhaps the last mentioned more than is generally appreciated.

What is the position of our currency to-day? On March 31, 1914, the total amount of bank notes in circulation in Canada issued by the

Dominion Government was..	$122,612,175
Chartered Banks..	96,848,384
	$219,460,559

These notes circulated freely and were accepted by all Canadians and also by our foreign creditors at their face value for the reason that they were payable in practice in gold, the only medium recognized internationally as a standard of value. The Government and the banks were in practice able to pay in gold because against their outstanding note issue they held 66.9 per cent in specie, leaving the amount of note issue not covered by specie, $72,636,280.

Under the Finance Act of August, 1914, an expedient designed to meet the emergency of war, gold payments in Canada were suspended. Under an Order in Council passed by virtue of powers created in the "War Measures Act, 1914," the export of gold from Canada was prohibited and the embargo thus created has never been lifted. In this regard Canada is not, however, peculiar amongst the late belligerent nations. All of them, with the exception of the United States, prohibit the exporta-

tion of gold. I am not in a position to assert that it would be wise to lift the embargo at once, although we must steadily set our faces towards the day when we will be again on a gold basis. The fact remains, however, that Canadian debtors may not pay their foreign (and domestic) creditors in gold and the partial effect of that disability may be seen at any time in the rate of premium that we must pay to convert Canadian funds into New York exchange, the New York market being the nearest approximation that exists to a free gold one.

What changes in Canadian note issues have occurred since March 31, 1914? At that date, as I have said, our excess note issues over and above the amount of gold and specie held by the Treasury and the banks amounted to $72,636,280; in two years, viz., on March 31, 1916, it had grown to $98,893,206; in the next two years, viz., on March 31, 1918, it had leaped to $224,451,483; and at March 31, 1920, had further increased to $346,925,313.

So, it is clear that by the expedient of August, 1914, there has been manufactured in connection with our note issue an inflation of the difference between $72,636,280 and $346,925,313, or $274,289,033 payable on demand, but not payable in gold. The purchasing power of the country has been increased by this device, and unless the quantity of commodities available for purchase by this purchasing power has increased in the same ratio, why, you have created a buying force that was bound to inflate prices. And that is what has happened.

Now let us see how our gold reserves stand now. I have pointed out that on March 31, 1914, before the war the proportion of gold and specie held by the Treasury and the banks was 66.9 per cent of the outstanding notes. Reference to the Canada Gazette shows the note issues on March 31, 1920 to total.. .. .. .. $537,702,420 against which we have gold in the

hands of the Receiver General	$100,286,281
Gold and specie in hands of banks..	$ 79,990,826
In central gold reserve (presumably gold) $108,200,000. But the Gazette shows that of this reserve $97,700,000 is not gold at all but is the promise to pay of the Dominion Government leaving in gold only..	$ 10,500,000
	$190,777,107

which in turn is only 35½ per cent of the outstanding note issues. So that in order to get back even to the relative soundness of the position that we occupied on March 31, 1914, we must arrange to reduce our note issue by $168,800,000. You can imagine, Mr. Speaker, what great distress a hurried contraction of this magnitude with its resultant disturbances would entail. It must inevitably, however, be faced at some time. Writers on economic subjects have likened financial inflation to an anæsthetic. They point out that the feeling of jubilation enjoyed by the patient when going under and while under is succeded by a very different state once the effect of the anæsthetic has spent itself. They allege that the effects of financial inflation will not be dissimilar from those of the physical anæsthetic when the time of inevitable deflation and reaction arrives.

In different lines of business in Canada to-day there exist unnatural conditions and prices created by direct Government action inaugurated during the emergency of war, the need for which interference, many authorities hold, has passed. The remedies for such situations will, of course, be found painful of application. Business men generally feel that it would be better, however, to courageously face the situation, take our medicine, endure its discomfort and get away from instability towards solid economic ground.

It is one thing to raise taxes from an unwilling people who do not understand the need for the extraordinary levies. It is quite another thing to raise money from a public that is well informed, understands the goal to be attained through their sacrifices, and is therefore willing to bend its neck under the yoke.

The minister has stated that the revenue for the current year, estimated on the basis of existing fiscal legislation and assuming that the values of importations for customs purposes remain practically the same as for last year, will amount of $381,000,000. He then proceeded to announce changes of a far reaching nature such as the abolition of the 7½ per cent customs war duty and a reduction in the rate of business profits taxes. How much of a dent will those two alterations make in his estimated revenue of $381,000,000? Who knows? The public does not know. It knows only that $30,000,000 was collected last year from the 7½ per cent customs war duty. We have no way of even estimating the loss in revenue from reduction in business profits tax. The press has guessed freely at the total probable receipts from luxury and sales taxes, but we have nothing official or definite to guide

us. Shall we assume that the announced luxury taxes and sales taxes and increases in income tax will provide income sufficient to make up these certain losses? Or will they do more? Until an official estimate is forthcoming it is clear that discussion on the Budget can proceed only with a lack of intelligence and precision. Until we have that estimate we can only take the figures that the minister mentions, namely $381,000,000 as the disposable income for the current year.

Now let us turn to the other side of the account. The minister advises that ordinary consolidated fund expenditures for the current year will amount to $341,000,000. Now the Canadian National Railways is the property of the people of Canada, and while it operates at a loss, is not that loss as truly a charge against the national treasury as would be the loss in operation of the postal service, the Intercolonial railway or the public buildings? I am personally very hopeful of the future of the C.N.R. I expect that at any rate it will fulfil its most important function, that is, to provide useful and efficient transportation to the districts it serves. I am not losing sight of the fact that there is a large and influential section of the Canadian public that believes no good financial result will ever accrue to the national treasury from the operation of national railways. The National Railway system showed a deficit last year of $33,000,000 which had to be provided by the Finance Department. What will be the deficit this year? Would it be unfair to assume that it will be an equal amount? If that deficit will be repeated, in order to obtain a true perspective should we not add that total to the ordinary consolidated fund expenditures giving us a total expenditure for this year of $374,000,000 or within $7,000,000 of the only estimate that has been given us as the year's revenue. And then it should be remembered we have made no provision whatever for further expenditure on consolidated fund growing out of the Supplementary Estimates yet to be tabled. These Estimates can be expected to include a substantial total, when it is remembered that last year's Supplementary Estimates provided for an expenditure of $36,723,120.66.

The Budget Speech indicated that it was intended to retire treasury bills and floating obligations this year to the extent of $74,058,400 and already the impression has gone to the country that this is to be done from revenue. In the absence of further estimate of revenue I submit that such an impression is unwarranted.

During the six years of the war period 1914-20 Great Britain met 36.17 per cent of her total expenditure by current taxation against 20.80 per cent met by Canada.

The minister drew an analogy between conditions in Canada, Great Britain, and the United States. He indicated that the currency inflation in Canada was 108 per cent as against an increase during the war in Great Britain of 207 per cent and that the increased purchasing power as gauged by currency and bank deposits increased during the war in Canada 91 per cent as against 125 per cent in England. Canada's debt per head of population based on the Estimates of the Minister of Finance and his predecessor is $256 as compared with a deadweight debt in Great Britain of £7,835,000,000 or £170 per head. With their more inflated currency and credit situation and thrice fold greater debt what is Great Britain undertaking to do during the current year?

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, in his Budget of April 19, gave an estimate of revenue and expenditures for the current year. He stated that the revenue estimated on the existing basis of taxation would amount to £1,314,000,000 thus meeting his estimated current year's expenditures which includes the upkeep of the forces still in the field in Mesopotamia and elsewhere and provide a surplus of £164,000,000 for the reduction of debt, which being over 2 per cent would redeem the total national debt in 26 years. He stated:

> Under ordinary circumstances this provision would be more than ample,—an extravagant sinking fund. But under the present circumstances in the opinion of the Government it is not sufficient.

So he proposed the imposition of additional taxes, whose estimated proceeds he gave in detail, to create a surplus of revenue over expenditure of £234,000,000 providing a sinking fund of 3 per cent. Mr. Chamberlain proceeded in explanation of his course:

> To attain such a position we are obliged to impose fresh taxation and to call for further sacrifices which may not bring popularity to the Government or to ministers: but I am proud to say that we have sought in our Budget to rise to the level of our great responsibilities so that when we render up the seals of office we may leave to our successors an ample revenue and to our country a national credit second to none. Twenty such Budgets would redeem the whole of our national situation.

In justifying what Mr. Chamberlain called "A terrific contribution" he stated

that a bold attempt was being made to consolidate the national position by getting in a time of comparative prosperity the wherewithal to reduce the nightmare debt.

Canada's deadweight debt (Hansard, page 2556) amounts to $2,273,305,436.92. The national debt while it exists in such tremendous volume is bound to be a deterrent to immigration, industry and commerce. All who appreciate Canada's present financial position will, undoubtedly, not only support the Government's decision to raise additional revenue by taxation, but they would, I am sure, be prepared to go even further for they must realize that it is of the utmost importance that taxes be imposed at the present time of comparative prosperity when the pre-war dollar is only worth, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 46 cents rather than carry it along to a time when the dollar will resume its real value of one dollar.

I have full confidence that if the public is clearly informed of the difficulty and need of the moment they will conclude that such a course is wise and statesmanlike and will gladly co-operate. But it would not be reasonable to expect their co-operation without an understanding of the full need and of the goal to which the country should strive to attain.

Now, admitting that the situation was once clear in the minds of the public, to what distinct goal should the national policy in finance be directed? Should it not obviously be to the provision of a sinking fund which will retire the national debt in so far as it is a deadweight debt within a stated period? If we attempt as courageous a course as that attempted by Great Britain, viz., the extinguishment of our deadweight debt in 20 years we should need to provide for the payment annually of $68,000,000 towards diminution of debt. A settled policy in this regard would afford tax-payers a prospect of reaching the end of their heavy exactions within the lifetime of the present generation and give a buoyancy and hope to business that would otherwise be lacking.

There is no sovereign remedy for our existing ills. They are the natural and inevitable consequence of the war. So far as our industry is affected by conditions in other countries, it can wait until they commence to recover. That recovery depends partly on the wisdom of the governments concerned, but far more on the energy and initiative, hard work and hard living of the people of each country. While, however, the troubles of other countries will bring us troubles too, these can be enormously diminished or aggravated by our own action. The Government's duty is clear. It must continue its courageous attempt to bring its expenditure within the limits of its revenue, cease borrowing except for redemption of short dated loans, and stop inflating credit and currency. That course will, I admit, require great courage. All sorts of schemes which ought for other reasons to be carried out must be abandoned and one criterion alone established, viz., "Can we afford it"? not "Is it an attractive and desirable scheme"? A man would often like to spend much more than he does for the benefit of his family but if he is not rich enough he cannot. So with a nation. A large part of the population believes still that the war either did, or at least ought to, bring great improvements in conditions. They look for some new thing, for a new Canada, where every one will be financially better off than before and they regard, very naturally, drastic state action as the main means to achieving this end. The State is to spend vast sums on housing, reforestation, public works, buildings, canals and other laudable objects. It is to find the means by raising great sums from the rich voluntarily if possible, or if not by compulsion. It is to secure to itself the lion's share of all profits of business or industry, or if necessary to confiscate a good part of existing wealth. Such a programme is not feasible. If a capital levy is resorted to the proceeds must be devoted to reducing existing indebtness, not to meet further expenditure. It is true there is urgent need for large expenditures in many directions but there is no benefit Government expenditure can give that would be at all commensurate with the evil of further inflation and further rise in prices.

We wish to secure an appreciation by the public of the factors of the national dilemma and the full co-operation of all in the efforts necessary to reach the desired goal. How shall we set about it? You have a peculiar situation. In the first place Canada having from the loftiest motives hazarded everything in the great war emerges from that war with a national debt of $256 per head or $1,280 per family of five, rich and poor, in the land, and is materially much poorer than in 1914. The war time inflation, extension of credit, debasement of the currency, or whatever you choose to call it, resulting in any case in a delusion of increased wealth has increased the extravagance of the population. Production does not increase. People on small fixed

incomes are at their wits' end to make ends meet. A large section of the people, having during the war received larger wages with shorter working hours than ever before has decided to take life easy, with the result that production is being curtailed.

A clear statement exhibiting the country's present debt, estimates of annual unescapable expenditures and the necessary ways and means to meet them, would help to bring home to the people a realization of the comparative national impoverishment caused by the losses in the war, and the necessity of harder work and harder living by all to balance the national Budget.

The Government should at once undertake an extensive national campaign to urge upon the people in every rank of life the vital necessity of suppressing extravagance and reducing expenditures. The public must be informed fully and frankly of the state of the national finances in language and by means that are so plain that all can understand. During the war when recruits were needed, additional agricultural production desired and war loans had to be floated, campaigns of this character were willingly carried on by public co-operation and assistance. A similar bringing home of the post war necessities is absolutely necessary. But this campaign will not be successful until the Government in its own operation sets the example. Every member of Parliament who has been brought in contact with the conduct of public business knows that there are in the Civil Service many individuals of ideal capacity, hard working, conscientious and capable. But the operation of the service as a whole will offend his business sense. He will detect laxity and inefficiency in many places. He will learn of Government offices and staffs that exist only because they had previously existed. It is, I am sure, within the knowledge of members, ministers, deputy ministers and heads of departments that theoretical safeguards and devices, honest without doubt in their conception, have resulted in a lowering of efficiency, multiplication of staff and red tape and, consequently, in a waste of public funds. Instead of confining its energies to insuring beyond peradventure a life tenure to the civil servant, the Government would be well advised to devote a part of its attention to the interest of the public that pays. I am convinced it were well that the Government secure from Parliament a power to be freely exercised to retire officials where services are no longer of value, or whose positions have become superfluous. It is, I submit, a surprising condition that the public service, instead of reverting to normal now that the war pressure is well past, has actually increased its personnel during the year by over four thousand, indicating a prima facie waste in salaries alone of many millions, entirely apart from rentals of buildings to house superfluous staffs and provide them with stationery, sealing wax, and all the other paraphernalia that goes with official position. So long as the citizen knows that public appropriations are being spent without full value being given in return we cannot make an effective appeal to him for economy and co-operation in the national behalf.

Mr. R. H. HALBERT (Ontario North): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest, and, I must say, with some amusement, to many of the speeches that have been delivered upon the Budget. I shall not take up any of the time of the House in extending my appreciation to the minister; I will simply ask him to take mine as read. We have heard the lawyers, the doctors, the manufacturers, the ministers, and the politicians; they have all stated their views with regard to the Budget. With your permission, I would like to present the views of what are very often called the common people, especially the farmers. I believe that the views I shall now express are those not only of a great many of the farmers, but also of a great many people of other callings in Ontario.

If cutting words, cross looks and scathing remarks could have killed this group on the cross benches, Mr. Speaker, we would have all been in the cemetery long ago. But you will see that even though there are no by-elections, we are still growing. I did not intend to take up the time of the House in replying to criticisms, but with your permission I feel it my bounden duty to reply to at least a few. I shall speak for only fifteen or twenty minutes, and I will make as good use of that time as I possibly can.

The member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt)—page 2940 of unrevised Hansard—said that this little group was dangerous. I would like to know why? The farmers never went on strike. If we are dangerous, I wonder to whom? If he means that we are dangerous to the Union Government, perhaps what he said was right. The hon. gentleman objects to the farmers organizing without first calling in the labour men, the clergymen and the manufacturers, and consulting with them. Well, I do not think

that when the Manufacturers' Association organized they sent for the farmers, or the clergymen either. I wondered when my hon. friend made that remark whether it was the One Big Union that he had in mind? Surely it was not that. I wondered, too, if it was Union Government that he meant when he was referring to the formation of a union. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have had a sample of that; enough said.

My hon. friend also said that the fruit growers did not belong to the farmers' organization. Well, I can say this with authority, because I have been down through the fruit-growing section of Ontario; we have the farmers' clubs among the fruit growers and we also have a prominent fruit grower from St. Catherines as director of our organization. I admit that there are a few fruit growers left of the same stamp as the hon. member for Fraser valley (Mr. Stacey) who still want to charge the poor people ninety cents a barrel on their apples.

The member for Brantford also referred to us as free traders—page 2942 of unrevised Hansard. No man has ever heard me say that I am in favour of absolute free trade. He said that in our platform we mentioned free trade with Great Britain, and he asserted that if we had free trade with Great Britain we would have free trade with the world. Now, if the Americans along the border can ship their goods to Liverpool, as he said they could, bring them back and lay them down in southern Saskatchewan and compete so dangerously with the Canadian manufacturers, then I say there is something absolutely wrong with the Canadian manufacturers; they should wake up and go to sleep right.

On page 2943 of unrevised Hansard the hon. member for Brantford found fault with the plank in our platform about raising revenue by a graduated inheritance tax on large estates of wealthy men. He objects to that; he says we are taxing the dead man's wealth. But the hon. member himself has always supported a tax not on the wealth of the rich man but on the widow of the poor man, a tax from which there is no escape; a tax upon his shroud, upon his coffin and upon the screw nails that fasten down his coffin lid. He is also willing to take from the widow of the poor man, if she has to earn her living by taking in washing, $13.05 by way of duty on her washing machine. If the widow happens to make her living by sewing he is satisfied to take $14.43 on her sewing machine. He is very anxious indeed to look after the poor. But that is not all. At page 2939 of Unrevised Hansard the hon. member drew a very pathetic picture. He told us a very heartrending story about the Scotchman and the steers. There was a small bunch of steers on good pasturage inside a barbed wire fence, while outside there was a large bunch of steers on very poor pasturage, and he was very much afraid that the fence would be let down. Now let us put our gas masks on and examine this. As we approach we perceive that the scene changes. He told us that on the inside of the fence there were shorthorns and moolies and they were very fat. When we get up close we find that inside the fence among the clover are some great manufacturers with a barbed wire fence of protection all round them. They have good pasturage, while outside the fence are the por common people, and no doubt they are on poor pasturage. He almost trembled for fear some ruthless man will take a few strands off the top of the fence so the poor people might pick an odd bunch of clover over there inside the fence.

Now we come to the income tax. On page 2944 we find the hon. member very wrathy, and he said "it was unfair and an unwarranted slander" because he had heard or read somewhere that some person had insinuated that there were defaulters in the payment of income tax in the Tory city of Toronto. He was very wrathy about that, and said that there were only 314 farmers who paid income tax. He insinuated that the farmers were shirking payment of their taxes. Mr. Speaker, there is no man on the face of the earth who would be more glad to pay an income tax if he had an income of $5,000 or $10,000 than the farmer. Give him the income and he will pay the tax. If the farmers have not paid the tax it is because they have not the income. The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Casselman)—page 2967 of Unrevised Hansard—said that he would welcome a return to private life. Well, Sir, just as soon as his Government gets ready to go to the country, he may get his wishes gratified. The hon. member at page 2970 — this is a personal matter and I do not like to refer to it—and the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) said that the day the Farmers' party came into existence was when the hon. member for North Ontario—myself—led his little band up the hill and led them down again here in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, I did not come here to protest

11 p.m.

against my son being conscripted. I was not fortunate enough to have a boy. My boys happen to be all girls. I had not a relative to conscript either. All my relatives that could go had gone voluntarily before conscription was introduced, so I had no one to plead for in that respect. What brought me here was this. It was after I came here that I was elected chairman of the delegation, and I may say that not one out of ten of the men who came here belong to the United Farmers of Ontario. At the request of Premier Hurst of Ontario I had given my services gratis since the war began—my railway fare and expenses were paid, that was all—to the Organization of Resources Committee which sat in the city of Toronto. I also was asked to serve gratis, of course, on the Victory Loan Committee, with headquarters at Toronto. I had been closeted in the Parliament Buildings with a representative of the Canadian Food Board and of the American Food Board, and we had been told the food situation in terms that we were pledged not to divulge outside of the walls of the building. If you had a boy sick and got him the best doctors and the best nursing, but he happened to die after all, you would have a clear conscience because you had done your duty. I considered that it was my duty, and nothing has happened since to make me change my mind, to lay the situation as I saw it before Sir Robert Borden and his Cabinet. We did so, and the farmers behaved like gentlemen while they were here. I want to say further that the great majority of those who came here with that delegation did not need to take a back seat to any member of the Government as to knowledge of the conditions in the back concessions of this province, because they came from there and lived among those conditions.

The hon. member for Dundas also made a remark which I cannot let pass unchallenged. At page 2971 of Unrevised Hansard he said that every member who sits in this little group had been a supporter of the Liberal party from 1896 to 1911. I want to contradict that statement most emphatically, for I, for one, did not support the Liberal Government. I did not support it in 1911. I was brought up a Conservative of the hottest kind; but a wise man changes his mind, a fool never. I have changed my mind. I was raised on the farm and have lived on the farm, and those of you who have lived on the farm know this: If you take a calf, when quite young, from its mother it does not make much noise, but let it run with its mother for some time and then take it away, and both calf and mother raise an awful row. It looks to me as if the manufacturers of this country had been helped so long and are so needed by the Government at election time, that both manufacturers and Government raise a terrible howl if you talk of letting down the tariff.

I shall not take up the time of the House to deal with any more of the questions raised in this debate, because I think a lot of time has been wasted already. The farmers are abused, but the fact remains that they are employed in the most important industry in the world. The farmers of this Dominion have as much at stake as any one else, the farmers and their wives are just as good citizens, just as patriotic and as loyal Canadians as are to be found in any other calling. The farmers are just as honest in their convictions, just as anxious and just as willing to do their full share in the re-establishment of this country and in paying the debt as are the people of any other calling. Some hon. members have displayed great anxiety for fear the common people might get hold of the helm of the ship of state. This thought seems to give them the nightmare, and they see all kinds of things happening. But there is one thing sure, Sir, these people would not make any worse mess of it than some others have done. I admit, Sir, that the farmers in the past have paid very little attention to national affairs. They left that to the politicians. But no result of the war argues as certainly for a bigger, better and stronger Canada than the demand of the agriculturist and labouring people for a place and a say in the guiding of the affairs of the nation. No longer will the farmer feed the world and produce the great bulk of the revenue, and have no voice in the conduct of its affairs. Representatives of the financial and protected interests would be well advised to take notice of this fact or like the Shunamite women of old they will go back to where they came from and among their own people. Any one who can still conscientiously advocate the old tariff policy should be given the Iron Cross, or perhaps it would be better to give him the Humane Society medal. The farmers and the farmers' organizations have during this session received considerable criticism and abuse. I prefer, Mr. Speaker, not to take up the time of the House replying to any more of those misrepresentations; I just consider where they came from and let them pass at that.

The farmers' movement constitutes the first real challenge to the party system, which has been in operation for over forty years, and that is why some hon. members are so uneasy. Having developed from adverse economic conditions that movement lays the emphasis on economic questions. Born in an age of democratic desire it is filled with the democratic spirit. The privilege holders of Canada to-day are maintaining a rigid vigilance to keep Canadian workers on the farm and in industries in economic enslavement by means of the protection tariff, although it is mostly done in ambush. It is very necessary, Mr. Speaker, at this critical period in our history, when there is so much unrest, when the whole civilized world is in a state of turmoil, when we as a young nation have tremendous issues to face and surmount, and surmount them we must if the ship of state is to be steered clear of the rocks and shoals that may be in its course. And in my judgment it is necessary for every citizen of this country, no matter what his colour, race or creed may be, and especially every representative of the people, to apply all his ability and energy, not to abusing one another, as I have witnessed here, but to the solutions of the problems with which this country is faced, in a manner that will bring the greatest benefit to Canada and the Canadian people as a whole. It is the duty of the Government to see to it that no obstacles are put in the way, that no artificial burdens put upon the back of the wealth-producing people of this country. The agriculturists of Canada not only supply the food for the people of Canada, but they also will have to very materially assist the Finance Minister in furnishing the wherewithal to finance the re-establishing of the returned soldier, the paying of the pensions, the care of the widows and orphans, and caring for the crippled and the maimed. Agriculture is the basic industry upon which the success of all other industries primarily depends. The agriculturists supply the food that stiffens the muscles, that stimulates the heart, that feeds the blood, that quickens the pulse, that nourishes the brains of the nation. Therefore, they are not going to be a football in the future as they have in the past, to be kicked, exploited and taxed by every little manufacturing concern that wants to start up. They have been the hewers of wood and drawers of water from time immemorial. For years, Mr. Speaker, the common people have been the human oxen, they have bowed their necks to the yoke, they have been driven in the furrow, they have borne the burden of the race, they have rooted in the rubbish barrels at the back doors of the legislative halls of this fair Dominion of ours and they have had to be satisfied with the dry crusts and the bare bones carelessly thrown away by the other fellows. But, Mr. Speaker, the day is not far distant when they will come in at the front door and demand their rights as those engaged in the basic industry of the Empire. It is our duty, Mr. Speaker, if we want to keep the producers on the land and encourage others to go on the land, to see to it that they are not penalized by a protective tariff for the benefit of a privileged class; that they get their implements of production and the clothes that they wear without being taxed anywhere from 12½ to 310 per cent to help the lords of finance and the idle rich.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government will be well advised to consider these matters, for no nation can succeed indefinitely without a vigorous, prosperous and contented population identified with rural life. The rural home has been the source from which has come the main supply of strong manhood and womanhood to our seats of learning, afterward to fill important positions of trust and leadership in the councils of our nation. In all that makes for national stability, intellectual power and social and moral uplift, the home in the country stands pre-eminent; within it the very soul of Canada may be said to be contained. In view, then, of the great importance of rural population in the building of a nation, it is the duty of every loyal citizen of Canada, and, of the Government of Canada, to see to it that the tariff-fed plutocrat and profiteer is taken off his back, the shackles off his feet, the handcuffs off his hands, and the padlock that has been upon his mouth for years unlocked and the key thrown away. Mr. Speaker, the economic issues of Canada are very vital and must be kept steadily to the front. The issue to-day is whether Canada is to have its destinies controlled forever by a greedy plutocracy, or whether it is to be allowed to develop a real economic democracy without which political democracy is farcical. There must be a change, or our civilization will be hopelessly brutalized. It behooves Canada, which was foremost in the fight against Prussianism, not to be behind in the struggle for a new social order. It looks to me that a change can never come from this Government. The country does not hope for anything

from this Government because figs do not grow on thistles, nor are silk purses made out of sow's ears. There may be setbacks in the struggle before Canadian democracy, but the result is none the less sure. The day is not far distant when we shall see embodied in active legislation the ideals and aspirations of the plain folk of Canada. Though the ship may sway with the tide, while the anchor holds firm we are safe. Democracy in every Anglo-Saxon country will rise and make an end of this existing tariff system which makes exploitation possible. I see by the Press, and the fact was mentioned by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. J. F. Reid), that the manufacturers, the high protectionists, were creating a press censorship by way of boycott of papers that advocate or favour lower tariff. Which goes to show how anxious they are that the public should not be informed on the workings of the tariff, and also how insidious the action of coloured or suppressed news has been upon the formation of public opinion. The public, in whose hands lies the ultimate power in a democracy, cannot form a proper opinion upon domestic or international questions if their sources of information are systematically poisoned to suit the interests of some particular political or economic propaganda.

Our present economic system is based upon the incentive of profits, but we must be prepared to let it function naturally and not foster it artificially by a protective tariff. It may take a certain amount of courage on the part of the Government to affront the pillars of society, the financial and manufacturing barons, whose word seems to be law in certain matters, but Canadians must be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to face and deal with these matters if they hope to become worthy citizens of a free country. It is often only a step from the sublime to the ridiculous, so sometimes it is not far from a form of patriotism to treason. It is not necessary that Canada should have great factories established artificially, but it is necessary that there should be a chance for a good comfortable living for everybody who is willing to work. Let us devote our efforts to what we can do best. with our immense resources and then exchange freely with other lands. This is the method which will mean the greatest profit to us. However fertile the soil of a country may be, and however frugal and industrious its people, it will remain poor and backward and the people will be lacking in the highest comforts of life if its trade laws and its fiscal policy are unsound. It is common belief that the protective tariff has fostered combines, trusts and "gentlemen's agreements" in almost every line of Canadian industrial enterprise, by means of which the people of Canada both urban and rural have been shamefully exploited through the elimination of competition, the ruination of many of our smaller industries, thereby giving to manufacturers the power to make Canadians buy made-in-Canada goods at made-in-Canada prices and pay penalty duties at rates dictated by those manufacturers, thereby taking from the pockets of every consumer a sum to be put, not in the public treasury, but in the pockets of the Canadian manufacturers. The result is that on the back of the Canadian commonwealth there rides an association of protected interests making the country contribute to their gains. The Government has no right to take, or allow any one else to take, from the earnings of any one anything except what is absolutely needed to carry on the business of the Government. The moment one cent is taken and that one cent does not go into the treasury, that is robbery. There was a time perhaps when the industries in this country were in their infancy, when tariff for protection was necessary; but when husky infants like the Dominion Textile Company can make 310 per cent profit, a protection does not seem to me to be necessary. The horn and hoof of the protected interests have been long enough upon the doorstep of Canadian homes and also of Canada's House of Government. The fight for freedom from its vulgar and oppressive domination has only begun in earnest and it will never let up until the common people, the wealth-producing people of Canada, are liberated from the thraldom of financial barons who own this country financially and control it politically, until we have equal rights to all and special privileges to none. To reduce the high cost of living it is necessary to lessen the cost of production and lessen the cost of distribution. The world is hungry and the indications are that it will be more hungry unless conditions are radically changed. In this naturally great agricultural country, Canada's food production is hampered by unjust fiscal laws, excessive distribution tolls, and the lure of short hours and high wages in the cities. The decrease in farm population which, according to the Bureau of Municipal Affairs of Ontario, averages about 16,000 annually, should give rise to thought and consideration on the part of the Government. We have been told that the tariff is for revenue; if so, why is the manufacturer refunded in drawbacks 99 per cent of

the duty on their raw material which they charge up in this machinery when sold to the farmers?

It may be interesting if I should just quote for the information of the House a few items with regard to the drawback paid to the manufacturers.

I find that the following amounts were paid to Canadian manufacturers on account of drawback:

	1915.	1916.	1917.
International Harvester Co.	$101,613 12	$ 64,000 00	$ 29,000 00
Massey Harris Co.	279,256 40	32,000 00	97,000 00
Frost & Wood Co.	31,005 27	.....	.....
Cockshutt Plow Co.	14,442 34	6,323 46	10,163 84
Ford Motor Co.	389,435 07	127,000 00	71,000 00
Quaker Oats Co.	74,034 05	264,000 00	231,000 00

I cannot imagine, if the tariff is for revenue, why these Christmas boxes should go back to the manufacturers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that th manufacturer was taken off the back of the producer and consumer and stood upon his own feet, which in my judgment, is absolutely necessary in this reconstruction period.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the final chapter. If, after carrying all this load through the years of farm life, the farmer who has gone bankrupt in the process, falls by the wayside when he hovers in the shadow of the Great Divide beyond which I trust there is no tariff tax before he can enter Heaven, I find that when he turns his mind to the purchase of the lumber with which to build the pine box in which his remains will be enclosed, his last days on earth are disturbed by the nightmare that before he is buried the few mourners must take up a collection in order to pay a tariff tax to the millionaire lumbermen like my hon. friend from East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson). The transactions of some of those firms with the people are now being investigated by a Farmer Government at Toronto, while his erstwhile honoured political provincial leader is said to have gone south for the benefit of his health. But, even after the tax is paid on the pine box, the grave is still to be dug, and before the aged sexton in the old churchyard on the concession line is permitted to delve into the last six feet of earth, the hereafter dream of the broken, unhonoured agriculturist is made hideous by the thought that there must be paid on the shovel which digs the grave a tariff tax in the interest of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) who, while so patriotic as to advise this House and us farmers to stand fast and protect everything Canadian, thinks so little of his own patriotic doctrine that he has told us he actually ships his hardware products away down to Mexico, up the American coast, and into the Canadian city of Victoria, B.C., right at the door of my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) rather than pay an extra ten cents per hundred to that great, patriotic, loyal Canadian institution, the Canadian Pacific Railway. I may be disloyal when I buy a shovel from an American. I may go down to the last resting place of an unhonoured disloyalist when I want to patronize an American factory because I can save money, but the ultra-loyalist manufacturing member from Lincoln can hand his money over to the United States railways and ships at the beginning, contribute something to the Mexican Greasers who load and unload his goods, put these same goods aboard a United States freighter and take them up the American Pacific coast to a Canadian city, and when he tells this House about having been able to beat a great, loyal, patriotic Canadian railway corporation out of 10 cents his brother loyalists in the House applaud his statements. Weighing all these facts, looking them straight in the face, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to ask if the time will not soon arrive when some modest capitalist or manufacturer or lumberman who supports this Budget and this tariff system will arise in his place in this House and ask that he be given some kind of a privilege that will enable him to charge some kind of a tax for the last prayers said over the grave of the farmer, some tariff tax before he can get into Heaven, and, if not bound in that direction himself, then some kind of a privilege from this Government that will give the modest gentleman some kind of a "corner" among his old high tariff supporters.

Mr. A. M. DECHENE (Montmagny): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, and to address the House in a language with which I am not as familiar as most of the members, I feel at a loss. I may not render full justice to this subject of national importance. I will endeavour

to present my remarks to the best of my ability being sure that in your fairness you will not find fault with my many mistakes.

The present Budget debate has given us the pleasure of hearing many good speeches, and the occasion of studying the Government's policies. We know now what the gentlemen sitting on the treasury benches have in their minds: to help the Canadian people carry the burdens of war and return to peace activities. For these purposes they preach economy and increased production on the people's side, while they attend to their part of the scheme by taxing the same people and spending lavishly the money they can get hold of. By the proper operation of this scheme the Government's friends will get richer, and the people at large poorer. In their minds, that being so, everybody should be happy. "Quand le roi s'amuse, ... la France est heureuse . . . . ."

I believe that the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) has had very little trouble in applying the Tory system of taxation; he has well succeeded with the help of his colleagues. These taxes will be heavy on the whole of the people, the consumers, while the rich men, his friends the millionaires, the backers of the present administration, will go unharmed. These gentlemen will help to carry on. They will do the book-keeping for the Government, while the people will do the paying. Being Tories, we all know that they excel in the taxing business, and that they always fail, in so doing, to impose taxation with justice and equity. On one hand, the Minister of Finance expresses his deep desire to do his best to promote harmony, unity and welfare in Canada; on the other hand, with his colleagues, he is doing his best to perpetuate unrest, hate, and class movement among our people. His last taxes are only the latest acts in that direction. They are so unjust, and so tyrannical that we cannot condemn them too strongly. What pleasure it will be for me to vote against them with the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), and the rest of the gentlemen on this side of the House, and assert once more the true principles of pure Liberalism, and the Government of Canada for all Canadians and by all Canadians!

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us, for one moment, study another point of our national problem, and see what can be done in the interest of the majority of our people. The friends of all the industries of this country have voiced their sentiments and put before the Government what they thought best in the interest of their people. We have heard the manufacturers' viewpoint on our fiscal policies. We all know that they want protection for the $2,786,649,727 —as per statistics of 1917—invested in their industries. Their shops during the same year put on the market $3,015,577,940 worth of products for which they want a higher tariff and still more protection, and yet there were only 692,067 men working for the benefit of this huge amount of capital. Hardly one-tenth of the population is making a living out of this peculiar branch of our national life. The industries in which the manufacturers are engaged certainly deserve a good deal of attention on our part. Those manufacturers help in building up this country and in making our possibilities known the world over. We must not overlook the fact that in 1919 they exported $549,284,268 worth of their products, or about one-fifth of their total production. What is left from that exportation is for home consumption. But even with this magnificent statement from the manufacturers' side, we must not take for granted that they stand first in Canada as a class. They are only second; second as to capital invested in the business; second as to the number of people employed; second in importance. They stand first only with respect to the value of exports, and then only by a small margin over the farmers of Canada as a whole who really constitute the first class. Mr. Speaker, I have just stated that the farming community was the first in this country. I must add that to the farmer we must give the largest part of our attention. In 1919, according to the best available sources of information, there were in Canada 51,427,190 acres of land under field crops, which, valued at $50 an acre—taking the value given by the Minister of the Interior—represents a total value for land alone of $2,571,359,500. The value of stock was, in 1917, $1,102,261,000, making a grand total of $3,673,620,500, exclusive of farming implements and capital invested in the farming industry. The total value in 1919, of Canadian farm products, was $1,975,841,000, of which $467,625,311 were exported.

We must also bear in mind the number of people interested in agriculture. According to the best authorities, five-eighths of the total population of this country is rural, that is pretty nearly four millions of people. There is a great difference between the capital invested in farming and the value of farm products, compared with the in-

dustrial capital and its output. That is accounted for by the fact that the farm products sell at a lower price per article. We must also bear in mind that the capital invested in farms brings a less return. The average farm in the East does not pay 6 per cent on the investment.

We have heard of the western farmers also, through their most prominent leaders. We know their aims and what they are after. Their motto may be expressed in a few words: More railroad facilities; more elevators at home, at the head of the Great Lakes and at the shipping ports; free agricultural implements; and most of the expenses to be borne by the country at large. What of the eastern farmer and his needs, and relation to his western brother? First of all, he will be the one to pay the major portion of the heavy expenditures, of the millions in fact, needed for the West, while the western farmer will not put up a cent to help the eastern farmer. The two are as far apart in their interests as they are in the land. The western stockmen and farmers enjoy the full benefit of the Government grant and the money voted to buy seed grains, feed and stock. They enjoy the full working of the car lot policy and of its supplement, the free freight policy. The eastern farmer does not get money to buy his seed or feed. He benefits very little from the car lot policy, which is not applied to its full extent in the East. What the eastern farmer needs is encouragement in improved methods of production; real, practical teaching in agriculture and its by-products—butter, cheese, live stock, etc. I do not think I am misstating the facts when I say that the interests of the western farmer and those of the eastern farmer are far apart, and cannot be merged together with success to them and to the country.

Will the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) permit me to make one suggestion on the farming problem of the East, and how he can help to make farming pay? And here let me say that I am sorry the minister is not present—in fact there are few members of the Government in their seats at the present time.

The last years of strenuous work in the different classes of our people have changed many recognized standard ideas. Many new methods of production have been found and put into practice. Many new necessities have come to life and must be satisfied. To meet this situation the Government must change its old policies and put forward improved ways and means of increasing production and wealth in the various fields of human activity.

Among the different kinds of production, the art of producing food, that is to say, agriculture, stands first, and, as already stated, it is the main principle of prosperity in a country as big as ours. The farmer, either active in his fields or retired in his native village, is the best customer of our industrial world; in fact, he buys more than half of the total output of our manufactures. That, of itself, should be enough to draw attention to his activities. But he is more than that to the country; he is the feeder of its people, he is the framework of any national prosperity. Cut the farmer out and what will be left in Canada will not be worth while to look at. The actual situation of reconstruction depends a good deal on him. To reduce the high cost of living, everybody is looking to the farmer. If we want to help, let the Government do its share and devise new means of promoting greater production on the farm.

New ideas have appeared even in the agrarian world, and the experimental farm as the practical factor of assistance to the agriculturist is giving way to new methods. I regret to differ from my hon. friend, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture as to the best methods of encouraging agriculture, but our differences are very slight, our aims being the same: Progress. The hon. gentleman and this Government favour few big farms; I favour many small ones. He has many good reasons to support his contention. I believe with him that the experimental farms are a necessity. I also believe that the present and near future is actually well provided for.

Out of the $3,903,000 voted for the Department of Agriculture $1,200,000 goes for experimental farms; $520,000 for administration of the Meat and Canned Food Acts; $1,400,000 for the Live Stock Branch and indirectly for the Meat Packers' Trust. Very little is left for real agricultural purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the work of the experimental farm to be of any use to the farming community must be known by that community. The farmer must have belief that he can get on his land the results obtained on these farms. Everybody knows that such is not the case. The reason for this situation lies in the fact that the farmer knows that these farms are costing lots of money for their upkeep, and that he cannot spend big money on his farm to achieve the same results. So he is little interested in those farms. He may be wrong, but it is the fact.

Some may say that he should go to those farms and see for himself the work done there. That is partly true. We must not, on the other hand, forget that at the time when it is worth while to visit these farms the farmer has more to do on his own farm than he can properly attend to. Under these conditions, are we obtaining the results we are aiming at? Are we getting the full benefit of our experience? We are surely getting some benefit, but it is coming in slowly. We are too much in a hurry to wait for slow results. Let us change our methods and try to get immediate results. If the farmer will not come to the experimental farm, let us go to him with it. Go to the farmer's field and demonstrate there, by actual practice, what has been found profitable on the central farms. For this purpose, the Government should multiply its illustration farms, or, to achieve still better results, transfer its activities in that field to the provincial government, and help them financially to carry on this work. These special farms have found favour with some provincial governments, and their number is increasing every year. This increase is due to many causes, one of the first of which is organization. We have 256 demonstration farms in Quebec, the details of which are as follows: 37 fruit (trees); 65 small fruits; 3 kitchen gardening (not including school plots); 42 sugar beets; 45 pototato fields; 64 experimental stations for rotation crops, wheat, oats, corn, barley, clover. The local Government pays the cost of these with successful results. They have passed the stage of mere experiment; they have come to stay. Their value to the farmers has been demonstrated, the improvement they have effected in the agricultural field is making them more necessary every year. Their results are immediate and lasting. That is what we are looking after,—results, more results, and immediate results.

I claim results, but you may think, Mr. Speaker, that I have brought little proofs to support my statement. The value of crops and stock value is the most significant and conclusive proof that can be presented to the house. First, the area under cultivation in the province of Quebec in 1914 was 4,863,850 acres. In 1918 it was up to 13,292,798 acres, an increase of 8,428,948 acres.

The value of the crop in 1914 was $98,779,000; in 1918 it was up to $271,750,900; in 1919, $307,994,280. It has practically increased threefold. The value of stock on the farm increased from $122,208,000 in 1914 to $252,445,000 in 1918. These results surely are due to the system of helping agriculture and the methods behind them.

There is also a better reason for this pre-eminent position of the province of Quebec in agriculture. That is Liberalism. While Quebec was under the Tory rule, it was making slow progress. Ontario had then a Liberal regime and was progressing very fast. A change came. Quebec went Liberal and is fast gaining ground. Ontario made slow progress during these late years of her Toryism.

The Tories have made the millionaires richer. Liberalism made the farmers well-off. Let us see what Ontario was doing during the same years. The value of crops which in 1914 was $168,455,253 has since increased to $384,013,000, a little more than double. Is it surprising, in view of these facts, to see the farmers of the province take their interests in their own hands and go into politics? These facts are really more than was necessary to support my statement that proper methods of agriculture will bring astonishing results.

These illustration farms in Quebec usually consist of a small plot of land, just a few acres, cultivated according to new methods under the special supervision of a rural demonstrator, a Government official. The farmers see one of their neighbours cultivating four or five acres of his land with some kind of crop. They know him; they see the work he does on these acres; they know how much the work costs. They discuss with him the whole of the experiment and are still there when the crop is gathered and results known. They then feel that what their neighbour has done they all can do. They are convinced, and are ready to follow this lead. That brings results. The experimental farms, I am sorry to say, cannot boast of such immediate progress. To help the farmers carry on experiments on their own lands, and to help those in charge of the Provincial Government's illustration farms, the Quebec Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. J. E. Caron, has retained the services of special agricultural experts or demonstrators, most of them are young men. They are obliged to reside in rural districts; they visit the farmer in his fields; help him with advice and show him how to get results. They are the farmer's friends. I recently read in an agricultural magazine of this province a quotation from Hoard's Dairyman, published in the United States, saying that the county agent, who corresponds to our district agronomist, is gradually becoming the

hub of the agricultural wheel around which are grouped all the individual or collective activities of the county. He is as much an adviser as a man at everybody's disposal. He is becoming more and more the farmers' business agent and friend.

The author of the above mentioned article added:

> The same might be said of our district agronomists. They strive to help each farmer with the means at their disposal; what they want is to make farming more remunerative and the farmer better liked and esteemed. Farmers who despised their agronomist despised their best friend, their most desinterested adviser and one of the most powerful factors for insuring the progress of a region. In ten years from now we will be able to recognize at once the regions under the happy influence of a good agronomist. They who still resist the agronomist's influence are the inveterate partisans of old routine or the great meddlers in people's affairs who find themselves hampered in their interested calculations, by a man of progress, a champion of the farmer's rights.

It is important to mention especially the proof of the appreciation of the district agronomists' work given by the counties which have an agricultural information bureau. This appreciation was manifested in the shape of bonuses varying from $200 to $600 voted the agronomists by the county councils. In the month of July, 1918, eighteen counties having the services of an agronomist had already voted bonuses. Since then, seventeen of the counties have done the same. One county only is needed to complete the list, but we hope it will not delay in following the example of others. Time and again these experts call the farmers of a particular locality into one field and give them practical demonstrations of what the new methods will do. Perhaps the House will permit a personal reference to illustrate my point. In one locality of my riding the rural demonstrator called a meeting of farmers in a potato field. That season there was much disease in those potato fields and the crop was endangered. The demonstrator had to fight the plague and show the farmers how to fight it. With their help he treated one field and a few days later he called the same farmers to the same spot to see the results of his teaching and compare the conditions with those in the neighbouring field. The results were immediate; every farmer started to work on his own land, using the new methods, and the crop was saved. That is practical teaching. That is immediate results. The illustration plot of land, coupled with the district rural demonstrator—that is the new idea in farm experiments; that is the new method. This new idea, these new methods, have superseded with the people the experimental farms. The cost to the local government of those illustration farms is very small; it averages around $200 in Ottawa, and a good deal less in our province. In Quebec the 64 illustration farms, on which wheat, oats, corn, barley, clover, were raised, cost to the province an average of $35 a piece. The 102 devoted to fruit trees and small fruit growing received no grant of money. Our financial contributions are limited to the purchase of seeds, plant sprayers, chemical fertilizers and farming implements. We also supplied seeds and fertilizer for quarter-acre fields for the 42 sugar beet demonstration plots. The same methods are applied to the 45 potato plots. This demonstrates very clearly that these illustration fields are not expensive when the proper organization is behind them. If the number of these farms was increased in a large measure; if we had thousands of them under the federal control instead of forty-two, the results would be wonderful and the country would reap big profits from these expenditures. The unrest among the farmers would soon disappear when these gentlemen would see that their interests were being well taken care of. They would be more interested in their work, and their sons would not be so anxious to leave for the industrial town. I would recommend that a few farmers in each municipality be given the advantage of such illustration farms. Do not take the whole of a farm, but only a few acres, on as many farms as possible. The farmer in charge of a small plot of this kind is bound to follow the move on the whole of his land. He will be obliged in order to avoid the criticism of his neighbours, to cultivate his farm up to the new standard and use the new and more modern methods. That is our experience in Quebec, and is, I am sure, the same in all other provinces, for the farmer is everywhere the same, a man of sound judgment. The report of the hon. Minister of Agriculture bears testimony to this. It says on page 62:

> During the past season, it was quite noticeable that crops grown on the illustration stations, and for several miles round, gave higher yields than those grown on farms more distant.

The Government should take notice of this new formula in agricultural improvement and do its utmost to get all over Canada the same results, and get at least some returns for the money spent. The Government should get in touch with the provincial Departments of Agriculture and co-operate with them in carrying out the

best means of promoting the system of directly illustrating to the farmer what can be done. This principle has been accepted for cow testing with good results. Why not in illustration stations? During the third week of March many of the Provincial Deputy Ministers of Agriculture were in Ottawa; if I am well informed, these gentlemen have taken up this question of co-operation between their Departments and the Federal Government. They have specially advocated that the work on these illustration farms be left in their hands, the Central Government making special grants to help pay the expenses. This was not agreed to by Ottawa,—why, I do not know. If I am permitted I may guess the reason. "No money to help the farmer; what we have we hold, for the big interests." What these gentlemen from the provinces are after is not simply dollars and cents; they are after results; they want unity of operation in their respective provinces to get efficiency. They have the staff to carry on the work. They can do it much cheaper than this Government. The duplicating of salaries, travelling expenses, and overhead charges would be done away with. That will leave more money to promote the real interests of agriculture. I will with pleasure ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture to give the best of his time to the study of new ideas and new methods in the farming business. I feel sure that as a farmer himself he will understand the strength of my plea, and give it his whole support.

We are increasing subsidies in many branches of this Administration by the millions, while we are hardly spending three millions of dollars for agriculture and the betterment of the farming community. I hope the minister when he brings down his Supplementary Estimates will have another million for agricultural purposes to be spent along the lines of the new idea and more modern methods of farming. Let him take his money from the ruinous Department of Militia, the Mercantile Marine, and the other war marine projects under consideration. Cut down the expenses there and give the savings thus made to his countrymen at large.

I have mentioned the farmer's son and his willingness to stay on the farm. It is easier to keep him there than to take him back to the farm. Prove to him that he can make a clean living there, that there is money in the farming business, and you will have good results. Seeing his father a leader in this line of social activity will stimulate the son's desire to follow in his steps and make good. Let us not forget this aspect of a big problem. This young man has also felt the changing state of mind of the world. He has also learned many things and is full of energy to carry on his aspirations. He wants to learn more, and is looking for better and quicker results. Let us use his good will and give him the best chances of getting educated in things pertaining to the farm business. We need leaders in that field. Our schools of agriculture could make those leaders if they had the proper support and were not so few and so far apart. The farmers' sons of to-day will be the farmers of to-morrow. If they are made progressive, the next generation of farmers will be a blessing to this country.

The well-being of the farmer, his progress and enrichment is the safest asset of this country. In time of stress the farmer stays on his land and works. He does not invest his savings in American funds like the millionaires do. His money works on the farm, in this country of ours, for the benefit of all. Everywhere the farmers have done more for their country than the millionaires during the war. They are still there to play the highest part in reconstruction work. If the farmer is rich, the country is rich. Millionaires don't make a country rich; they live on a rich country.

So my last word will be: Get behind the new idea and the more modern methods of increasing farm production; make the farmer well off, and the country at large will be prosperous.

Mr. S. F. GLASS: As the hour is late, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. ROBB: This motion is not debatable, but I wish to say that we shall not be able to arrive at a vote to-morrow night unless the debate is proceeded with now.

Mr. A. L. DAVIDSON: The Whip for the Progressive party arranged with me that the adjournment should be moved for the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Under the circumstances, I take it, the hon. member desires to withdraw his motion. He will thus reserve his right to continue his speech. If the motion is put to the House and negatived, the hon. member will be debarred from taking any further part in this debate.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. OLIVER ROBERT GOULD (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, as I rise in my place

to address the House I am reminded that I have waited not impatiently, nor with great expectation, for some 46 years to have the opportunity of expressing my views in the House of Commons upon matters pertaining to the welfare of Canada.

I would approach the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) and speak to him a few words partly in approbation, because I have tried to realize the great task that confronts him as Minister of Finance, inasmuch as it seems to me that the heritage handed to him and the task before him is greater than that assigned to any other Finance Minister in the whole history of Canada. It seems to me that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) was absolutely correct when he stated that the ex-Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White) and his Government did not have a task, for the road was then a highway of enthusiasm. The people knew of the task in hand, that of winning the war, and anything, reasonable or unreasonable, that was asked of them at that time was forthcoming. All the people demanded was that the funds they so lavishly provided for the Government should be used with judgment and discretion, and the day has long since dawned when the people believe, as I believe, that the funds so lavishly given to the Government have not been disposed of in a fair or equitable manner. It further seems to me, Sir, that the ex-Minister of Finance, knowing of that enthusiasm, should not have taken the attitude that he did in the flotation of the war bonds when he advertised them to the people of Canada tax free. That, Sir, in my humble opinion, may be interpreted as either a bribe to the people or permission to the millionaire and the wealthy man to hide much of their wealth away from taxation, which wealth, he knew, must be increased materially as a result of our war efforts, and I am here to say, particularly for the West, that during that whole period, during the flotation of those bonds many of the people of the West used their credits at the banks to provide the necessary $50 or $100 to purchase a bond, thereby demonstrating their patriotism and their desire to do what they could. These people cried out loudly against the issuing of the war bonds tax free. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, the present Minister of Finance has my sympathy, and I may say to him that I believe, and wish to believe, that we might have received a Budget at this time much better than the one that has been brought down if no artificial difficulties had intervened.

I would now draw the attention of the House to the able address that was made in this debate by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark), and I wish to record the fact that I am pleased as a member of this group to have as an associate a man of his abilities, foresight and power of expression. Truly, his abilities are the envy of the House, and when the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) stands in his place and presumes to tell this House that he does not fear the task imposed upon him to reply to the hon. member for Red Deer, in my opinion that was only meant to be read in Hansard and after reading it to find out that the boast was not made good. I regret very much that the Minister of the Interior is not in his place, but he is not to blame for that, of course, because it is rather extraordinary to be talking at this time of night. There are a few things, however, that I would rather say in his presence than in his absence.

I would direct a few remarks across the Chamber to the Minister of the Interior, perhaps because he directly addressed us "angularly," as he put it, across the floor of the House. Twice did the hon. gentleman refer to the Progressives, or to us who sit behind the hon. member for Red Deer, as being out in the side lines in the townships. Twice did he advise us, or advise the member for Timiskaming, to do certain things. Twice it is also known that he himself visited the same townships, Carleton, Victoria, and Timiskaming, and twice it is recorded that he returned humiliated and defeated. And acknowledging his defeat he presumes to tell the Progressive party of this House what to do. Does the hon. gentleman think, after failing to persuade the people out in these electoral districts that he visited that anything he could say here would persuade us who represent these people, that he is on the right track? I think not, Mr. Speaker. May I inform the hon. gentleman that his story, so far as I am concerned, falls upon deaf ears—I have listened too long, and I fear I am an unbeliever of his doctrine. The arguments the hon. gentleman presented were based largely upon the findings of a commission that was appointed by the Asquith Government of Great Britain in the year 1916. The report was handed in to the Government in the year 1918. It purported to show, according to the interpretation of the hon. minister, that Great Britain was a decadent nation, and to show the dire state into which agriculture had fallen, and the inanimate status of the iron and steel

industries. And the minister endeavoured to prove that a high protective policy for Great Britain would be her only salvation.

Mr. Speaker, to my mind it appears presumptuous on the part of the minister to think that he should criticize the Government of which right hon. Lloyd George is Premier, and the people of Great Britain who placed him in that position. Well do I remember, in the year of 1918, coincident with the report that was issued by the commission in question, how the high protectionist press of Canada heralded it all over the country that Great Britain would resort to high protective principles. To me, Mr. Speaker, the soft impeachment suggested by the hon. Minister of the Interior on a coalition between the official opposition and ourselves was to be expected, though in his later effort he failed to construct anything on his foundation of sand. Similarly, his charge was almost offensive that there was a proposal of a coalition designed to deceive the people. The idea of any proposal to deceive the people has never entered my mind, and I regret for his sake to believe that such thoughts could and did enter the mind of the minister. I wonder whether this is the first time that such a question has entered the mind of the hon. gentleman. We believe that many hon. members who have listened to his teachings and his doctrines are at present well-nigh persuaded to come out from among his party. It is our cry that they come out from among them. As I have listened to the debate upon this Budget I could not help feeling that this has been a discussion absolutely and entirely on the merits and demerits of the tariff, and that the debate is only a preliminary to that which will take place throughout the whole country. This being so, the time spent in debating the principles of the question has been well spent.

We do object to special privilege and we do argue for equitable distribution of taxation. During the address delivered by the Minister of the Interior he stated that our whole platform and our arguments were designed toward free trade. That statement I wish to repudiate, and I take as my authority the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture. If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer particularly to two cases, which we consider may be typical of many others in our Dominion of exorbitant protection given to industries. The first one I wish to refer to is the Dominion Textile Co., of whom we have heard the familiar phrase: "Their factory was not built for the glory of God but to make money for the shareholders." If I might be permitted to add my sentiments to that phrase I would say it was specially built for the financial exploitation of the people. Protection heralds the cry of increased wages for increased cost, and it is a recorded fact that woollen textiles advanced 80 per cent in price to the consumer. Was the increased cost paid in wages? We will see the schedule:

Groups of Earnings.	Male.	Female.
Under $5 per week	29	74
$5 to $11	292	1,104
$10 to $15	745	1,047
$15 to $20	738	234
$20 to $25	458	28
Over $25	268	2

Or, in other words, the average wage paid per week to their employees was $12, or $624 per year. Is that schedule any justification of an increase of 80 per cent in their selling price? If we were to deduct 80 per cent, or even 40 per cent of the selling price from the schedule of wages I have given does it not afford an illustrative picture? And this company's privilege is a 30 per cent or 35 per cent protective duty. As regards these gentlemen who built this factory, not for the glory of God but for their own profit, I will say that whatever may be their state of mind, they are undoubtedly dressed in sheep's clothing.

The cotton industry is even worse, where the annual wage paid to employees was $516 per year or $10 per week. What now of their boasted cry of high wages? If high wages were the determining factor along with the advertised fact that there had been greatly increased costs of production, there would have been an accompanying list of the wages paid that would be a proof of the sincerity of their arguments. But never have these companies seen fit to advise the people and to prove their assertions by such statements.

Allow me to inform the House that the determining factors as regards the salaries paid are: Firstly, the unionism of workers that endeavour to force a living wage from the employers; and, secondly, the supply and demand of those who wish to work and those who wish to employ them. These, Mr. Speaker, are in all countries in the world the determining factors of wages paid, and not the amount of the protection that the interests receive from gratuity-giving governments. In this mulcting of the people by the tariff and the greed permitted thereby, the Minister of Finance

assists by further imposing a tax, a tax, Mr. Speaker, which rests primarily on the necessities of life. I would, Sir, give to the House a concrete illustration of the manner in which the necessity becomes a luxury by and through the combination of excessive tariff and the proposed excise tax now brought down by the Minister of Finance.

Let us imagine a pair of shoes made by a United States manufacturer in 1914 and regarded as an actual necessity because of their low cost. These shoes are purchased by the Canadian retailer in 1914 at, let us say, $3 per pair f.o.b. Chicago. The same pair of shoes—still a necessity—made by the same manufacturer in 1920, is purchased by the Canadian retailer, but because of increased production cost, labour, etc., it has increased in cost during the six years by one hundred per cent and is therefore sold to the Canadian retailer in 1920 at $6 per pair f.o.b. Chicago. Now, let us make a comparison between the cost of those shoes in 1914 and in 1920 and let us remember that in view of the price the shoes must still be considered a necessity and not a luxury. Adding to the 1914 Chicago price of $3 a 30 per cent customs tariff, amounting to 90 cents, freight and handling charges 10 cents, you get a cost laid down in Canada of $4. The Canadian retailer adds his profit of 40 per cent or $1.60 and the price to the purchaser in 1914 is $5.60. The price of the same shoes in 1920, f.o.b. Chicago, is $6 and the addition of the customs tariff, amounting to $1.80, freight and handling charges 20 cents, makes the cost laid down in Canad $8. The Canadian retailer adds his profit of 40 per cent, or $3.20 and the price to the purchaser, exclusive of the excise tax, is $11.20. Under our new excise tax ten per cent is added to the cost of what was originally a necessity but which through the customs tariff is placed in the class of luxuries. The $1.12 excise tax making the cost of this necesity to the purchaser in Canada now a luxury with an inflated value of $12.32.

I would now ask tolerance, to inform the House something about this Farmers' platform, particularly in view of the complaint made by the hon. Minister of the Interior during the course of his address. It is within the knowledge of many of the members of this House that during the central portion of the war period many public men and others throughout the Dominion foresaw the reconstruction period, and an institution known as the Canadian Reconstruction Association was formed with Sir John Willison as the head. That board was composed of members of the majority of the big industrial and financial interests of Canada, but mining, agriculture and labour generally were not represented. In their self-sufficiency they ignored the advice; in fact thy desired not the opinion or advice of the factors I have mentioned, and they proceed to educate the people of this country as to their duties during the reconstruction period. Now this titled gentleman, Sir John Willison, who is known to be an able platform man, toured the Dominion and addressed meetings in the most populous business centres, but it was not long until the people of Canada seemed to believe that the whole object of the Canadian Reconstruction Association, as outlined in the policies of its advocate was to do nothing more than propagate in the minds of the people the theories of high protection. Now when a manufacturer appears in the West and presumes to tell the people, those hard-working and sunburnt people of the West, the merits of his protective policy under the guise of the name of the Canadian Reconstruction Association, while they listen, they do not believe.

To-day it seems that the vision had been lost for under the name or guise of the Canadian Reconstruction Association they have for months been singularly quiet. While in session in 1916, the Canadian Council of Agriculture, seeing under the mask of this doughty knight, realizing what the objects of the association were and that the advocacy of its cause was not in the best interests of Canada, conceived the idea that they would endeavour to frame a platform suitable for all the people of Canada, having particular reference to reconstruction. I wish to inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that the platform was not designed for a political party purpose, but as a suggestion to the Government in power as to the best way of meeting the problems of reconstruction. That I am sure of.

I could go on much longer and tell this House of the earnestness displayed by the people of the western plains after their discussions in the local associations. I could make a long story of how they fought it out in their big conventions, how they argued and amended, but when they saw that those who sat in high places ignored all the advice that was tendered in that platform they began to conceive the idea that nothing but their own determination would give to Canada the benefit of this platform whose merit, Mr. Speaker, has been acknowledged by the ablest men and politicians in Canada.

In connection with this story, having particular reference to the silence of the former Canadian Reconstruction Association, I have been interested in an article appearing in the Montreal Gazette of 22nd May, describing a proposed organization to be called the Western Canada Colonization Association. I would not have it understood that I speak in a critical way regarding this, yet I would have it distinctly understood that I do speak in a very questioning manner. As I look over the photographs and I read the names of the gentlemen whose photographs appear on this page, I see: Charles R. Hosmer of The Canadian Cottons; Sir Joseph Flavelle, whose close connection with the Davies Meat Packing Co. we all remember; D. Lorne McGibbon, of the Atlantic Sugar Co.; Huntley R. Drummond, of the Canadian Sugar Co.; Brig. General F. S. Meighen, of the Lake of the Woods Milling Co.; Sir Edmund Osler, banker, and leading high protectionist; Sir Charles Gordon. In connection with this organization a note in the paper says:

> The organization will carefully select settlers, welcome them into the country, give them such information and advice as they require, and make of them good Canadians.

All very good if that is their platform, but I wondered why these gentlemen showed such an interest in this matter. It goes on further and says that the Government and the railways are cooperating with this organization in the great national undertaking. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when the plain people ask for something they are ever denied; but when "big business" comes to this House it is received with open arms. The denial that was given to the suggestion of the big steel merger that was brought up in this House some weeks ago is not much in evidence. Might I remark again that when the Bell Telephone Company wished to increase their capitalization by one hundred per cent they found their sponsors ready and willing to tell this House, or to tell the people of Canada, that no harm could result from it. My idea in connection with the steel merger is that it does not merely propose to capitalize the assets of the country in a certain manner, but it does propose to capitalize the taxpaying ability of the people; and in the spirit of prophecy I predict that should this merger really take effect the day is not far distant when—after selling to the people of Canada five, and ten-dollar shares of stock—they will return to the Government and say "Here is public opinion represented by these shareholders," and they will ask for a bounty or a subsidy. I wish to say to this House that the people are tired of bounties, subsidies, high protection—tired of broken promises, of profiteering, and graft.

We listened some weeks ago, during an exposition given by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) to the statement that millions of tons of iron ore were in close proximity to the city of Ottawa, and it was stated these ores assayed sixty per cent. A scientist in my office, in connection with the statement that was made by the hon. member, gave me authority to state that thirty-three per cent of iron is a workable basis, and by that I presume is meant that it can be handled at a profit. Well, the hon. gentleman spoke briefly of having a bounty given to some one to work these mines, but it has occurred to me that the difference between a thirty-three per cent assay which shows a profitable basis and the sixty per cent assay referred to should provide dividends enough for any company that wished to go to work diligently and make a profit in that direction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I might refer at length to the number of names that have been applied to this party since the House met on the 26th of February. However, I do not wish to dwell upon it. Neither do I wish to say that I am in anything but a good mood because I am prepared to believe —and if the House had as much evidence as I have concerning this matter it would also believe—that the abuse that has been heaped by hon. gentlemen opposite on this little aggressive party during the present session has been the greatest capital for our cause that we could ever have. Hon. gentlemen opposite have made charges and counter charges absolutely without knowledge of the facts, aiming at something and hoping to get a retort from this side that would give them a little capital. We have been called "Bolshevists", "One Big Union", "Agitators", "Reds", "Free Traders", and "Little Canadians". We have been styled "dangerous" not once but many times, and we have also been called "Levites". The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) pictured us as Levites. That hon. gentleman also drew a picture of "steers" that was referred to tonight. The picture of the steers reminded me—and I think it also reminded the hon. gentleman—of the cartoon that was published back in 1911 during the reciprocity cam-

paign. I would advise the hon. gentleman, or anyone who speaks in that fashion, that they have altogether a wrong conception of the minds of the people. We are too big—and we were too big in 1911—to be persuaded along the way they wished us to go. When they produce a cartoon purporting to be educating to the people and wish to send it out West they should send something other than the picture referred to—something bigger. That is a piece of advice I wish to give to the hon. member for Brantford.

With reference to the assertion respecting "free trade with Great Britain" I shall not consider it at any length other than to say this. If my hon. friend's argument holds good, that free trade between Great Britain and Canada would result in free trade with the whole world, why does it not work out that way under the British preference? The hon. gentleman's argument is a bugaboo, something that he fears and is unable to prove. However, the thing that has occurred to me is this: We have been called "Little Canadians," and I have wondered what constitutes a big Canadian. I have wondered, Mr. Speaker, if some of the hon. gentlemen who have made these charges would be considered "Big Canadians"; and I have been to some pains to find out wherein I am lacking as a Canadian as compared with any individual who charges me, or any member of my group, with being a "Little Canadian".

Now, I was not in the House when the Budget was brought down, and I did not have the opportunity of hearing a number of the speeches both for and against the high protectionist Budget of the Government—a Government that promises tariff revision downwards in spite of the statements of men like the Minister of the Interior, who tells us that some other countries have been almost ruined by looking in the direction of lower tariffs. But I found much interest in reading in Hansard several of the speeches delivered in this debate, and among them I may say the deliverances of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), and of the hon. member for Fraser Valley, B.C. (Mr. Stacey), interested me immensely. It was not, perhaps, so much what these hon. members said as the fact that these three, this significant trinity of kindred spirits in Union Government, represent three distinct schools of thought in this House, and when we see the spectacle of this trio lying down together with the sheep and the goats and the lambs within the protected fold of the Union Government—over whose destinies the big interests of this country are watching with such zealous care and solicitude—it is time, I believe, that some private member of this House should draw attention to the peculiar combination that, in the minds of the people who know, must take on a three-faced external appearance, with but the one bleeding, patriotic heart beating beneath the bosoms of the three. On the one hand, we have the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, whose widespread far-reaching, diversified interests in the country are said to extend from the operation of newspapers, of dredging companies and Government dredging contracts, of lumber and canning mills and factories on the far Pacific ocean—

Mr. STEVENS: Does the hon. member suggest that I personally am interested in the businesses which he has mentioned?

Mr. GOULD: Oh, these are interests out there. You are not interested in farming in the fruit country; you come from a country where all these things—

Mr. STEVENS: I am asking the hon. gentleman a question, if he will permit me: Does he suggest that I am personally interested in these businesses?

Mr. GOULD: No, I do not say so—Now let me continue where I left off when interrupted—to the ownership of newspapers, of grain elevators, of stock food dispensaries along the broad prairies, to catch up again with terminal elevators, dredging companies, steamboats, etc., when the head of the Lakes is reached, speaking to this House as the pure and undefiled Tory of the old school of forty years ago. During all these forty years of the National Policy his confidence in it seems never to have wavered, and he tells the House to-day that he supports it as did his grandfather, perhaps, at the time of its inception.

The National Policy of this and other Governments, seemingly, has been good to the interests in the country with which is connected the hon. member for Vancouver Centre. Under it great lumber mills, large dredging companies, immense terminal elevators, and even Tory newspapers, have grown up and prospered through the benign influence of this policy, and in the days when the people of this country, after forty years of it, have come to the conclu-

sion that the protective policy as a developer and a populator of Canada has failed to populate and has failed to develop, except in some remote cases of which the hon. member for Vancouver Centre might tell this House, my hon. friend, knowing as he must the sum total of what this protective system has done for Canada, has the temerity to rise here and sing the praises of a Government and a policy that, if we may judge by the census figures of Canada, its huge national debt, and the trade returns for a no later period than the month of April last, is little less than throttling the legitimate and natural growth of the whole Dominion. Truly we can put the first member of this strange trinity I have mentioned down as Faith. I am not going to even suggest that it is misplaced faith on his part, for who knows but himself the extent of the ramifications of the interests for which the hon. member for Vancouver Centre speaks in the province from whence he comes and so ably represents in this House.

Then we have the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat). For this same forty years, up to quite recently, the hon. member for Parkdale, could find neither hope nor virtue in the protective tariff. His despair began, it seems, about the time of its inception, when a great man named Mowat was Prime Minister of the great province of Ontario, a man who at times was prone to dispute with the father of the protective system in Canada certain constitutional rights with respect to the province of which he was guardian for so many years, and who, because of his staunch loyalty to principle and right and justice, earned from the Tories like the hon. member for Vancouver Centre and from some other hon. members of this House who were always Tory, always will be, just about the same kind of criticism as we hear levelled to-day at the men of this little Progressive party and others who think as we do, and who to-day are carrying on the same fight against class and privilege and injustice to the common people as did the illustrious forbear of the hon. member for Parkdale some thirty or forty years ago.

This is a free country, of course, and men are privileged to change their minds. Some men change their minds from conviction, and some because in changing sometimes the way is better paved to get a seat in Parliament—the seat that could never had been secured unless there was a change of heart. But I am constrained to ask this House and this country, what would the late Sir Oliver Mowat say—the man who helped to lead Sir Wilfrid Laurier to victory under the motto "Laurier, Mowat and Victory"—if that sterling old Liberal were privileged to-day to look down upon the wayward namesake, the hon. member for Parkdale, who in his declining years of a rather chequered and unfortunate political career finds it necessary to swallow the Protectionist Budget. It seems to me I have heard a story of an occasion that in this particular, might interest the honourable member for Frontenac, (Mr. Edwards), I tell this story chiefly because one of the figures in it happened to be a certain Joseph Haycock, at one time leader of a Farmers' party in Ontario and a rival, I understand, of the hon. member for Frontenac when he was much younger than he is to-day. It seems to me that I have read somewhere among the political reminiscences of the county of Frontenac and of Joe Haycock that on a certain occasion, when he was chided by a certain speaker, then much younger than to-day, for having changed his political coat, remarked that "a man sometimes changes his mind, but a donkey never will." Perhaps the hon. member for Frontenac has heard that story before, perhaps indeed he may have been present on the occasion. At any rate, to give due credit to the hon. member for Parkdale for his eleventh-hour repentance, it cannot be charged against him that he has not changed his mind, no matter what the reason for the change. We do not have to go back very far for a record of the political affiliations of the hon. member for Parkdale. Even as late as 1911, he was, I understand, a supporter of free trade and lower tariff, and, if I mistake not, the good offices of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, with whom the elder Mowat served with such distinction, were at that same time put forth to secure for the hon. member for Parkdale a seat in this House from among the past protectionist province of Ontario that has sent to this House during these forty past years so many Tories that, to give credit where credit is due, might be placed in the category given by the late lamented Joseph Haycock to those who never change their minds. Not being fully conversant with the various events in the political history of the hon. member for Parkdale during all these long years in Ontario, of his struggles and hardships in the midst of the Ontario Tories who have seemingly taken him to their fold, not being acquainted

with all the details of his election campaigns and his election campaign funds, perhaps I might leave further particulars in this connection to some Liberal who stood with Laurier when the elder Mowat did, and who may know more about Mowat political history in Ontario than I do. But, if I go back but nine years, I find the hon. member for Parkdale in 1911 supporting the reciprocity treaty of Mr. Fielding and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, I find him a candidate I think in one of the Ontario Tory ridings, and I find him in the face of the Tory denunciations of that treaty and in the face of fear and shivering that free wheat for the country from which I come would drive us into annexation with the United States—I repeat I find the hon. member for Parkdale no later than in 1911, supporting that reciprocity and defending it against the aspersions of the Tories who, with the same density of vision as they display to-day, were peddling the bogey that free wheat would make this country an adjunct of the United States. These same Tories, whom the hon. member for Parkdale announces to this House he has joined after a chequered if not inglorious career as a Liberal, a reciprocity, and a lower tariff candidate, were in 1911 afraid to let us sell our wheat to the United States, but the noble patriots in 1918 and 1919 were not afraid to not only lift the embargo and sell our wheat to Americans, but were actually not afraid to permit the soldiers of Canada and the soldiers of the United States to fight the same battle for freedom on the continent of Europe, to mingle with one another, and to eat the same bread made out of the same wheat of America.

But the mind of the hon. member for Parkdale is still troubled. He did perhaps have some slight thought for the interests of the western farmers, the great body of producers of the West, when he supported the reciprocity pact in 1911. But he has been able to get a seat in Parliament since that time. He did not get that seat from Liberals, working men or farmers, apparently. It came from the protectionists, and perhaps from big implement companies like the Massey-Harris Company. Therefore, the hon. member for Parkdale proposes to run true to form so far as the protectionists and the implement companies are concerned. Though no Mowat before him ever accepted a seat in Parliament as an apostle of protection, the member for Parkdale after a few years contact, appears to have become inoculated and, despite his previous political record, he is now, safely in his seat, prepared to swallow the whole protectionist dose—hook, line and sinker. The only public reason for this remarkable right-about-face is that he has the Massey-Harris works located in his riding, and, though holding no business or legal brief for the company, he must sink any individual opinions of his own he may have had and subvert the whole interests of this country and its people to the interests of that company. I have heard one after the other of these protectionist members rise in their place and tell this House that they are not sectional in their vision, that they are not class in their composition, and that they stand for all of Canada all the time. And as if to demonstrate the breadth of their vision, their great faith in all of Canada all the time, here is one of them who pops up in this House and out of his own mouth tells us that the extent of the vision which he sees through far-seeing eyes gets no farther than the business of the Massey-Harris Company goes—about as far as Medicine Hat, I think I read. He and his colleagues talk about building a great country, yet the hon. member for Parkdale, who has been converted to some kind of a new-found hope, cannot see past the tall chimney out of which the smoke comes from the Massey-Harris Company. And yet I might tell him that, if it were not for the farmers of this country, there would be mighty little smoke coming out of the Massey-Harris chimney.

I listened the other day to the eloquent Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) tell about the groans and the cries and supplications of some certain faction in England who had sought some kind of death-bed repentance on tariff matters over there. I wonder if before this repentance of the hon. member for Parkdale, this getting himself together with the interests of those who build tall chimneys for which the farmers supply the coal and the smoke, there were any groans and cries and supplications. Perhaps not—not in the presence of that new Hope which is said to beat eternal in the human breast. Be that as it may, surely it would not be amiss to liken the hon. member for Parkdale, the second member of this strange trinity, in the face of the surrounding circumstances, to that virtue of Hope.

And surely Charity has never been better exemplified in the country or in this House than by the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Stacey) the fruit farmer who coaxes his living out of the fertile soil of the magnificent valleys of British Columbia. The

hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) I understand, includes in his business and political repertoire such things as daily newspapers, grain elevators, lumber mills, terminal elevators, dredging contracts, steamships, and the like. The hon. member for Parkdale must have big implement factories with tall, smoking chimneys to make him see the light. But the hon. member for Fraser River, honest, hard-working fruit farmer that he is, asks only thirty cents a box for his apples. The heathen of old and the unbeliever of the present may have erected idols of gold, and the hon. member for Fraser river has worshipped not. The filthy lucre has had no temptations for him; he walked on in the straight and narrow path so typical of the simple life of the trusty folks of the farm. But thirty cents a box on his apples and a market among us farmers on the prairies, where we have no apples of our own, and like Samson of old, he falls down and worships, not at the shrine of the prairie farmer who pays the additional price to enable the fruit farmer to live, but at the feet of the people who take those means that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior would call "constitutional," to compel the prairie farmer to pay this thirty cents per box whether he likes it or not. Viewing this procedure briefly in passing, I cannot help wondering if the hon. member for Fraser Valley, out of the goodness of his heart, would have raised his voice in such high praise of glorification of this tariff if, instead of virtually buying his support at the rate of thirty cents a box on apples, it had erected a tariff wall around British Columbia, where no wheat was produced, and order this same law-abiding, trusty, fruit man to pay the prairie farmer thirty cents a bushel more for his wheat than the same article might have been secured for in Montana or Washington or Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, all men, it is said, have their price; but in comparison with what it has required to keep the honourable member for Centre Vancouver seeing the light, and to force the same light on the honourable member for Parkdale, the price of the hon. member for Fraser River is too cheap. But by placing his own valuation upon his own independence, by sinking his principles and life-long convictions at the rate of thirty cents per box, the whole sum, thirty cents and all, to be paid by the prairie farmer whom the hon. member for Fraser River is to place in an exclusive market for himself, surely the honourable member has placed himself in that category that may aptly be described as Charity. Thus we have the earthly trinity—Faith, Hope and Charity.

Speaking as a western farmer, one of the peculiar things about this particular trinity is that, while absolutely opposed to conceding anything in the shape of trade privileges to the western prairie farmer, each one of them has something to sell to this particular farmer. And, what is more significant still is that each one of them, while desiring to sell their wares to the prairie farmer, stipulates that in selling, the prairie farmer shall buy upon the terms and under the restrictions laid down by these three honourable members and those who think like them in matters of trade. "Big Canadians," "no class"—Oh, no, perish the thought; only farmers are "class." If we on the prairies desire the lumber from the interests served by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, we pay the price demanded by those lumber interests, plus the tariff protection on the commodity they sell. If we desire to purchase a binder from the factory with the tall, smoking chimney in the protectionist constituency that has given political life to the hon. member for Parkdale, we go down in our pockets, and we pay the price demanded by the man who owns the tall chimney that excites so much admiration in the mind of the hopeful member of the trinity. Then, if we farmers yearn for a little fruit to relieve the monotony on the prairies where wheat is produced, we must before securing it purchase it at the price and at the terms, plus 30 cents tariff per box, demanded by the charitable third member of this trinity. Neither the faith, the hope, nor the charity of any one of these big three Canadians that do not believe in class legislation, however, points the way to the manner in which the prairie farmer is going to get the money to pay for the protection accorded to the diversified interests represented by this trinity, and when we have anything from the prairies to sell we find that we must sell it at the price dictated by Liverpool, after we, the farmers, have paid the freight across a continent and across an ocean. Then the Faith-Hope-and-Charity trinity, when they have anything to sell to us, demand that we pay the freight on their wares as well as paying it on our own. Thus we get it both going and coming, while this trinity chorus re-echoes a Te Deum to the tune played by the capitalists

who own tall chimneys in protectionist Toronto and big lumber mills on the Pacific coast, while the hon. member for Fraser Valley and the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) utter a sort of a benediction as we begin our journey down to Jericho and a prayer that no danger may meet us on the way, just so long as we can keep paying the prices demanded by the implement factories of Parkdale and the lumber mills of British Columbia and have enough left to shell out the 30 cents per box on apples that tends to keep the wolf from the door of the friends of the hon. member for Fraser river—no matter whether or not the same wolf howls about the door of every prairie farmer in Western Canada. No "class legislation" for these three. Surely Shylock, in all his avorice, would never have exemplified anything like that. Shylock did not boast of such big, broad Nationalism as is so frequently and loudly proclaimed here, while the action is denied.

We were advised that the hon. member for Fraser Valley had saved the prairie farmer from the clutches of the Nash fruit interests and had given the poor, downtrodden prairie farmer cheap fruit at about 45 cents a box for berries and something like $15 a barrel for No. 1 British Columbia apples. But a closing "Amen" from our high protectionist friends will give the proper color to the end of a little tragedy in which another erring brother has joined with the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) and in the anxiety to swallow the Tory doctrine as graciously as possible, despite the groanings, the cries and the supplications the Minister of the Interior has told us about, has taken freely of the hook, line and sinker without making even an unpleasant face.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that each one of this trinity described before, represents a distinct and different commodity for which the western farmer is the chief customer, it might be of interest in this House to outline some of the conditions under which the farmer purchases the commodities involved in the transactions. Let me take them one by one.

Let me for a moment refer to the question of the agricultural implements turned out of the factory under the smoking tall chimneys in the riding of my hon. friend from Parkdale—chimneys that smoke only when the farmers buy, and whose temperatures, when the farmers don't buy, descend to a degree about in keeping with the political reception my hon. friend received at the hands of his admirers in the large number of ridings in which he was a candidate up to 1917. The hon. member for Parkdale in his speech the other day cited as one of his reasons why he should support this protectionist budget of his friends, that the Massey-Harris Co. shipped their machines as far west as Medicine Hat, presumably to sell to the farmer whose cause in this House finds no merit in the eyes of protectionist members, and that that company had given millions of dollars in credit to those same farmers. It is admitted, for the sake of argument, that the farmers did get a good deal of credit from the implement companies in the West. If the farmers had not, then, in the absence of any intelligent conception of successive Protectionist governments as to what the West really needed in order to populate it, the chances are that many a farmer would have been unable to start in the farming business. But I understand, too, that when the war broke out, the implement companies in Canada had out in Germany some seven millions of dollars in credit which had been given to the Germans; and, when we take into consideration the fact that the Germans were given credit and probably sold their implements cheaper than they were sold to the farmers of this country in which these same companies have enjoyed protection for over forty years, surely it is not expecting too much to ask that the Canadian farmers be given at least the same credit as was extended to the Germans.

But did any one in the West ever hear of an implement company giving a farmer any credit on his farm machinery unless that company was amply protected in the way of security? I do not think so. My hon. friend from Vancouver Centre, who, I understand, has had some little experience with newspapers at Vancouver, if not at Winnipeg, will probably understand that when a representative of a printing machinery company sells a machine to a newspaper, that machine is sold on a lien that affects only the machine in question, and that the accompanying notes carry an interest of somewhere from 6 to 8 per cent. But what about the machinery of the farmer? That's a different matter. When a farmer, on the other hand, in the past has wanted to buy a machine of some kind he has had to give a lien note of the same kind, but he has had to pay anywhere from 9 to 15 per cent interest on that note, and, besides holding a chattel mortage on the machine in quest-

ion, it has not been the fault of the implement agent if he did not secure a mortage in addition on all the stock and other machinery on the farm, and, if the farmer was not keenly alert, a blanket mortage on the whole old homestead.

The heart of the hon. member for Parkdale need not bleed for the poor implement companies. They have usually been able to take care of their own interests, and when they cannot do it, then any individual member of this House is wasting his time when he ventures to fear for the future and safety of the factories with the tall smoking chimneys in the protectionist constituencies of Toronto. Those chimneys, let me say, will smoke just as long as there are farmers in this country to purchase implements and no longer, and, if my hon. friend would consider the real interests of his capitalistic friends, he might better employ his time in this House in devising ways and means to increase the number of farmers and to increase the prosperity of those already on the land, knowing as he must know that the greater the number of farmers and the greater their prosperity, the greater the volume of smoke that will be emitted from the tall chimneys in Parkdale. I do not desire at this time in any way to minimize the consideration given the farmers by some of the implement companies. That would be unjust, and it is not the method we have of doing business among the farmers. All we desire is a square deal, a fifty-fifty split, and I am satisfied that that kind of an arrangement will be of just as much benefit to the implement companies, many of whom neither need nor desire a continuance of protection. But, in case the members of this House do not know it, I want to tell them that the provincial governments of both Alberta and Saskatchewan a few years ago found it necessary to place upon the statute books of those provinces legislation which would prevent the implement companies from selling implements to the farmers under agreements that not only loaded the farmer with implements, but virtually gave these companies a blanket mortgage on everything the farmer owned. It might be of further interest to this House, particularly to the member for Parkdale, to know that the man who framed that legislation, first in Alberta and later in Saskatchewan, was none other than the late Hon. A. G. Mackay, a lifelong friend, I believe, of another public man called Mowat, who in his declining years was found steadfast in the faith that he had helped to inculcate in the late Mr. Mackay, and perhaps to some extent in his distinguished and hon. relative of the same name who occupies a seat in this House. It may be of further interest to this House to know that because he framed that legislation, Mr. Mackay in a subsequent by-election was the target for attack on the part of representatives of the implement companies who were having their credit extensions curtailed in the interests of the farmers, and that, despite their opposition, he was elected to the Alberta legislature. I would advise my hon. friend to desist shedding any crocodile tears for the oppressed, down-trodden, self-sacrificing implement companies. Rather might he keep them for the farmers who have to pay the price of the machine, plus the duty—an amount vastly increased during the past few years, despite the statements of the Minister of the Interior, who first spoke of having reduced the duty, then pleaded the cause of high protection, and thirdly and finally told us of the reduced pressure and benefit the cutting off of 7½ per cent would have. Some somersault and swallowing all in one address! And he might keep some of his tears, too, for the workingmen consumers in his own constituency who will pay much of the taxation of this Government, while the capitalists who own the factories with the tall chimneys will contribute but very little. And, if he has any tears left, let him keep them for himself and his colleagues for, unless all signs fail, there will be enough political funerals in the protectionist party at the next election, both in the rural districts and in the cities, to keep a multitude of mourners busy shedding tears for a considerable time. There does not seem to be much hope even for the member of the trinity who has been designated by the name of Hope. The position of my hon. friend from Fraser Valley is somewhat different, yet I can scarcely think that there is much hope, or that there should be much charity, for the man who will virtually place a price of 30 cents a box on his political convictions. As I have said, compared with his confreres, he appears to have sold out cheap, conducted a sort of bargain sale, as it were. However, as he has told this house that his market is to be among the prairie farmers, perhaps we on the prairie have some cause to raise our humble voices in supreme praise when he starts his protectionist dogma, and offer our devout thanks that his fruit growing friends in British Columbia did not insist on some-

thing like 47 per cent tariff on valuation, as are the textile and other interests supporting the protectionist Budget of this Government.

But, if my hon. friend imagines that he has the Western Canadian fruit market free to himself without interference from the Nash fruit interests, which he so greatly fears, then he has made a grave error. As a matter of fact, he must know, as most of us do on the prairies, that it is a combine that sets the price of fruit in Western Canada, that this combination would at times rather see the fruit destroyed than sell it cheap to the long-suffering public on the prairies that is denied fruit altogether except at exorbitant prices. And let me tell him this, that if the fruit farmers of his province ever hope to overcome the ramifications of that combine, if they ever hope to get for their fruit a price consistent with what the prairie public pays for that fruit, then he will have to join the movement of farmers, and he will have to provide for co-operation like his brother fruit farmers have found to be absolutely necessary in the marketing of their wheat, in order to protect themselves from those interests in respect to which perhaps the hon. member for Vancouver Centre could enlighten his neighbour from Fraser Valley. Rightly or wrongly, I might liken my friend in this House to Charity, but I want to tell him he will find very little charity in the marketing of his fruit until he places the marketing and selling of it in the hands of the men who grow it. And he will find that because he compels the prairie farmers, through a tariff, to pay an additional 30 cents a box for his products, he has not solved the problem so far as he and his neighbours are concerned. And I would like to tell him here and now that the best market for his British Columbia fruit will be found in the prairies, not because he tries to shove it down our throats with a thirty cent tariff tax, but because he can get it to us at the right price and in the right condition. After that, if he expects his prosperity out of the farmers on the prairies, I would suggect to him now that, if he will vote for the square deal for those farmers and relieve them from some of the economic bondage that the member for Red Deer outlined here the other day, then the population of that country will double and treble, and with it will come a doubling and trebling of the volume of British Columbia fruit consumed by its people.

The same thing may be said to the hon. member for Parkdale. If he wants the industries to grow, if he desires the smoke to continue from the tall chimneys, give the man who has to buy and use the implements manufactured a fair chance. The farmers of our country do not want it all; they do not want to destroy any Canadian industry. On the other hand, they desire to build up Canadian industries, to see them grow and expand, to see them pay good wages, employ large numbers of men, and supply the bulk of the consumers of Canada. But that cannot be done by a tariff that throttles the great basic industry of this country, upon which all others depend. It can only be done by increasing the farmers and their prosperity, and by putting them in the position where they are substantial customers for the products of the manufacturing plants of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, let me now refer briefly to another point that I find involved in connection with the numerous interlocking interests as represented by the speeches of the three members whom I have mentioned. Let me give a word to the member for Vancouver Centre and the interests which he represents in this House. I am told that they are newspaper, shipping, dredging, canning, lumbering, and elevator, terminal and otherwise. But it is to the lumbering industry that I desire to particularly refer, because we in the West just now have an outstanding illustration of just what tariff protection has done for the lumber business of British Columbia. Just as long as I can remember the British Columbia lumber men have claimed a tariff on lumber because they declared they need it in order to build up a Canadian industry and to prevent unfair competition from Washington and Oregon to the south. Sometimes they got what they wanted, and sometimes they did not. But for many long years there has been more or less duty on lumber, and every homesteader who has gone into the West to build his little shack, every workingman who has constructed his little cottage, and every business man who has ventured to build, has gone down in his pocket and has paid tribute more or less in the shape of tariff protection to the lumber mills of British Columbia, for which, I presume, the hon. member for Vancouver Centre speaks in this House. Not being in favour of protection, I did not favour it. And there were others of the same mind. But we all had to pay, and among those who did pay were thousands of men and women who believed in building up Canadian industry and thought they were assisting it when they kept on the tariff.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. GOULD: Yes.

Mr. MACKIE: How much longer is your chimney going to smoke?

Mr. GOULD: Fifteen or twenty minutes longer. Why, do you not like it? Things went on, and the prairie supplied the only market these lumber mills had. The prairies virtually built up their industry. Yet what do we see to-day? We find that, in spite of the protection given by the people of Western Canada for these long years, the lumber kings do not give a snap of their fingers for the welfare of the people who gave them that protection. We find the mills, on the other hand, would rather sell their product to the Italians, to the Germans, to anybody outside of the prairies, provided the foreigners can pay a higher price than the prairie farmers and the workingmen of Western Canada can afford to pay. We find, indeed, that the Canadian price to-day is not only a hundred per cent higher than it was five or six years ago, because these protected mills are shipping abroad, but we in the West also find that the Canadian price is a price actually based on the value of Canadian money plus the American exchange. That is one sample of just how much one protected industry cares for the interests of the people who give it protection.

In Regina, Winnipeg, Calgary, Saskatoon, and every other city, thousands of men and women, hard-working Canadians, are clamouring for some place to live, but they can find none because the price of building material, lumber among the others, is out of all reason. The man who has fought overseas has in many cases returned to Canada, frequently with his bride and more frequently still having married a Canadian wife; and these young people find themselves virtually without a roof over their heads, with a cold wintet staring them in the face, and there is no relief in sight for thousands of people who will need accommodation when the first of next November comes. Does anybody hear of any suggestion of relief from the protected lumber interests. Not much! The trade with foreign countries goes merrily on, and these patriots who a few years ago needed the protection of the Canadian people to enable them to build up Canadian industry care no more for the protection of the Canadian people who were generous to them than if these Canadian people never existed and never had a right. To show the ideas that are entertained by men engaged in the lumbering industry, I have here a clipping which contains certain statements that are credited to Mr. A. E. Clarke, a prominent lumber man, who stated in Toronto recently that even if the cost of production were to decrease at once lumber prices would not begin to come down for another two years. A telegram from Prince Albert intimated that prices there had increased 85 per cent in the last twelve months, with nothing like a corresponding increase in the cost of production.

Mr. STEVENS: Prince Albert is not in British Columbia.

Mr. GOULD: No.

Mr. STEVENS: It is in Saskatchewan.

Mr. GOULD: Yes. But that is not all. If any member of this House has been following the proceedings of a certain inquiry concerning lumber operations in the province of Ontario, he will have learned that a number of these lumbermen did not even pay their honest dues to the Government that gave them privileges, thus touching the public, both going and coming. And, strange as it may appear, many of these ultra-loyalists, the Divine Righters,—I am not referring to the press gallery—who needed the protection of the Canadian people to enable them to build up Canadian industries, to keep the trade away from the Yankees, are turning out to be Americans and not Canadians at all. I do not think any one in this House will accuse the farmers of being Bolsheviki in their tendencies. I do not think any one will say that we believe in seizing governments by unconstitutional means, as was charged in connection with the Winnipeg strike. Personally, I harbour no such belief. But at the same time I want to tell this Government that if this wholesale plundering of the people is not stopped, if the working people are to be deprived of places to live, while millionaire lumbermen demand the protection of the Canadian people and at the same time sell to foreigners cheaper than to their own people, and on top of that virtually rob the state of a large portion of the dues they should pay for their lumber, then this Government has not enough police in Canada to quiet the riots that will surely follow. I noticed by a statement in this House some time ago that this Government spent no less than $154,000 in costs to prosecute the Winnipeg strikers. That is a large sum, but perhaps it may have been well spent if it has taught this Government a

lesson that the producers of this country have come to the point where they are going to demand a square deal, that the burden be removed from the shoulders of the poor and placed where it properly belongs, and that the manufacturers of Canadian lumber, implements and other things, have to play fair with the people whom they serve. If that is not done, then all the eloquence of the hon. member for Parkdale, of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre and of the hon. member for Fraser River will not prevent the people of this country from taking matters into their own hands to see that there shall be equity and justice all round.

I am only a young member of this House, and my experience and acquaintance is therefore limited. But in the short time I have been here the most remarkable thing that has impressed itself upon my mind is the number of members who sit in this House on the Government side and virtually plead for the special interests and the special business in which they are engaged. It is, to my mind, no particular crime for a member of this House to place before it the importance of his business if he has a good one, and to try to remove from the conduct of that business, if it be legitimate, any handicaps that may be placed upon it by government legislation. That is fair politics and fair business, but when manufacturers and men representing special interests in the country labor day after day in this House to extract special privileges from the government of this country and place the cost of those privileges upon the shoulders of the people of Canada, particularly upon the farmers, I am constained as an agriculturist to voice my emphatic protest.

Let me show the members of this house just how it works out so far as the agriculturist is concerned. Let me show those who have no interest to serve in this house save the interests of the people just how it works out. Let me suppose that I am a farmer and I want to embark upon farming within the prairie provinces. If I desire to build a little shack to keep out the cold, before I can do so I must pay some kind of a tariff upon the lumber secured from the friends of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre on the Pacific coast. If I get the shack and venture to exist, when I want a little fruit for breakfast, as is the wont of the well-fed manufacturers of this country, I must contribute something in the shape of tariff to make up the thirty cents per box that has brought about the political conversion of the hon. member for Fraser Valley, (Mr. Stacey). If, after breakfast, I start out to break up the homestead, I must first hand over something in the shape of a tariff on plows to my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). If I manage, in spite of all these handicaps, and all the uncertain elements, such as drouth, hail frost, and grasshoppers, to get something on the farm to cut, before I can cut it I must make a little donation in the shape of tariff on a binder for the benefit of the tall chimneys of Parkdale so ably represented in this House by my hon. friend from that constituency. If it so happens that, after a hard day's work, I need something in the shape of canned fruit to add something in the shape of spice to my frugal meal before I can enjoy that fruit I must pass along a little handout to the canners combine of this country, whose peach cans I have thought contain as much water as the stock, of the company that finds such an able exponent in this House in the hon. Member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor). If I happen to be fortunate enough to secure all these things, and get a crop besides, and desire to start out to haul that crop to market in the fall, before I am ready for the road and the cold, I must have some underwear to withstand the frost, but before I can secure it I find I must make some little contribution to the interests which send to this House the hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Stewart) and the hon. member for Haldimand, the latter of whom, representing the dual interests of canners and knitters, also carries on a sort of a dual woollen business on both sides of the international boundary, and insists that I shall pay him a tariff when I buy his Canadian woollens, presumably to enable his Canadian factory to compete with his woollen mill across the line in the United States.

Should I happen to get through all this, and get the hired man started on his journey with a load of wheat to the elevator, if the wagon breaks down and I need a common, ordinary nail. I find that before the conveyance can be repaired or the trousers of the hired man hooked up in lieu of a button, we must go down and dig up something in the shape of a tariff tax for the hon. member for St. John and Albert (Mr. Elkin), who also has announced his conversion to a policy that, if I mistake not, is designed to maintain the protection on common nails, which will enter into the construction cost of every house and shack on the prairies during, perhaps, the next forty years.

But, if after all these taxes and misfortunates and handouts, the hired man manages to get his wheat to the elevator, if it happens that a farmer's elevator is not at that point, I find that I must sell my product at the price dictated by Liverpool and under the local conditions laid down by the elevator friends of the hon. member for Vancouver centre. Admitting that I get my wheat sold and a car of it on the way, I find that when it reaches the head of the Lakes or the Pacific Coast, it must again enter the storage terminals of the friends of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre or of the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer), and be stored there and shipped out under the conditions imposed by the elevator interests represented by these two gentlemen. And, if my grain happens to have a considerable amount of screenings, etc., due perhaps to the fact of the high cost of implements with which to clean it, I find that the stock food friends of my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre purchase my screenings at their own price and at their own terms, make out of it fodder for my stock and ship it back to me and sell to me my own product at their own prices and upon their own terms. Upon the big volume of my wheat product, if it is to go down the lakes, I find that the moment it is read for shipment, it is placed on board the steamships of the interests represented so ably, and so infrequently, in this house by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol), whose company, according to a statement I heard here a few weeks ago, started out with five millions in capital eight years ago and now has a plant that is being put into the big merger at an approximate valuation of $45,500,000.

Going a little further with my deductions, carrying the process to that logical conclusion that, in spite of everything, will eventually find a large number of farmers, after paying all these numerous tributes to the interests, in the shadow of the poorhouse, out on the street, as it were, I find that, if without a railway pass on which so many representatives of the interests travel, the farmer who goes broke must go down in his empty pocket, before he takes to the ties, and pay something in the shape of a tariff tax on boots to the interests represented in this House by the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Scott), and so ably sponsored for so long in Parliament by that eminent capitalist, Sir Herbert Ames, who has been carrying the glories of protected Canada to the impoverished peoples of darkest Europe.

I might go on and enlighten the House still further about the ramifications, both in this House and this country, of the interests to which the farmers of this country must pay tribute in some shape or form. If carried to a conclusion, there is absolutely no limit in this respect. But I will go no farther than to say that if the farmer of the prairie ships his wheat to Port Arthur before it can reach the Atlantic it must pass through the harbours that are kept clear by the dredges of the capitalistic friends of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, and if he ships it to the Pacific coast, it must pass through the harbours kept clear by the capitalistic friends of that hon. member. And, if I protest, if I complain of this multitude of tariff and other taxes, and of the conditions imposed upon me, the capitalistic friends of the hon. friend for Vancouver Centre have a newspaper at Vancouver and another at Winnipeg to tell both the public and myself that I do not know what I am talking about, and that I should be happy and contented under the spreading and protective mantle which they have thrown about me. The conditions which I have just outlined I would like to impress upon the mind of the Hon. Minister of the Interior. He is a Western man, though I regret to say that many years ago he forfeited any right he ever had to speak on behalf of the western people who have helped to make himself and others of his colleagues from the West. But there is a story going the rounds today, the truth of which I am in no position to confirm or deny, that he is angling for the Conservative, the Unionist or the Tory leadership, and that the capitalistic friends of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre are prepared to back him in his aspirations. What the outcome will be no one knows, but let me, through you, Mr. Speaker, put to the Minister of the Interior, who was so profuse with his questions in this House the other day, the plain query, whether or not, in the event of his succeeding to the leadership of the Tory party and the premiership of this Canada of ours, is he going to represent in this House the plain people of Canada or the capitalistic friends of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre?

One thing more that has occurred to my mind because of the remarks in this House by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee). He told us the other day that while the cotton interest, the textile and

other big protected interests, were not touched by the new taxation, while they contribute nothing new and little old, while the long-suffering consumer must pay the whole shot, these beneficent industries designed to build up a great country and an army of happy, contented Canadian people, were actually paying their thousands of employees who make the commodities that we have been buying at such exorbitant prices, the munificent wage of something like $550 per annum. Let me put the question to the Minister of the Interior, as a western man who has done some denouncing of men who went on strike, let me ask him: does he think any man or woman in this country, or in his own cold section of Canada can live on $550 per annum—can they live in Winnipeg, in Montreal or in Valleyfield on $550 per annum, and still be healthy and decent? Let me ask him is he in favour of further protection to textile industries that show surpluses on watered stock of millions of dollars annually, and pay their men and women the magnificent, princely wage of $550 per annum? Let me ask him, too, does he tnink all his pleadings, his hair-splitting and his legal briefs can prevent the spread of discontent among the men and women who receive such wages and see such profits if this system is to be protected? And let me say to my hon. friend from Fraser Valley (Mr. Stacey) —who I honestly and sincerely believe would extend the sympathetic hand,—let me ask him does he think any woman in these days can remain healthy and decent and sufficiently well-clothed to withstand the cold on a wage of $550 per annum?

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has been reading the whole of his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the point of order is well taken. The rule is very clear, and the hon. gentleman has certainly violated it most flagrantly.

Mr. GOULD: I am not in the habit of reading my speeches, but I thought tonight I would change my procedure because it has been such a common practice of late in the House. However, I will endeavour to continue my remarks without reading the manuscript.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is at perfect liberty to refer to his notes. He will also recall the circumstance that the rule on the subject is very clear, and when the attention of the Chair is directed to a violation of it no other course is open than to decide in accord with the established practice of the House.

Mr. GOULD: I will abide by your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I have brought my remarks very nearly to a close but I wish to make a reference to a subject I spoke on before—a matter of railway extension. It would seem that when anything is desired from the Government it is very difficult for one to obtain it. I have pleaded in committee. I have pleaded in the House and I have pleaded by letter, to have a short stretch of nine miles of railway built through my district to carry sixty million tons of coal that we in the western plains want, and want badly, and for the lack of which hundreds of people are suffering each winter. The coal is there, and we would like to have it released and carried to the homes where it is needed. The construction of nine miles of railway will permit that coal to come out, and yet it seems we are to be denied. I quote this only as another illustration of why there is unrest throughout the country. The people read of big interests and the influence which they exercise. These interests say, "We will form a $500,000,000 steel merger, and we will come and ask Parliament for a double capitalization on this, that and the other thing," and always some one rises to speak in their behalf. I speak for the people in my district, and it seems a hard thing to be denied this little matter. The release of the coal in question will bring revenue to our own lines of railway. The thing that we need more than anything else in this country, in view of the deficit upon our railway operations is revenue. I know of no other business that will produce such a revenue to our railway system in that part of the West as the release and the carriage to its destination of that coal will bring. The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) has also made a plea with respect to this matter, and therefore it cannot be charged that it has become political in any sense at all. My hon. friend knows the circumstances as well as I do. He has already pleaded for the construction of the small stretch of railway necessary to bring this coal out, and I desire to supplement his plea. My people are very much in earnest regarding this matter, and I want to say that in our part of the country the Government could not do a more popular thing than to listen, once at least, to the pleadings of the plain people. I have come here to speak for them, and I think if the Government fully understood the conditions,

I would not have to make so many repeated requests to have this simple justice done for my people.

The man from Assiniboia has spoken.

Mr. STEIN: On behalf of the Opposition I beg to move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

On motion of Rt. Hon. Mr. Doherty, the House adjourned at 1.45 a.m. (Tuesday.)

Tuesday, June 1, 1920.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 142 (from the Senate), for the relief of Jennie Wright.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 143 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alfred Charles Edwin Westley.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 144 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Orville Scott.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 145 (from the Senate), for the relief of John William Wallace.—Mr. Wallace.

Bill No. 146 (from the Senate), for the relief of Harry Davis.—Mr. Wallace.

Bill No. 147 (from the Senate) for the relief of Elizabeth Conway Murray.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 149 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frank Fulsom.—Mr. Fraser.

Bill No. 150 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Proudfoot.—Mr. Hocken.

INCREASED INDEMNITY — ALLEGED ROUND ROBIN.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER DENYING NEWSPAPER REPORT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, some hon. members of the House have directed my attention to certain statements in the press to the effect that they had signed a round robin for increased indemnity, and that the attendance of hon. members on this side of the House had been affected because of non-compliance by the Government with their desire. So far as I am aware, no such round robin exists.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: At all events, I have never seen it nor heard of it—

Mr. BELAND: Nor have I.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:—except through the press reports to which I have alluded. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I have no reason to suppose, nor do I believe, that the attendance of hon. members on this side of the House has been in any way affected by reason of the cause assigned.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The only action taken by members of which I have personal knowledge is the fact that a certain number of gentlemen had an interview with me upon this subject about a week or ten days ago, at which a very non-committal answer was received from me.

NEWSPRINT SHORTAGE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. R. WILSON (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the Government the fact that about an hour ago I received a number of telegrams from my city in reference to the paper shortage. It is stated that the newspapers in Saskatoon will have to cease publication unless some arrangement is made to secure a supply of paper. I should like to know whether the Government have taken any action in the matter, and what they intend to do to relieve the situation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): The newspaper publishers of Canada have had a committee looking after the newsprint question, and negotiations have been under way with a view to obtaining necessary supplies for the newspapers. An agreement was reached last October under which the mills and the newspapers arrived at certain prices, not on the basis of Governmental paper control, but as a matter of ordinary business arrangement between the mills and the newspapers. That agreement provided not only for the supply of newsprint at a fixed price which had been agreed upon up to the end of June, but also for a supply for the Canadian press from then on at the usual trade rates as fixed by the pulp and paper manufacturers as applicable to the export trade. I regret very much to have to inform the House that last Saturday the newspaper publishers interested came to Ottawa and reported that they had been unable to provide for proper newsprint supplies and that there was grave danger of a large number of Canadian papers—some 27 in all—having to suspend publication, not because they were not willing to pay the price but because the commodity was not available for them. Telegrams have been sent out to the different manufacturers of newsprint and the matter will be taken up to-morrow morning with those manufacturers. I hope to be able to give

my hon. friend more definite information after that meeting.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL: Has the minister suggested to the newspaper proprietors the propriety of reducing the size of their newspapers?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is a matter that has been considered by the newspapers. What the newspapers say is that the amount of newsprint that they use is negligible compared with the total Canadian output. They point out that the whole additional quantity that they require to carry on only amounts to two per cent of the export of the Canadian mills. What I mean by that is this: Contracts have been made to a certain extent with the Canadian papers and all that is necessary to keep these 27 newspapers going is the insignificant amount of two per cent of the export of our mills.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I would like to say in regard to the matter that while the organization of the newspapers—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. If the hon. member wishes to submit a question to the Government he will be quite in order in doing so, but a debate cannot be entered on at this stage.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Then I will ask: How is it that this association of newspaper publishers have secured contracts for themselves when they had agreed, or had taken the position, that no agreement was to be made unless all the papers were provided for? Now we hear that certain papers have been provided for and apparently the energy of the association has weakened. I want to point out to the minister that all the papers should be taken care of in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is going beyond the limits of a question.

SUPERANNUATION OF MR. De CELLES, LIBRARIAN OF PARLIAMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I hope I will not be indiscreet if I ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) in perfect good faith if the rumour is correct that the present King's Printer is to be promoted to the position of Librarian of Parliament and if the present Librarian, Mr. DeCelles, is to be superannuated. I wish to state further that all the lovers of Canadian literature, because Mr. DeCelles writes with equal fluency in English and in French, would be very sad indeed if he were superannuated. He is full of health and vigour and can render most valuable service to the Canadian people by his writings.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. DeCelles has been superannuated after a long period of creditable service extending over forty years. I understand he has arrived at the age of 76 years. Mr. Taché has been appointed Librarian.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: Was Mr. DeCelles superannuated at his own request?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. DeCelles was superannuated with his full consent.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: "At his request," and "with his consent," are two different things.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With his consent.

Mr. FIELDING: Not at his request?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I cannot say that.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL: Is a new King's Printer to be appointed or is the position to be abolished?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The department of Public Printing and Stationery has been partly reorganized. The reorganization is still being carried on with immense advantage, as I believe, to the public interest, and with a very great saving to the public exchequer. Further information will be given at a later date.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is not my right hon. friend afraid that too many Cooks will spoil the broth?

Mr. GAUVREAU: May I ask the right hon. the Prime Minister if any good ground has been given for asking Mr. DeCelles to give his place to Mr. Tache?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have given the fact to my hon. friend. If any further information is desired on the subject, I would respectfully suggest to hon. gentlemen that they should put their questions on the Order Paper.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—Mr. H. A. MACKIE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (East Edmonton): On Friday last some members of the House were putting questions concerning my ab-

sence and I find on page 2946 of Hansard the following:

Mr. ARTHUR TRAHAN (Nicolet): Mr. Speaker, although a member coming from the province of Quebec it affords me great pleasure to stay here at the week end—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. TRAHAN: —to take part in this debate. I do not see the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) present.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. TRAHAN: Where is he?

Mr. BELAND: Do not forget that to-day is Friday.

Mr. TRAHAN: Has the hon. member gone for a week-end trip? I leave the answer to the members of this House. As my hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Béland) reminds me to-day is Friday and it is also fish day.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. member for East Edmonton has gone home.

Mr. Speaker, I was out of the city on public business of great importance to my constituency and the province of Alberta.

THE BUDGET.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON THE ANNUAL STATEMENT PRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

The House resumed, from Monday, May 31, the debate on the motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, at this late stage of the debate it will hardly be expected that much can be added by way of argument either for or against the proposals which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) has given to the House in the resolutions which accompanied his speech, or indeed either for or against the amendment which has been moved by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding).

In the remarks I am about to address to the House I shall endeavour, therefore, not to go into particulars to any great extent in regard to the resolutions, but rather seek to emphasize in bolder outline than has been possible in the course of the discussion which has taken place, the differences in attitude and point of view which seem to separate hon. gentlemen opposite who are supporting the Budget from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who are supporting the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding).

But, before directing attention to the differences which exist between us and which have been so manifest in this debate, may I say just one word, with many others who have spoken, in regard to an opinion which we all hold in common and that is a word of congratulation to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) on the manner in which he has presented the Budget to this Parliament, on the arrangement of the Budget itself, the information it contains, and the purpose which he has had at heart in presenting it to the House. I think we all realize that upon the shoulders of the Minister of Finance at this session of Parliament there has fallen a burden heavier indeed than that which has fallen on the shoulders of any previous Minister of Finance. He has not only had to take account of the vast expenditures which have been incurred in the ordinary course of the increasing obligations of this country, but he has also had to take into account all the extraordinary expenditures which have to be met in consequence of the war. As my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's mentioned, in presenting previous Budgets during the period of the war, the Minister of Finance of the day has been able to count upon the sentiment of patriotism and enthusiasm throughout the nation to back up any suggestions he might propose to this Parliament. But now the war is past, and instead of the urge of patriotic endeavour the present Minister of Finance has the aftermath of the war to contend with and he has to present to the House in their stern reality conditions consequent upon the enormous expenditures which have been incurred in the last few years, the liabilities which they have involved and the herculean efforts in the matter of sacrifice which will be necessary before these obligations can be met. I think that in presenting the Budget in the manner in which he did, going fearlessly and fully into the liabilities of the country, not seeking to conceal in any particular our obligations or to make them appear less than they are, but presenting to us the facts in their true light and significance he has enabled us to comprehend the situation with which we are now confronted. For that reason, as well as for the splendid manner in which he presented the Budget itself, we owe him our hearty congratulations.

I think, too, that the hon. the Minister of Finance is to be congratulated on having professed at least a desire to accomplish certain things. He has said that he hopes that it will be possible in future to raise the revenue that is required without resorting to any further loans. Every hon. member, and every citizen of this country, will

believe that that is a right, a proper, a good and a necessary policy. We may have little consciousness of the full extent of our liabilities, but we all do know that with these liabilities what they are, unless it is going to be possible to meet obligations out of current revenue we are heading towards an abyss of bankruptcy in this country from which it will be impossible to recede. So it is wholly to the public interest, it is wholly to the good of the nation, that the Government have determined—and indeed they would be culpably negligent if they did not so determine—not to have further public loans for the purpose of meeting our obligations.

The Minister of Finance, I think, has also been wise in intimating that he hopes to raise the required revenue by taxation upon luxuries rather than upon the necessaries of life. Whether or not his proposals will accomplish that end I shall deal with in a moment, but in so far as he is endeavouring to place the burden of taxation upon the shoulders of those who are best able to bear it, he is following the sound and proper line of finance.

I think he has been wise also in urging that so far as possible taxation should be in a direct rather than in an indirect form. Though it is not so pleasant a form of taxation, in the long run it is going to result in greater good to the country. It is right that we should know exactly what we are paying out so that we may take the course that is wisest both from a personal and from a public point of view.

So that in these particulars—in giving us a true statement of the facts, in promising that there shall be no further loans, in seeking to make taxation direct rather than indirect, in promising to place a tax upon luxuries, and also in recognizing that taxation upon incomes is a form of taxation that is preferable to that of indirect taxation—the Finance Minister's professions have been in the right direction, and I believe his purpose has been in accord with his professions.

But, Sir, if he has failed to accomplish his purpose, and if he has failed to carry out his intentions it is because he has found himself a member of a government which has a particular policy of its own for the raising of taxation, and he has been prevented from going as far as he would have liked in the direction he has professed. The fault and the criticism which we on this side have to find are not with the good professions and the good intentions of my hon. friend, but rather, that at this time in the history of Canada, at this time in the history of the world, the Government has as respects the Budget, done some things which it ought not to have done, and has left undone other things which it ought to have done. Sir, let me speak for a moment about the things which it has left undone and which it ought to have done.

My hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) spoke at considerable length about the necessity of economy and retrenchment. Nothing could be more deserving of praise than profession of economy and retrenchment, unless it be the practice of those virtues. But when we turn from the professions of my hon. friend to examine the practices of the Government of which he is a member, we find that we are a long way from seeing an earnest of that economy and retrenchment which he would have us believe is the motive which the Government has at heart. I shall not attempt now to mention the particulars in which the Government has shown a great indifference—I might almost say a wanton indifference—to extravagance in public expenditures, because these matters have been admirably dealt with in the many speeches made by hon. gentlemen on this side. I refer in particular to the speeches of my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster), my hon. friend from Guysborough and Antigonish (Mr. J. H. Sinclair), and my hon. friend from Chambly-Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) who spoke last night. If I might I would suggest that hon. members read these speeches carefully, and see wherein the Government has been extravagant and indifferent, and then take note of what has been said in reply by hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, Sir, some very strong accusations have been made against the ministry from this side of the House, accusations so strong that one could hardly believe that they could pass unchallenged for a single moment. But unchallenged they have passed up to the present time. I shall mention two or three of these things in order to give my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, who has not yet spoken in this debate, or some of his colleagues who may speak on his behalf, if he himself does not speak, an opportunity of making an explanation concerning them.

First of all, take the expenditures for last year. I shall not go into the expenditures during the war period because we are all prepared to admit that those expenditures —however vast they may have been, how-

ever carelessly and recklessly they may have been administered in many particulars—are part of the war period which has passed, and that nothing will be gained by going at too great length into them. But we have a right to consider what has been done since the war, and especially have we that right in view of the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite, after promising that they would hold office only for the purposes of the war are retaining office now for the sake of office. We have a right to ask therefore—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Will my hon. friend state when that promise was made, and by whom?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend asks me when the promise was made that the Government would retain office only for the purposes of the war, and by whom. My right hon. friend knows that I have not at hand at the moment the different speeches made by himself and his colleagues—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —and he knows therefore that I am not in a position at the moment to quote chapter and verse, but I will give him this answer: The people of the Dominion, when they were listening to the speeches of the Prime Minister and of those who sit around him as his colleagues to-day were clearly and definitely under the impression that by their utterances they meant that they were forming the present coalition Government solely for the purpose of carrying on, and helping to win the war, and that when that purpose was accomplished the elements of which the ministry was composed would revert back into the natural groups from which they had come—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —and that the people of this country would be given an opportunity of returning to power a government which would be in a position to frame peace policies for the period of reconstruction. May I say to my right hon. friend and to his colleagues that if, in the remarks they addressed to the people of this country at the time they were appealing to them for their support, they meant anything different; if they had in their hearts and in their minds what the Minister of Marine intimated yesterday he had in his mind, a mental reservation—if anything of that kind is conceivable it discloses the extent of the deception which they were practising upon the people of Canada at that time. What are words after all? The devil can quote Scripture for his purposes. It is the intention, it is the impression that you seek to convey, that counts; and hon. gentlemen opposite—both those of Conservative persuasion and those who at the time professed to be of Liberal persuasion—led this country to believe that the two parties should unite for the purpose of winning the war, and that when that purpose was accomplished they would go to the country and give the people a chance to return a representative parliament.

I am happy to think that there were at least some members of the Government who from a sense of honour felt it incumbent upon them to leave the Administration. On what ground? On the ground that they entered the Government solely for the purpose of winning the war, and on the distinct understanding that when that was accomplished their contract was completed and they were at liberty to retire. Those hon. gentlemen at least had no intention of deceiving the country; they at least had no doubts in their own minds as to what the people understood at the time—they have lived up to the professions they made and the pledges they gave.

Well, Sir, inasmuch as we have had from the question of the Prime Minister a further evidence of the intention of the Government—openly professed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) recently to hang on to office regardless of the wishes of the people, may I give reasons to the House and to the country why such an intention should be frustrated if it is at all possible to prevent this Government continuing to administer our national affairs?

One reason why an appeal should be made to the country is because these hon. gentlemen have the war habit of mind, and so long as they remain in office they will persist in it. What do I mean by "the war habit of mind"? It is the habit of mind which believes that everything should be done by the autocratic will of the ministry, regardless altogether of the wishes of Parliament; it is the habit of mind which allows lavish expenditures to be accounted for by chance. And I say to hon. gentlemen opposite, and more particularly to the people of Canada, facing as we are the great questions of the day, that so long as this present Administration remains in office, so long will that war habit of mind continue to actuate the Government in their

management of public affairs, especially as regards extravagance in public expenditures.

What evidence have we of that tendency? As I have said I do not purpose to speak of the actual period of the war, but to take the post-war period. As an example I refer to the expenditure for the last current year as given in the Auditor General's Report. And in that connection let me develop the thought which my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) brought out so clearly last week. He showed that the addition to the public debt during this year of peace was $395,000,000, or more than $1,000,000 a day. That is the practice of hon. gentlemen opposite as contrasted with their professions of a desire for economy. Notwithstanding all our public debt we are faced with an increase of over $1,000,000 a day on the ordinary expenditures of the country. Such is the record of the Administration since the Armistice, as reported in the last volume of the Public Accounts.

Then take the record of the Government in regard to appointments—which are another prolific source of expenditure. We would have expected that with the large number of appointments made during the war period, there would have been, after the Armistice, a rigorous cutting down of those large war staffs. But we find, in answer to a question asked in this House as to how many appointments had been made to the permanent and temporary staffs of the Civil Service since the Armistice, that at the date the answer was given, several weeks ago, there had been added 4,176 permanent appointees and 22,954 temporary appointees, or a total of 27,130 added to the Civil Service list by the commissioners of the Civil Service during this peace period. In other words, 50 civil servants a day have been added to the Civil Service since the Armistice, or as my hon. friend said in presenting the information,—27 regiments of 1,000 each had been appointed by the Civil Service Commission in this period of peace. There is an example of the practice of hon. gentlemen opposite in contrast with their professions of economy and of retrenchment.

Then we have the moneys that have been unaccounted for,—and here is a statement that has been made from this side time and time again. The Auditor General's Report, brought down only two or three days ago, repeats the story contained in the reports of the two previous years, that a sum of $121,000,000 of public money paid out during the war, has been unaccounted for up to the present time, and that the Auditor General himself has been unable to get any explanation regarding this huge sum, although he has made request in writing for an accounting of it. There is the practice of hon. gentlemen opposite as contrasted with their professions.

In addition to the failure to account for moneys which have been paid out in accordance with the votes of Parliament, we have also instances of moneys used for purposes other than those for which they were appropriated by this House. That is a violation of one of the fundamental principles of Government: the control of parliament over the public expenditures. When Parliament votes a sum of money for a particular purpose, it is supposed to be used for that purpose. But according to the statements given to us in the Public Accounts money that was voted for the demobilization of our forces, in other words, money voted for military purposes for the security of this country, has been used for publicity purposes to help establish a press bureau which would be of service to hon. gentlemen opposite. There again we have a contrast of the professions of hon. gentlemen opposite with their practice.

Further, we have the indifference of the Government in the matter of requiring tenders for contracts. As has been stated here on several occasions, our laws require, in order to protect the public in matters of public expenditure, that when the Government is about to award contracts it shall call for tenders so that the lowest tenders may be accepted. We had recently an exhibition of that indifference in regard to one item which I shall mention—although I might mention a great many—the expenditure for the mercantile marine which is being built by the Government. Contracts amounting altogether to $70,000,000 were awarded, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) in defending his Estimates admitted on the floor of this House that in not a single instance had the Government called for tenders or sought to award those contracts by public tender. And what is true in the case of those contracts is true also of thousands of other contracts which have been awarded by the different departments of the Government—awarded with absolute indifference to the laws which have been placed on the statute book for the protection of the Treasury.

Then, again, we have the indifference of the Government to the supervision of Parliament in the matter of expenditure. As an instance I may cite the case that came

up in the House last week in regard to the appointment of a minister plenipotentiary to Washington. Was Parliament given any opportunity to pass upon the expenditures that will arise in connection with that appointment? All we were told was that the Prime Minister himself had read the correspondence, and had had some one else read it, and that no member of this House should see a line of it, although already a contract had been entered into which will involve large expenditures, which expenditures the Government will force through this House by virtue of the majority at its command.

Then let me refer to the moneys which have been loaned to foreign countries. Last night we had a pretty strong indictment of some hon. members and their friends in regard to contracts awarded out of the credits extended to foreign countries. Some $70,000,000 or more have been loaned to countries like Roumania and Greece for the purpose of enabling them to buy supplies of various kinds. Whether or not these credits are worth anything remains to be seen; but it was shown conclusively last night by the hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) that the Government had not hesitated to ask companies of which some hon. members on the other side are members or officers to supply goods to these countries, and had not hesitated to pay handsome sums from the public treasury for such goods sent abroad on the credit of the Dominion. That is a form of procedure which, possibly, can be defended by the letter of the law, but I ask my hon. friends opposite: in their efforts with regard to charity, where should charity begin in times such as these if not at home? We have need of economy; we have need of retrenchment in every particular. Instead of spending money lavishly and without the security that is necessary, the Government owes it to the people of this country to see that every dollar that goes out of the public treasury, spent for materials of any kind, is spent wholly and absolutely in the public interest.

Then, I might refer also to the Estimates of the present year, but it would take considerable time to go into the details. Members on this side have referred to item after item that we could well afford to cut down. Surely no member of this House would have found any fault with the Estimates of the Department of Militia and Defence had they been at a lower figure this year than they were a year ago. But what is the difference? We are called upon this year to vote $4,000,000 more for the Department of Militia and Defence than we were asked to vote last year. Is that going in the right direction? I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance: Is that retrenchment? Is that the economy of which he approves?

Mr. CURRIE: May I put a question to the hon. gentleman? How does the vote for Militia and Defence this year compare with the vote for the year immediately preceding the war?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has asked me for a comparison between this year and the year before the war. He knows that I have not the figures with me as to the period before the war, but if I had, that would not affect matters one way or the other. The figures that are important are those which indicate which way we are tending. Are we going in the direction of economy, or have we since the war been going in the direction of increased expenditure? The figures of the Auditor General's Report show that whereas last year we spent a sum which was fairly large on Militia and Defence, this year the Government are asking us to spend an additional $4,000,000 on that account. I say to my hon. friends opposite that if they had come down to the House with four millions struck off the amount of last year, they would have fulfilled to a better degree the wishes of the people of this country.

So Mr. Speaker, while we can compliment the minister on his fair professions and good intentions, we cannot do other than condemn the Government on its record in the matter of economy and retrenchment as having moved entirely in the wrong direction. Just to summarize what I have said: the Government has vastly increased the ordinary expenditure—increased it by over a million dollars a day according to the last statement brought down. It has vastly increased the appointments, both temporary and permanent, to the Civil Service—increased them at the rate of fifty civil servants a day. It has left unaccounted for $121,000,000 or more of public moneys which have been paid out. It has spent money for purposes for which it was not appropriated by Parliament. It has spent public money on contracts without calling for tenders in accordance with the law of the country. It has given money in loans and credits to foreign countries on very doubtful security and in a manner which will help its own friends rather than further the best interests of this country.

And, instead of decreasing the public expenditure for the current year, it has shown in many particulars a tendency to increase the expenditure and to be indifferent to the necessity of retrenchment. That is one count which we have against hon. gentlemen opposite.

But, Sir, looking further at the Budget; looking at the resolutions which my hon. friend has brought down, may I say perfectly frankly to him that what we most object to in his Budget is that it protects privilege and war profiteers instead of protecting the consumers of this country? We had expected, at this time of all times, a people's Budget; we have instead a profiteer's Budget; that is apparent when we come to analyse it. I say that for this reason: when we study the incidence of this taxation we find that in practically everything the minister has proposed there are increased burdens placed upon the consumers, not the upper classes, so-called, but the middle or poorer classes; and there is, on the other hand, a careful protecting and safeguarding of those who are in a position of privilege in this country.

We had a right to expect, having regard to the professed desire of hon. gentlemen opposite for economy, some statement from the Minister of Finance to the effect that the Government had devised machinery whereby the people throughout the country who had failed to pay their income tax in the last year or two would be obliged to make good their failures. We all know that the income tax has not been collected as fully and carefully as it should have been. Last summer, at the convention which the Liberal party held in this city of Ottawa, a resolution was passed, which was brought to the attention of the Government—a resolution condemning the Government for the non-enforcement of the income tax law. It was in these words:

> This Convention condemns the Government because it has not enforced the income tax law in such a manner as to make it produce the revenue which such a tax should produce if properly collected.

The Government, Mr. Speaker, had that resolution before it. The Minister of Finance knew that that criticism was being made, not by one political party only, but by people generally throughout the country. As I have said, we had therefore, reason to expect and hope that when the Minister of Finance came down with his Budget he would also come down with the announcement that as respects the men and possibly some women in this country who had not paid the income tax, the Government had devised machinery under which all arrears of taxation would be carefully and fully collected.

Not only have the Government safeguarded some of their friends in that particular; but in regard to war time wealth, the wealth which was accumulated during the period of the war, have they had one word to say in the Budget proposals? One would never know that a single man had made an extra dollar during the period of the war, from what has been said by the Finance Minister in his address or by what is indicated in his Budget. There are several reasons why the Government should have taken account of war time wealth—that is to say, wealth that was made in the period of the war, out of the war, as a consequence of the sacrifices and of the necessities of the people during that time. I say there is more than one reason why the Government should have taken note of that. The first reason is that the Government should have been taking account of it during the war; the Government while the war was going on should have been making some effort to secure from those who were profiting and profiteering during that period sums of money which would help to meet the expense of war. That was not done. Every day of delay means increased difficulty in reaching that particular source of wealth. By not introducing a resolution this session in regard to war time wealth, the Government make it increasingly difficult, if not almost impossible, to reach that source of wealth at any subsequent session or at any subsequent time. And my hon. friends tell us that they are going to stay in office for another couple of years—stay in office for another couple of years and further protect during that period those who have profited so largely during the war.

But, Sir, there is a third reason why the Government should have made some effort to collect from those who profited during the period of the war, and that is that such a course as that is only right and just. Think of it, Mr. Speaker; think of vast fortunes being amassed during the period of the war, when men were giving their lives and incurring sacrifices in the service of the country. Think of the Government allowing the heaviest burdens to rest on the shoulders of the people generally, on the shoulders of those who already have endured great sacrifices, and not seeking to

lighten those burdens by making a levy on war fortunes. It would be better for every man who has made a fortune out of the war to give that fortune over to the State. It would be a thousand-fold better for him, for his children and for his children's children were he to do that, for I can see no good that will come to any home or family that gains a new status and builds up a new place in society out of fortunes that have been reaped through the blood of men and sacrifice of human lives.

I shall not trust to my own words to express the indignation which I believe the people will feel in regard to this indifference on the part of the Government. Let me read the words of a well-known Canadian woman, one who is greatly interested in social and industrial questions, a speaker of great ability, and one whose voice has been heard championing many causes of right, justice and popular liberty. I find in one of the May numbers of this year—I have not the exact date—of the Calgary Albertan, this article:

> Government which conscripted life has not proved strong enough to conscript the war wealth. Mrs. Nellie McClung—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: I hear some hon. gentlemen opposite laughing. Some day they will listen to Mrs. Nellie McClung, and to the voice of the women on whose behalf she is speaking:

> Mrs. Nellie McClung, the noted authoress, of Edmonton, was asked by The Albertan yesterday to give her opinion of the new taxes proposed in the Budget and last evening wired the following:
>
> The money has to be raised, of course, and, personally, I can do without silk stockings and georgette blouses, but I did hope that some of the war debt could be dug out of the war profiteers and the people who boldly proclaimed that they were not "running their business for the glory of God." The new taxes will not be any hardship for those. They will simply add it to the price of their products, and let the people pay, as usual. But it will bear heavily on the salaried and professional people, who are now burdened to the limit. To them it will mean a further lowering of the standards of living, and they will become more than ever the new poor. I would have liked to see the Government make drastic reduction in the tariff, and cease to protect wealthy manufacturers, sugar people and others and show a real strength in throttling the big interests. The present Budget does not aim to do this. I am disappointed. I thought a Government that felt strong enough to conscript life would be strong enough to do anything.

That is the view of a woman in regard to the attitude which the Government have taken in protecting those who have made vast fortunes out of the war and in throwing the burden of taxation upon the common people.

Let me give another voice, the voice of the men who served overseas, as stated by the president of the Great War Veterans' Association. Hon. members have doubtless noticed that within the last few days the Great War Veterans' Association have been considering the effects of this Budget; they have felt so exasperated at the attitude taken by the Government in intimating they intend to hold on to office irrespective altogether of the views of any class of people in this country, that the Great War Veterans' Association are now sending to the different branches of their organization communications indicative of the attitude of those who hold executive positions, and asking that resolutions be passed telling the Government that the time has come for them to get out of office.

But what do the Great War Veterans say in regard to these taxes? This is a quotation from a message sent by Mr. R. B. Maxwell, Dominion President of the Great War Veterans' Association of Canada, to all branches of his association urging them to call mass meetings for the purpose of demanding a general election. In this message he gives the reasons why the Great War Veterans think a general election is desirable. This is what he says in particular reference to the Budget that has been brought down:

> Parliament now requires that those who served in the war shall share in the payment of the major portion of the war debt despite the fact that war-accumulated wealth remains practically unmolested.

There, in one sentence, is the charge which they make against hon. gentlemen opposite. In this Budget which the Government have brought down, the Government have left war-accumulated wealth practically unmolested.

Lest it may seem that I am going a little far in suggesting that war-accumulated wealth should be held as a first charge for meeting expenditures which have arisen out of the war, may I give to the House a few extracts from a memorandum submitted, not by any special committee chosen for any special purpose, but by a department of the British Government to a committee of the British House of Commons in regard to this question of war wealth? I do this just to illustrate the nature of the sources from which it might be possible to draw in helping to meet the vast expenditures with which the country is confronted at

4 p.m.

the present time. The memorandum was submitted by the Board of Inland Revenue of the British Government to the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Increases of Wealth. It is published in printed form and is available for distribution. It is an expert official judgment by a government department of proved efficiency. I should like hon. members to notice this statement in regard to the particular subject with which I am dealing. What is spoken of in particular is not a levy on capital, but a levy only on that particular wealth which was derived in consequence of and out of the war. The British Government, through their Board of Inland Revenue, have facilities for ascertaining the total wealth of many of the people of England, and it is upon the statistics which have been gathered by the British Government that the following figures are given. This will indicate how private fortunes have increased during the war:

> Before the war the aggregate amount of private fortunes in the United Kingdom was estimated at about eleven thousand million pounds. After the war Dr. J. C. Stamp, who is our leading statistical authority on these matters—

That is the English statistical authority:

> —estimated the aggregate net increase in current market values at five and a quarter thousand million pounds, or nearly 48 per cent. The Board of Inland Revenue, going more minutely into the data, under slightly different conditions, puts the aggregate net increase in value between June 30, 1914, and June 30, 1919, at no more than four thousand million pounds, or 36 per cent. Of this "war-time wealth," one-third is supposed to be in the hands of people whose increase in fortune is less than 5,000 pounds; and among these about 170,000 persons (including families, say 1 per cent of the community) are from 3,000 pounds to 5,000 pounds richer than they were.
>
> Two-thirds of the aggregate net increase, or nearly three thousand million pounds, is computed to be in the hands of 340,000 persons (including families, say 2 per cent of the community), whose total post-war wealth is put at 9,100 million pounds. No less than 6,000 million pounds of our present wealth, being two-fifths of the whole, is possessed by 73,500 individuals, each owning more than 25,000 pounds, who have secured among them over 2,000 million pounds of the increase, or half the total "war-time wealth." Thus is body given to the popular vision of "war profiteers"!
>
> The 280 among them who now own more than a million pounds apiece have managed to get no less than 200 millions of war-time increase, which has raised their aggregate possessions to close upon 600 million pounds sterling.
>
> Two out of every hundred families own two-fifths of all the private property of the nation; and to this two per cent has accrued two-thirds of the aggregate increase in wealth during the past five years. Those among them whom the Americans would call millionaires (viz. the 3,600 owning each at least a quarter of a million pounds) have taken no less than 700 million pounds of the increase.

Those figures show how individual fortunes increased in England during and in consequence of the war. The Inland Revenue Board of the British Government has sought to ascertain, if the Government were to make those who had made such large fortunes out of war profiteering give part of their fortunes to the State, how far it would be possible to meet the obligations of the war in that way. What do they find? On a scale averaging 25 per cent the Board of Inland Revenue sees its way to raise no less than £1,000,000,000, which would enable the Government to pay off more than one-eighth of the whole national debt, or, alternatively, to discharge its entire indebtedness to other countries. Now, my reason for quoting that statement is this: If in Great Britain during the period of the war enormous wealth has been amassed in the hands of a few people through profiteering is there not reason to believe that in this Dominion of Canada large fortunes have been amassed by a few individuals in much the same way? I ask, therefore, is it not a thoroughly sound and just and right and proper principle that if men, starting out with privilege in the first instance, have been able during the period of the war to amass great fortunes, at least a percentage of those fortunes should go into the public treasury at this time instead of having the consumers carry the extra burden? I would not say that the Government should confiscate all that wealth. They were ready enough to conscript human life; well, I do not ask them to be equally ready to conscript wealth, but I do say that where vast fortunes have been made by reason of the war, and men and women and children are suffering under the deplorable conditions that have resulted from that war, the Government owe it to the people of the country to see that something at least is contributed in a substantial way from this source which will help to reduce the public debt at this time. It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, when we come to consider the questions that affect human life and material wealth, how indifferent men are to the sacredness of life and how careful they can become in guarding and safeguarding material possessions, as though wealth were in any way comparable with life.

I repeat, Sir, that hon. gentlemen opposite owe it to the people of this country to see that further burdens are not placed on the shoulders of those who are struggling as hard as they possibly can for very exist-

ence. At least, the Government should not add to the burdens the people have had to bear until they have taken some part of the great fortunes that have been made as a result of profiteering during the period of the war. We know, Sir, that there was profiteering. A committee of this House has examined the fortunes that have been made by individual men, and we have the records of this Parliament to show to what extent those fortunes were increased as a consequence of profiteering. Are we going to build the future of Canada on any policy that will help to protect mainly those who have great wealth, and build up an aristocracy of wealth in Canada while the great mass of the people struggle on day after day, making their livelihoods as best they can? That really is the question which is fundamentally at issue in this Budget. Sir, it is a question of the people versus the profiteer, and my objection to the Budget as brought down is that it is a Budget which is designed to protect the profiteers and not the people of Canada.

There is one point I should much like to develop in regard to the justice of causing a portion of this vast wealth accumulated during the war to be turned over to the public treasury, and it is a consideration which I think is an all-important one in matters of political economy. We are inclined to attribute these vast fortunes to individual initiative, to the great skill of individual men, to the foresight and directing or managerial capacity of individuals. Now, I am prepared to give every credit to managerial ability; I am willing to concede due credit to the man who is able to bring into combination the forces that are needed for the successful furthering of production and into that relationship which will help to make them productive and beneficial to the maximum of their potentialities. But let me point out, Sir, that managerial ability of itself can accomplish nothing. You can have all the managerial ability in the world, but what can it do without labour to assist it? What can it do without the community and the part which the community plays? What can it do without capital—capital not always derived from special sources only, but very often from the savings of the masses of the people accumulated by banks and loaned out by the banks to different industrial concerns? All these factors are essential to the production of wealth. The various factors in the production of wealth are the natural resources of the country, capital, labour, managerial ability and, pre-eminently and above all else, the community in its different organized capacities. Sir, it is the community that controls the natural resources from which all wealth is ultimately derived. It is the community that carries on and maintains Government. It is the community that maintains law and order and promotes trade through its consular and diplomatic services. It is the community that fosters banks, railroads, and transportation enterprises. It is the community that aids invention. It is the community that carries on the work of education. It is the community that creates the demand for the commodities that are sold. It is the community that makes possible returns to capital and labour. Now, if the community does all these things as its contribution to the creation of wealth, has not the community, through its representative the Government, a right to some of the wealth which it helps to accumulate?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps my hon. friend will wait until I am through, when I shall be pleased to answer any questions he may ask. At present, I desire to continue this argument. I have said that the reason we take exception to the Budget which my hon. friend has brought down is the fact that it does not recognize these great public needs, these great public rights. It has lost sight altogether of what the profiteers owe to the community and to the State at this particular time, especially in view of the conditions that have been developing during the past few years.

Sir, I wish also to say that another reason for our exception to the Budget is that it reveals the outstanding fact that the Government has no policy for dealing with the high cost of living. Mr. Speaker, if there is any question which is paramount in Canada to-day, and which transcends all other considerations, it is the important question of the high cost of living. We could not expect hon. gentlemen opposite to solve that question. Certainly not; but we at least had a right to expect that they would take some step towards a solution of the problems which the high cost of living involves, and that they would have had some suggestion to offer which would, if adopted, have helped to relieve the burdens which men, women and children in this country are bear-

ing to-day. But what have they done? Instead of alleviating the high cost of living as it affects the great mass of consumers they have added to it. They have increased the cost of living and made it more difficult for the people of Canada to live than it has been heretofore. To an invisible tariff they have added a visible tariff on a great multitude of commodities, thereby increasing the cost of living to the vast body of consumers. From one end of Canada to the other, in every home, there has been considerable difficulty in coping with the situation. Go where you will, you will find this the baffling problem that taxes the ingenuity of the great majority of the people. As I say, Mr. Speaker, instead of meeting the high cost of living as it was obviously the duty of the Government to have met it, by reducing the tariff on the necessaries of life, they have added this visible tariff in the nature of an excise to the invisible tariff which already exacts its toll from the people in regard to commodities in general use.

But they have done more than that. They have not been satisfied with merely adding one tax but they have heaped tax upon tax on many of the necessaries of life that enter into daily consumption.

So far as this Budget affects luxuries, we can heartily endorse all that the Government proposes. It is proper that luxuries should be taxed and taxed just as much as they will stand, but, as has been pointed out by one hon. member after another on this side of the House there are many articles, such as boots and shoes, clothing, the different articles required in the daily food of poor people, canned goods for example, which are taxed and over taxed. Consider this excise tax in relation to the cost of living. Take clothing for instance. The cloth say is brought from the Old Country, and on it a tariff tax is paid when it enters Canada, a tax which is based on the par rate of exchange, although the pound sterling has fallen in purchasing value. The result is that instead of the tax being paid on the actual value of the commodity, it is levied on the higher arbitrary rate, which results in additional protection being given to the Canadian manufacturer on this particular article. Then when that commodity gets into the hands of the wholesaler or of the manufacturer who passes it to the wholesaler, an excise tax is levied not merely on the value of the commodity itself but also on the extra taxes that have been put upon it. Upon passing from the wholesaler to the retailer another excise tax is placed upon it and then, from the retailer to the consumer, yet another tax is placed upon it. By the time this commodity, in the nature of a necessity, reaches the consumer, it is carrying not only its own value but tax upon tax upon tax and that is the way the Government is solving the problem of the high cost of living. We find that under this Budget the consumer not only has to pay the tariff on many necessaries of life, but his burden is added to by these different excise taxes.

There is another ill effect which the Budget is going to have on the poorer people in this country in that it is going to encourage the manufacture of shoddy goods. Quality is quite as important as quantity and there is probably no way in which you can hit a man harder than to give him poor value for his money. It will be recalled that Charles Kingsley in describing shoddy material, used the term "cheap and nasty." The poor man who has a hard enough struggle already to provide food and clothing for his children will feel that he cannot afford this extra tax and will be forced to buy this wretched shoddy material.

Instead of caring for and protecting the consumers the Government have left them to their fate. One thing I was surprised to see in regard to this matter was that while a tax is put upon the goods obtained by the consumer there is no tax upon the goods that are being sent out of the country. Why? Because in that instance it helps the manufacturer. He, not the consumer, is the chief consideration with the Government. Again, the more you export out of the country, the less there is for the consumer. Look it all over and you see all along the line the interests of the privileged classes carefully taken care of while the interests of the great bulk of the people have not been safeguarded.

But not only has the Government failed to make any contribution towards the solution of the high cost of living, it has shown its absolute incapacity to bring down any proposal, or to denote any policy in the Budget to assist in securing increased production. We have heard hon. gentlemen opposite get up in turn and say that the only salvation of the country is increased production; that it is only by increased production we can solve the high cost of living, and get the money to meet high taxation. Yet in the Budget proposals there is nothing to further that increased production which is needed most of all. To increase production

you must take some of the duties off necessaries and thus lower the cost of living. Then you will make men happier, more ready to work, more ready to put their zeal into the particular lines of production in which they are engaged. But you must also take the duties off the instruments of production. The Government has not done this. It has not taken any duties off the necessaries of life; it has not taken any duties off the instruments of production. On the one hand, it has no policy to cope with the high cost of living and on the other it has no policy to bring about increased production, which through reduction of duties on the necessaries of life and on the instruments of production is demanded on every side. It is demanded by all classes of people in this country.

Go where you will in Canada to-day and you will find that people are not getting the necessaries of life such as food, clothing and shelter, in the quantities in which they should be able to secure them. Take a young man or woman making his or her own way in the world, starting out in life. Is it good public policy, is it in the interest of human well-being that struggles should be made more difficult than necessary for these young people? If in any way the Government can help to make possible an increase in the number of homes it will be contributing to the happiness, contentment and prosperity of the country. Take homes that are already established in the crowded cities, Montreal and Toronto, for instance, where you have one house close against another or one tenement above another; or in the lonely regions whether on the prairies or in the recesses of the mountains where you have isolated homes; or in those more favoured localities where there is neither overcrowding on the one hand nor isolation on the other; in almost every one of these homes, whether you find there only two persons living together, or a large family, or three generations, you will find the joys of home life diminished, and anxieties increased, by reason of the great advance in the cost of living. The one thing necessary is, for the Government to do what lies in its power to bring relief from that anxiety, to make possible a greater degree of happiness and comfort than now exists. This it can only do by making possible greater production in those basic industries which provide what is necessary in the way of food, clothing, and shelter.

Take the requirements of industry itself. What is all industry? Industry is nothing other than the transformation of natural resources, through a variety of processes, into commodities and services available for human use. It starts with the great basic industries of agriculture, fishing, lumbering, mining. These primary basic industries are those that have to be developed in the first instance. After their development, whatever of wealth is produced from that original source becomes converted by further processes of transformation—through the application of labour, and through the application of tools and machines, to assist in furthering production—into commodities and services of one kind and another available for human use. One result is: that unless you make possible the increase of production in the basic industries to the largest extent possible you are only handicapping all the subsequent processes and the ultimate development of wealth. So we say that in regard to the instruments of production applied to the natural resources of the country, there should be as little in the way of handicap as it is possible to have. The more readily available the instruments of production are, the greater will be the wealth produced from those primary industries; and as greater wealth is produced from the primary industries so will greater wealth be available for the secondary industries, and consequently available to the consumer of commodities. In that way the volume of trade will be increased and the volume of prosperity will also be increased. That is why it is so important that in an effort to increase production the Government should have brought forward some constructive policy.

I can imagine my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, saying when I suggest that some of the war-time wealth might be taxed, "It is poor policy to tax capital, because capital is the goose that lays the golden eggs." Well, I can appreciate his not wishing to tax capital, but I wonder if it has occurred to hon. gentlemen opposite that if there is one form of capital that is most essentially capital it is the instruments of production that are used for carrying on further production. Instruments of production for the basic industries are the real capital that is necessary along with labour, to create further wealth; and as long as customs duties are kept on the implements of production of the basic industries so long you are simply taxing the capital that is necessary to produce further wealth.

Now, not only is it in the interest of industry generally that there should be the utmost freedom of production in the primary industries but it is especially in the interest of the manufacturing industries. As I have said the wealth that is to be used or further transformed in manufacturing, has to come in the first instance from these primary industries. If it is not obtained there it cannot be obtained at all. As it is increased in volume there, so it will increase the volume of these other industries. There is also this further circumstance: Wages have been going up, salaries have been going up. They cannot go up indefinitely if our manufacturers are to hope to be able to compete with the manufacturers of other countries. There are real wages and there are nominal wages. Nominal wages are what a man gets in terms of money; real wages are what he can buy with his money. If real wages are not increased a man is no better off no matter how much he gets in the way of increase in nominal wages; and real wages will increase only as the necessities of life become more plentiful and it becomes possible to obtain, at lower cost, the food, the clothing and the warmth and shelter that is necessary. As these things become available in larger quantities so will a man's real wages increase. Now if manufacturers, if the owners of transportation systems, if those who employ men at wages and on salaries hope to be able to meet the world competition it will only be by so increasing the development of the natural resources of the country and the basic industries that wealth will be made more and more plentiful, and that thereby it will be made possible for the wage-earning and the salaried classes to obtain what is needful through the real wages which they receive.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the same increase is equally desirable in the interests of trade and commerce. It is not less in the interest of increased production and manufacturing than in the interest of trade and commerce, that there should be a large volume of trade. I think I am perfectly right when I say that in trading profits are made not on the price but on the volume of trade. It is the turn-over that counts—and the greater the number of transactions, the better it will be for the man who is fortunate enough to be carrying on a particular business. Now what is the effect of the taxation which the Government is proposing? It is for the most part in the nature of a restriction upon trade; it is making it more difficult for those who are engaged in trade and commerce to carry on their commerce in the volume to which they were formerly accustomed. The turn-over will not be what it hitherto has been. And if the turn-over is checked at one point it is going to check the man further down; and so instead of making for prosperity, the effect of any taxation that restricts development in trade is simply to turn back the hands of the clock, to hamper the production of the real sources of wealth from which all wealth is ultimately to come. I might go at some length into the requirements of trade and commerce in that regard, but I think the point as stated will be sufficient of itself.

Let me, however, develop this further thought—an all-important one at this time—that development of the basic industries of this country is absolutely necessary on the score of a wise, economic development of the future of industry and trade in Canada. The kind of wealth and the kind of production is just as important as the quantity of production, and in many respects more important. Statistics will show unmistakably that in Canada the trend has been relatively away from production in agriculture to the production of commodities along other particular lines. In other words, instead of fostering a natural development in industry in this country, the Governmental policies in Canada have been fostering a highly artificial trend in development. We have been building up cities and towns at the expense of rural life. That is something that cannot be denied; and I say that that is not only against the interests of rural life but is against the interests of the manufacturers, it is against the interest of all who live in cities and towns.

Let me give the House a few statistics in this regard as to the development of Canada in the last few years. We have not available any census statistics other than those taken in 1901 and 1911, but they show that in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick between those years the urban population had increased very considerably while in those provinces and Prince Edward Island the rural population decreased materially. In Quebec the urban population increased in that period by 314,383, while the rural population increased by only 39,951. In old Ontario the urban population increased by 392,511 in 10 years, or a total of 1,328,489, but the rural population actually decreased 52,184 in the same period, leaving a total of 1,194,785. This

tendency for the urban population to increase at the expense of the rural has been greatly intensified in the province of Ontario during the period of the war owing to the artificial stimulus given to industries connected with the war.

In the western provinces, which are rural above everything else, in 1901, taking the provinces together, 75.39 per cent of the population was rural, and 24.61 was urban; while in 1916—there is a later census in the West—the figures are 64.31 per cent for the rural population and 35.69 per cent for the urban. This is an abnormal and unhealthy division of population where 15 per cent of the available agricultural land is not yet under cultivation.

The census of 1911 shows that the urban population of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta increased 92 per cent in ten years; but the rural population increased only 52 per cent. The census of 1916 shows that this tendency towards expansion of the cities has increased. In Saskatchewan the rural population decreased from 84.37 per cent to 72.79 per cent between 1911 and 1916.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the significance of those figures is very great indeed. What is needed at the present time above all else? During the war the cry that went out to the world was first, for more men; then the cry was, for more munitions; then for more ships; then for more food, and more food, and more food. And it is the cry for more food that the world is hearing to-day. It was the lack of food that ultimately brought the German and Austrian armies to their knees. It was starvation that ended the war as effectively as anything else. To-day the need of the world above all other things is for increased quantities of food, and the problem of the high cost of living will never be solved until there is that increase. Yet these statistics that I have read show that the trend in this country during the last couple of decades has been all in one direction: Increasing the demand for food in the urban centres, while reducing relatively the numbers of those who are capable of producing food in the rural districts. I cannot but believe that a development of that kind is certain to be inimical to any country in the long run, and that it is not a wise national policy which abnormally stimulates development in one direction, while retarding it in a direction which seems all-important from the national point of view.

The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) I think recognized that this would be one of the most difficult arguments for him to meet in the course of his campaign on behalf of the special interests, and he undertook to tell us the other day that it was no use trying to deal with this movement from the country into the towns, that civilization was tending that way, that it was inevitable. I think we get the crux of the situation in the attitude we take towards this problem if we really believe that it is in the interests of national development to be indifferent to this movement away from the land to the urban centres, that it is the urban centres that must at all costs be developed at the expense of the rural districts, why, certainly we are likely to advocate a policy that will further that end. But, on the other hand, if we believe that the interests of both the rural and the urban centres will be best served by keeping a maximum number of people on the land to produce the necessaries of life in as large quantities as possible, then our views towards the fiscal and other great problems of the country will be determined accordingly. Let me read what the Minister of the Interior said in regard to this development. His remarks will be found in the unrevised Hansard of May 25, at page 2774:

> But, this diminution which has come to Canada, to the United States and to every country in the world—and it is terribly aggravated in Great Britain by reason of their fiscal policy, undoubtedly,—this general diminution in rural population is inevitable; no change of policy can ever alter it. Why? Well, it seems to me that the reason is obvious. The farmer produces food; that is the great product to the turning out of which he applies his energy. As the world advances in population, people do not eat any more food individually; the need of food increases just as the population advances and no more. But as civilization advances the other needs and indulgences of mankind multiply an hundredfold. Transportation needs, clothing needs, entertainment needs, all these requirements advance by leaps and bounds, whereas food remains relatively stationary. Consequently a larger proportion of the world's people are engaged in making these other products and rendering these other services than are engaged in the growing of food. Do what we will, we would be foolish to try to beat back logic itself, and the whole trend and movement of the age.

That is a hopeless attitude to adopt, and I am surprised that one who is usually so careful in following out an argument to the last point should have slipped into some of the errors which my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) has made in that statement. He says that the people's demand for food has not increased, but that their demand for clothing has, and that that is something we need more and more of as we go along. Well, I would ask my hon. friend: Where

is the wool and where is the cotton to come from which are so essential for clothing unless from the products of the farm?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman will see that I used the word "mainly." That, I said, was "mainly" the product of the farm. It is true that the raw wool is also, but it would be a stretch of the imagination to believe that cotton is a product of the farms of Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend was not speaking of Canada alone, he was speaking also of the United States and of England. I would like to bring to the attention of my hon. friend that all the things essential to life—food, clothing, shelter, warmth—are derived from the basic industries—agriculture, mining, lumbering, fishing. These things are fundamental. When we follow out what my hon. friend has said, what does it come to? That the thousands of men going into the different callings of transportation, of mercantile life, and other city activities mean that so many more men have to be fed in the urban centres and that fewer men remain in the country to supply the needs of the augmented urban population. That is what it comes to, this artificial development; society is making less possible all the time the production of the necessary commodities in the required quantities. I can see nothing but misfortune for any nation or any country that permits a development of that kind to proceed. My hon. friend spoke about England and talked about the increase in the slums. He pointed out that there was a great deal of unemployment in these slum areas of the cities. Well, that is an inevitable effect of the turning of development from the land into urban centres, where the development is not natural and proper. Let me quote to my hon. friend words of great truth as well as of great beauty, which I take from Goldsmith's Deserted Village—they are familiar to him, I am sure. These words view in one stanza the situation that we are trying to view as a whole:

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.
Princes and lords may flourish, or may fade,
A breath can make them as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroy'd, can never be supplied.

That, Sir, is a fundamental consideration of which we should take account at this time. We do not want to see in Canada an aristocracy of wealth grow up in our large cities, and men leaving the rural areas, a great plutocracy and aristocracy combined on the one side, and men decaying and villages and rural life deserted on the other. What we want is a bold peasantry; what we want is men who love the soil, who love contact with nature. We need them, as I have already said, if we are to maintain our human society in a proper degree of strength and vigour. It was with that consideration in view that at the Liberal Convention held last summer, in addition to a resolution with regard to the tariff, to which I shall refer in a moment, the following important resolution on encouragement to agriculture was laid down as one of the planks of the Liberal platform:

In the interest of agricultural production and development it is expedient to encourage co-operation and induce greater investment in farming; therefore, it is deemed expedient to utilize the national credit to assist co-operative agricultural credit associations to provide capital for agriculture at the lowest possible rates.

With the object of reducing the high cost of living by eliminating as far as possible the waste and expense in handling food products between the producer and consumer, it is expedient to extend the principle and system of Canadian Government elevators and to provide interior and terminal cold storage warehouses equipped for the assembling, assorting, preparing, storing and grading of food products in order that co-operative organizations and others may have available to them reliable, modern equipment, for the distribution of farm products in superior condition and at lessened cost either for domestic consumption or for export. And that cold storage transportation facilities should be provided, at the cost of operation, for the shipment of food products throughout Canada and for the carrying to the markets of the world the surplus farm products of this country and delivering them in such condition that will make Canadian foodstuffs a standard of quality for the world's market.

That, in the interests of agriculture, in aid of greater production on the land, and for the conservation of the soil in Canada, it is expedient for the Government to arrange for the distribution of fertilizers at the lowest possible cost.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party in its advocacy of measures that it believes to be in the interests of agriculture is not seeking in any way to care primarily for the interests of one class as against the interests of another. As I have said to-day, I firmly believe that the welfare of every city dweller is dependent absolutely upon the well-being and welfare of the people who dwell in the country, and only as we increase and improve agricultural development shall we make possible a happier lot for the masses of the people in the cities; shall we make possible a reduction in the cost of living; shall we make possible the obtaining of food supplies at a price which will enable us to get the labour that is

necessary for the carrying on of the manufacturing industries.

There is another reason why I think we should encourage the people as far as we can to live in the country. The greatest of all assets to a nation is the health of its people. There is no denying that country life makes for the health of the human being, as life in the city does not begin to do. To the extent that the people are engaged in rural occupations; to the extent that they are in close contact with nature, —in fishing, in mining, in lumbering, in agriculture, in any of these great basic industries—to that extent will they be stronger and healthier. For that reason I should like to see an energetic policy of rural development instituted in this country which would help to make rural life as attractive as it possibly can be made. Let me illustrate what I mean by a simple example. The Government has had voted large sums of money which it is prepared to lend to municipalities for the purpose of putting up dwellings for working men in cities and towns. That may be good as far as it goes, but something much better would be the erection all over this country of cottages on farms where men and women could live with their families, working as farm labourers and farm helpers, if you like, having their own cottages, their own homes, and assisting the farmers in the production of necessities for the people in the cities and towns. Anything that will encourage the people to go on the land; anything that will help to make farm life enjoyable and prosperous, will help to develop a prosperous and vigorous people.

Having regard to the vast losses which we sustained during the war, to the numbers of men who were killed, and to the large numbers who suffered physical injury of one kind or another or impairment of health, it becomes most important that the Government should give as much attention as it possibly can to the conservation of human life. We talk a great deal about the conservation of natural resources, but, Sir, the conservation of human life is equally important. May I here refer to another most important plank in the platform of the Liberal party as laid down at the convention of last year? The following resolution on the conservation and improvement of physical standards of Canadians was moved, as I recall it, by one of the women delegates:

> Whereas the Great War and the greater epidemic have taken an appalling toll of Canadian life; and
>
> Whereas human life and physical efficiency are the nation's greatest assets; and
>
> Whereas the conservation and improvement thereof should be the country's first care;
>
> Therefore this gathering of Liberals in convention assembled pledges itself to a vigorous prosecution of the measures best calculated to conserve the life and improve the physical standard of our Canadian citizenship.

As I said a moment ago, human life is much more important than wealth; health is of greater concern and a more important capital than money. But what is being done at the present time along preventive lines? I know that hon. gentlemen opposite have established a Department of Health, and in that work they have had the co-operation of members on this side of the House. But thus far we have seen very little as a result of what is being done by that department. May I urge the department to consider this matter of the health of the people, not in any small way, but as part of a great national policy such as I have been endeavouring to indicate during the course of my remarks this afternoon, based upon the wisdom of bringing people into contact with nature; the desirability of enabling as many as possible to find their places of residence, their homes, where their health is likely to be benefited to the greatest degree?

Let me read a line or two from an editorial which appeared in the Montreal Star of May 13. The subject with which it deals is a very important one in connection with the production of wealth, which we are considering at the present time. I am putting it on the material ground, for the meantime, of increased production, because it is only as labour and capital are applied to the natural resources of the country that we have an increase of production. This article is headed: "More Deadly Than War," it says:

> Dr. C. D. Parfitt, of Muskoka, tells the special committee on pensions at Ottawa that Canada lost more lives from tuberculosis than in battle with Germans.

The editorial continues:

> The figures Dr. Parfitt gives are alarming. In five years 35,684 Canadian soldiers were killed in battle in Europe, and during the same period 42,920 Canadians died of tuberculosis in Canada. The incidence of tuberculosis was 120 per cent greater in the Canadian than in the British Expeditionary Force, suggesting that the people of this country are peculiarly susceptible to the ravages of the disease.
>
> The greatest war of all time has come and gone, with its tanks and poison gas, and many deadly weapons perfected by science, yet it has failed to equal in destruction of life the steady ravages of tuberculosis. Its sum of misery, with families broken up, lifework cut

off, strong men bent under bereavement, and talent filched from the public service, makes a smaller heap than is the regular loot of the White Plague.

The contrast between the nation at war and the nation at peace is now being realized in Canada, and it means the lifting of a deadly weight off the minds and hearts of the people. But judged in terms of life and death, a more deadly weight crushes down upon the public. It places also a burden upon the conscience of all. Canada took effective action to bring her men home from the deadly trenches; what is Canada doing to save her women and children from tuberculosis?

That is not my question, but a question put by a paper which is friendly to the Government. What is Canada doing to save her women and chidren from tuberculosis? Five per cent or one twentieth of our population who earn a livelihood, regardless of their calling in life, are absolutely wholly and continuously, physically incapacitated from performing the duties pertaining to their profession, trade or labour, by disease which is and should be preventable. Place the total population of Canada at 8,000,000, and generally speaking, we estimate one half of this to be male. If it is further estimated that of the male population, at least two-fiths or 1,600,000 are wage-earners, and if you calculate that 5 per cent of this number, because of disease which is capable of prevention, are totally and continuously unable to earn, you can readily understand what a loss this means financially. In order to ascertain what this means, let us suppose the average earnings to be at the rate of $3 per head per day. Five per cent of 1,600,000 of a population represents 80,000, and this multiplied by $3 each would give $240,000 per day. First you have the loss to the families of the wage-earners, second, the profits lost to employers as a result of these 80,000 people being forced to remain idle, and third, loss of production to the nation at a time when conservation plays such an important part.

As regards the saving of life, approximately 200,000 babes are born every year in Canada, and an average of 120 out of every 1,000 of these die before they are one year old from conditions which may and should be, in large measure, prevented. This in itself deprives the nation of 24,000 potential native-born citizens a year. There are between 10,000 and 15,000 deaths annually in Canada from tuberculosis.

My reason for touching on these questions of health at this point is as I have indicated, that the Government have told us that what is needed at the present time above all is increased production. We can have increased production only as we have increased labour, increased willingness to produce and increased instruments of production wherewith to labour. It is going to be increasingly difficult to have the immigration we had in former years, because Europe cannot spare her people as she formerly did. Is it not then the part of a wise, sane and far-seeing policy to try to develop our national life in a manner which will best conserve our human life as well as best increase the production of the necessaries of life for the masses of the people?

I come now to some references which have been made to the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite have sought to revive and stimulate throughout the country interest in the so-called National Policy of protection and to recount all it is alleged to have done for Canada. Without arguing the question one way or the other as to what the National Policy did or did not do, may I submit this consideration to the people of Canada as an all important one, in any consideration of a fiscal policy, namely, the condition of Canada as it was when the National Policy was introduced and as it is to-day in regard to possible future development. When the National Policy was introduced into Canada in 1878 or 1879, we had no export of manufacturers worthy of the name, and we had little in the way of a home market. When Sir John A. Macdonald appealed to the House of Commons to support his policy of protection of manufactures, he did so on the ground that what we needed was a home market for our manufactured goods; that we needed to stimulate individual industries; that we needed to give an infant industry an opportunity to grow and develop. The infant industry of the day of the inauguration of the National Policy has become the giant iron and steel merger of which we have heard mention in this House recently. Is the iron and steel merger, running up into millions, if not billions of dollars, an industry comparable with the kind of industry which Sir John A. Macdonald wished to stimulate? All that I am anxious to point out at the moment is that as times change, conditions come to the fore of which full account should be taken? From the moment the National Policy was introduced to the present time, efforts have been constant to improve conditions for a number of special industries in this country? Look at the vast expenditures that

have been made on railways and on canals and shipping; look at the transportation within the country itself and across the seas; see what the Government are doing at the present time in the matter of stimulating the merchant marine; take the work of the Department of Trade and Commerce in having trade commissioners in different parts of the world; take the credits the Government are giving to foreign countries —all of these are ways of helping special interests to develop their particular industries. I am not saying that these are not good, but I am pointing out that they all help to give a larger market to the manufactures of this country, and to the extent that they do so, the consumers of this country are placed at a greater disadvantage than they would be if these great advantages were not given to particular interests. If we are going to consider one interest, let us consider all interests. That

5 p.m. is what we say is desirable in developing an industrial policy. No one would say that it was unwise to further internal and export trade; but if it be wise to help and stimulate one industry in its world development, it is equally wise to stimulate all the industries of the country. Let me read what Sir John A. Macdonald said when he introduced the National Policy. These are his words, respecting Canada in the seventies, as he uttered them in Parliament:

> a young and struggling country, just emerging from the first struggles with the forest. We have but little realized capital as yet. The manufacturers of the country, with a few small exceptions have scarcely taken root.

He quoted with approval John Stuart Mill. And here I might direct the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) to the question he asked the other day as to whether John Stuart Mill had or had not supported protection. This is what Sir John A. Macdonald quoted from John Stuart Mill:

> The only case in which, on mere principles of political economy, protecting duties can be defensible is when they are imposed temporarily (especially in a young and rising country) in hope of naturalizing a foreign industry in itself perfectly suitable to the circumstances of the country.

Those are not my words, but the words of Sir John A. Macdonald quoting John Stuart Mill. The point I make is: That any argument as to what was necessary and what was the best policy for Canada in 1879 must be considered to-day in the light of the changed conditions.

Sir John A. Macdonald in the statement I have just quoted refers to the fact that Canada was then a young country with practically no home market for her manufactures and certainly with no export market at all. Let me give my hon. friends the contents of a communication which I think will appeal to them as authoritative, and which will indicate the change that has taken place in Canada since the National Policy was first introduced. When my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) and I had the pleasure of visiting the Maritime Provinces in the early part of this year, we were most generously received by the Commercial Club of St. John, of which, I think, the hon. member for St. John is president. He was away at the time, but the vice-president and other officers of the Commercial Club showed us great courtesy and asked us if we would accompany them to St. John harbour to see the nature of the shipping at that port. We spent the morning going over the harbour and looking at the different ships that were lying at anchor there. The point that these gentlemen wished to bring especially to our attention was that the facilities at St. John were wholly inadequate to meet the demand which was imposed upon them by the amount of shipping that was being done at that port. It was in the month of January, and at that time every wharf was lined with ships. Lying at anchor in the harbour were some thirteen or fourteen ocean liners that had to wait their turn to get accommodation. Those ships were there from every quarter of the globe. They were there to take Canadian goods, the natural and manufactured products of Canada, to the markets of the world. They were there to carry our products to Europe, Africa, Australia and South America. After we had had an interesting survey of the harbour I asked one of these gentlemen if he would kindly furnish me with a statement of the different ships we had seen and of the cargoes they were carrying. Let me read the letter I received. It throws light on the present development of trade in Canada and what our industries are doing in relation to foreign markets. The letter is dated St. John, N.B., January 17, 1920, and is as follows:

> Honourable W. L. MACKENZIE KING,
> City.
>
> Dear Sir:—Agreeable to your request of this a.m., I have great pleasure in endeavouring to place before you full particulars of steamers lying in and about the port of Saint John,

together with their import and export cargoes to be handled here.

Beginning with steamers you did not see, and which were lying outside the harbour, beyond Partridge island, obscured by the snowstorm, there are:

C.P.O.S. SS. Dunbridge, from London with inward general cargo; arrived January 9th to load grain, provisions, cereals and general cargo for Antwerp and London.

C.P.O.S. SS. Montezuma, from London with general cargo; arrived January 10th to load grain, provisions and general cargo for London.

C.P.O.S. SS. Batsford, from U.K. port, in ballast; arrived January 11th to load flour for U.K.

Canada Steamship Line SS. Georgic, from Havre with general cargo; arrived January 11th to load meats, provisions, farming implements and general cargo for Havre.

SS. Grof Kuen Hendervary (Italian), arrived January 12th in ballast to load grain for Italy.

SS. Monceniso Primo (Italian), arrived January 12th in ballast to load grain for Italy.

Vessels at anchor in the inner harbour:

Marine Navigation Co., SS. Alston, from St. Nazaire with general cargo and ballast; arrived January 12th to load automobiles, machinery and general cargo for St. Nazaire.

SS. Protea (Italian), arrived January 11th in ballast to load grain for Italy.

SS. Willpolo (American), arrived January 10th in ballast to load grain for Italy.

SS. Fedora (Italian), arrived January 7th to load grain for Italy.

SS. Drammensfjord (Norwegian), arrived January 14th to load general cargo for Scandinavian ports.

Vessels in berth:

SS. O. A. Knudsen (Norwegian), arrived January 6th; idle awaiting grain berth to load for Italy.

Furness Line SS. Glenspean, from Antwerp; arrived January 11th with ballast and general cargo; idle awaiting loading berth for grain, provisions and general cargo for Antwerp.

Manchester Line SS. Manchester Mariner, arrived January 9th from Manchester with general cargo; awaiting loading berth to load grain, provisions and general cargo for Manchester.

Dominion Coal Co., SS. Lingai discharging coal.

Canada Steamship Line SS. Lord Dufferin, from Havre; loading general cargo for Havre.

SS. Dailwen, loading deals for U.K.; sails to-day.

C.P.O.S. SS. Sardinian, loading grain, deals, and general cargo; sails for London to-day.

C.P.O.S. SS. Mottisfont, loading grain, deals and general cargo for London.

Houston Line SS. Hyanthes, with lumber, manufactured goods and general cargo for Brazil; sailing to-day.

C.P.O.S. SS. War Peridot, repairing propeller; will sail for Liverpool with grain, deals and general cargo.

C.P.O.S. SS. Holbrook, with general cargo from London; arrived January 7th. Only docked to-day to load grain and general cargo for Antwerp and London.

C.P.O.S. SS. Empress of France, from Liverpool with passengers, mails, and cargo, loading for Liverpool.

SS. Posillipo (Italian), loading grain for Italy.

SS. Bradavon, loading flour for Belfast.

SS. Cairnmona, loading flour for Greece.

SS. Orari, loading autos, machinery, and general cargo for New Zealand and Australia.

SS. New Georgia, loading autos, lumber and general cargo for Capetown, Port Elizabeth, East London, and Delagoa Bay.

I am sorry I am not able to get from the photographers scenes we had taken of the harbour and railway terminals, showing the congested and chaotic state existing a few days ago, but hope to have these on Monday, when I shall mail them to you at Ottawa.

Again thanking you for your great courtesy and interest in viewing the harbour situation at Saint John, I am,

Yours respectfully,

D. W. LEDINGHAM.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a picture of the development of trade and industry in this country as it is at the present time. This was the month of January. You will observe that the ships were to sail to practically every part of the world, to Africa, to Australia, to Brazil and to the northern and southern parts of Europe, and this was only from one of our ports. It all denotes trade that has been facilitated by the Government. It must be apparent that the great body of consumers in this country are entitled to at least some consideration when their taxes are going in very large measure to help to make possible this vast development of export trade. The photographs which were promised in the letter came in the course of a day or two, and when one looks at them one sees railroad terminals jammed with cars. Everything that can be done to increase and further develop this vast trade may be desirable, but as was pointed out by some hon. gentlemen who have spoken in this debate, and particularly by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), it is impossible to have trade going in one direction and expect to continue doing business unless you have cargoes in the opposite direction as well. Many of these ships came to Canada in ballast, bringing nothing valuable to our shores; that is not a condition that can be maintained indefinitely. If we want to build upon a sound basis we must develop those industries which we are best qualified to develop, and to the greatest extent possible encourage exchange of products with other nations.

All I am arguing for is that in our national policies we shall not have a circumscribed or narrow vision; but that we shall look to the necessities and interests of all classes and groups and not to the particular interests of any group or class. As I listened to the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) who expounded the Government's policy, it seemed to me, that

he had fallen into the common error of those who become advocates of protection of looking primarily to special interests as of vital concern. His mind seemed focussed on particular interests to the exclusion of industry as a whole. He spent a great deal of time citing from the reports of special committees which he said had been appointed by the Asquith Government to report upon the condition of particular industries in England. He sought to emphasize the findings of these committees because some members of them urged increased protection. But my hon. friend forgot to make a survey of British industry as a whole. It is perfectly true that certain industries in England have not the position they formerly had, but the question we must ask is: "What was England's position as a whole during the war; was she not able not only to finance herself and the different nations allied with her, but to carry the war through to a successful issue?" It is possible that the steel and iron industry of England is not at the moment what it once was. But what about England's shipping industry? Englishmen say that so long as England is an island she has to keep command of the seas through her merchant marine, and she has to protect it by her navy. As a result when the war came on England was supreme in that realm and it was her merchant marine together with her navy that saved her and helped save the rest of the world. England with her merchant marine could go to any quarter of the world to get the supplies she needed to feed her people, and to produce the needed armaments.

You can always get men to say that from the point of view of a particular industry it is desirable to protect it and you do not need to go to England for an example of that. If you focus your mind on any particular industry or profession or business you will find some who are interested in it favour the application to it of the protective principle. But when you leave a particular industry and cast your eye over all industries you will realize that while protection may be necessary in special cases,—its application generally is not equally beneficial. You prove nothing if you take one example and leave out all other considerations. There is a little book which was published in the Middle Ages in England known as Seldon's Table Talk in which a youth says to his father that he can prove by the kind of logic that his father has been using that he is perfectly entitled to marry his own grandmother. His father has been saying that a certain thing has been done in one case and therefore it ought to be done in another. When questioned by his father as to how he could argue as he did the son replied: "You married my mother; why should I not marry yours?" So it is in regard to the logic of my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) who says that because certain industries considered by themselves would be the better for protection, therefore other industries in other countries are in need of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What industries of importance are there that are not covered by the iron and steel industries such as the electrical trades, the engineering trades and the textile trades?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There are a great many others but I have not the time at the moment to go into them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend smiles but he does not take into account the agricultural, the fishing, and the mining industries, which are surely of some importance in England. There is also the shipping industry and others which might be mentioned. Surely these are examples enough for my hon. friend. The whole carrying trade of England is involved. It is a matter of relativity having regard to possibilities and opportunities for future developments. I could give my hon. friend a parallel to much that he has given us. Last year in England I took occasion to examine somewhat carefully the workings of joint industrial councils and I was told that in practically all the industries in England where they have joint industrial councils their members were united in a demand for increased protection for their particular industry. Every day there were demands from bodies interested in particular trades such as the textile trade and others, saying: "We would like increased protection for this industry by itself." When I spoke to one of the English members of Parliament and asked what attitude the Government were likely to take in regard to the matter, his reply was: "That is all right as long as we are dealing with individual industries, but these matters are not settled by individual industries; they are settled in Parliament where all industries have a voice. When they look at their own particular industry they say that it is desirable to give that industry special consideration but when they are confronted in Parliament by

men who are representing different industries it becomes a different question." When you get a vast body of opinion to view the question from its many different angles, you begin to see the necessity of give and take and the wisdom of not deciding what the policy of the nation shall be on the basis of one, two, or three particular industries because the question must be decided on the basis of what is the proper policy for all. That is the security which is found in our parliamentary institutions; that is why self-government stands for government of the people as a whole. While it is desirable that the interests of every industry should be safeguarded, Parliament must take into consideration the general interests of the community—it is the good of the whole body politic that has to be considered.

I was surprised to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) make the comparison he did between England and Germany at the commencement of the war. He spoke of the condition of preparedness that Germany was in by reason of her vast industries and wealth. If there is one thing more than another which the war has revealed it is that the aim of Germany was not merely political domination but industrial domination, and that what made possible the action of Germany was the combination of plutocracy, autocracy and militarism, the combination of the Ballins and Krupps and men of that kind who had built up vast industries to the exclusion of the rights of the great body of the common people and the autocratic aristocracy that controlled the State.

There would have been no war had Germany been cast in a different mould; but they developed in Germany that love of power, that worship of wealth which made men blind to every consideration of human well-being. So, when Germany took her ruthless step she did it for the purpose of achieving industrial and political conquest throughout the world. But she was beaten by those who took a different course. She was beaten by those nations that did not favour the special few—either in the matter of wealth or in the matter of privilege—but which had regard for the common weal and for common well-being. Sir, it was the autocratic Government in Germany, combined with the autocratic control of industry, that made the war possible. If the German Government had not been modelled on the basis of autocracy, if her industry had not been constructed on a basis of autocracy, the war would never have been possible—it was the combination of the two for an object that would further their joint ambition that made possible the step which Germany took.

What is wanted in the world to-day is not autocracy either in government or in industry. What is wanted in the world and in this country to-day is the democratization of government and the democratization of industry. I say that any government that will assume office as this Government did, and say that it intends to hold on to office—despite the demand of the people to the contrary—is an autocratic government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I say that the Government, being an autocratic government, in seeking to maintain its friends in their positions of privilege, is trying to build up that combination of autocracy in government and autocracy in industry which must prove disastrous to the well-being of a state. In industry there are four factors which are entitled to consideration: Labour is entitled to consideration as well as capital; the community is entitled to consideration as well as managerial ability, and all four are necessary to the carrying on of industry. Give to the workingmen of the country a larger voice in the determining of policies which affect the conditions under which they have to work and earn their wages. Give to the community a larger say in regulating prices, in preventing profiteering, and in restricting combines, and our industrial future will be safe and secure.

But, Sir, in case I have not answered my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) sufficiently in regard to what he quoted from these special reports, let me give him an authority which I hope he will respect. It relates to what I said a moment ago about considering the well-being of all instead of the well-being of a privileged few. When my right hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) was Acting Prime Minister, he asked permission to place on Hansard—because of its great importance— a document of vast significance. It was the declaration of the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference in regard to the economic conditions of the world. Let me read what my right hon. friend said in asking permission of the House to place this document on record. Here is my right hon. friend's statement as reported in Hansard of May 3, 1920:

I desire to call the attention of hon. members to a certain matter, and with the assent of the

House, to make a motion thereon. The reason therefor is briefly this: I hold in my hand a declaration made by the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference on the economic conditions of the world. It is a recent compilation by an authority which is at the centre of things in Europe, and which has very wide sources of information, and being a pronouncement of that body on the present economic conditions in the world, it seems to me that it would be well to give it as great publicity and attention as possible. The motion I propose to make is that this declaration, which is not a very lengthy one, be recorded in Hansard so that it may come into possession of members of the House and be studied by them. I think it would have an even wider effect by being so published; it would be drawn to the attention of the press of the Dominion generally. It would be of the very greatest benefit to our people throughout the whole country if the statements contained in the declaration were brought to their attention and studied. They go to the very foundation of existing troubles and they end with a certain number of recommendations, or suggestions, and it would be a most excellent thing if we all took them into our consideration.

Now what does this declaration of the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference say? I have not the time to read it all, but does it say—as my hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior, says—"Protect this particular industry and restrict trade so far as possible," or does it say, "Make trade as free as you can between different countries and industries thereby helping world development in freedom of exchange?" I shall quote from the document itself. Here are some pertinent passages:

In the sub-joined review of the position, the conference indicates the lines on which it considers that a solution of the problem can best be found. . . .

The first step to the reconstruction of Europe is to complete the process of demobilization in all countries, to resume the full employment in peaceful pursuits of the whole of the able-bodied population, and to encourage by every means the normal interchange of their products.

Then elsewhere it says:

—the output of factories and manufacturing industries throughout the world is below the standard which prevailed before the war, and far below the demands now made upon them. The net result of under-production arising from these various causes is an acute shortage of the essential supplies on which the economic life of Europe depends. . . .

This situation requires to be met with the same courage as was displayed on both sides during the war. The energy which was then thrown into the production of foodstuffs must be revived and redoubled in order to restore the situation. It must be made a point of honour with the tillers of the soil in every country to show that peace can extract from nature more than war. Europe must take measures to provide herself more largely with the food she requires in order that she may resume her full activities, and much can be effected if the necessary preparations are made without delay. . . .

In regard to industry generally, each Government must take steps to impress on its people that the limitation of production directly assists the upward movement of prices, and that it is by increasing production that they can best help to solve the problem. Every proposal which may assist in this direction deserves the closest attention. . . .

Governments must co-operate in the reconstruction of the common economic life of Europe, which is vitally interrelated, by facilitating the regular interchange of their products and by avoiding arbitrary obstruction of the natural flow of European trade. . . .

The demand not only for foodstuffs, but for clothing, boots and other manufactured articles, is in most countries far in excess of the supply, while luxuries of every kind command a readier sale than at almost any previous period. . . .

It is essential to the recovery of Europe that the manufacture of additional paper money and Government credits should be brought to an end, and this must be effected as soon as the war expenditure has been terminated.

Excessive profit making, commonly known as profiteering, has resulted from the scarcity of goods. Deflation and a check upon the continuous rise of prices will do much in itself to end the conditions that make profiteering possible. But it is essential, in order to obtain the co-operation of all classes in the increase of production, that each government should take such steps as are appropriate to the circumstances of its own people to assure and guarantee to the workers that the burdens that they are called upon by their efforts to remedy are not aggravated by those who would exploit the economic difficulties of Europe for their own personal ends. . . . .

That the states which have been created or enlarged as the result of the war should at once re-establish full and friendly co-operation, and arrange for the unrestricted interchange of commodities in order that the essential unity of European economic life may not be impaired by the creation of artificial economic barriers.

There is the report which my right hon. friend, when Acting Prime Minister, caused to be placed on Hansard. There is the report of the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference which he says goes to the very foundations of existing troubles. And the whole tenor of that report is to make the natural flow, or interchange, as between different countries and different industries just as free as it can possibly be made.

Now, Sir, let me speak more particularly in reference to the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) which is before the House. Unless I have altogether failed in making apparent what I believe to be most necessary in this country at the present time, not only because of Canadian needs but also because of the world situation to-day, it will be evident that above all else we should have a policy which will help reduce the high cost of living and increase production. If we take the resolution of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), we shall immediately see

that its whole aim and purpose is to call upon the Government to take immediate steps here and now to relieve the problem of the high cost of living by reducing the duties on the necessities of life, and to make possible increased production by reducing the duties on the instruments of production. That purpose is stated in general terms, but that is the real significance of the amendment.

Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to take considerable satisfaction in pointing out the differences in points of view to which expression has been given by hon. members on this side of the House when speaking on the fiscal question; and their party press has been deliberately trying to emphasize those differences. They seem to think it is remarkable that in a large body of men representative of every section of the country and engaged in different activities there should be differences in point of view in regard to what attitude should be taken by the Government toward one industry or another under certain circumstances, or regardless of circumstances altogether. Let me say to my hon. friends opposite that weakness does not lie in differences in point of view where there is an honest expression of opinion, it is not uniformity of opinion that marks the robust and vigorous mind. The weakness that is truly weakness is that type of mind which will not admit into the regions of its thought any views other than those which agree with its own, and which therefore cannot entertain any really honest differences of opinion. The only weakness which I can see in the expression of opinion whatever it may be, is where opinions are expressed that are not in the public interest, and which are dictated by personal considerations. But let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if it is united action they are looking for, they will not have very long to wait; as soon as this amendment is put to the vote they will find that every member on this side of the House without exception will vote in favour of it.

Why is that? Because the amendment expresses what is the view entertained generally by the people of this country. It is perfectly true that the amendment does not express all that every member on this side of the House would like it to express; it does not go the length of certain of my hon. friends on this side who incline towards an extreme of free trade, if you will, or towards an extreme of protection. I am perfectly free to admit to hon. gentlemen opposite that on this side of the House we have some men who hold quite extreme views on the fiscal question one way and the other. But this I would point out, that while individually they hold extreme views, they are men enough to give up those extremes and unite on ground which is common and which they feel to be in the public interest; and so long as they are prepared to do that, so long are they serving the public interest. It is out of differences of opinion—strong differences of opinion if you will, held by men of one particular attitude of mind and by men of another particular attitude of mind that in the last analysis we resolve what is best in the public interest. Nothing is ever gained in the long run by countenancing extremes, and sooner or later all men realize that the only road of progress is by taking the moderate course.

So while hon. members on this side of the House, as I have said, may not all agree in detail with everything that hon. friends opposite would like them to favour in regard to fiscal matters, nevertheless they are, I believe, agreed on this —that what is most needed is expressed in the amendment: an immediate reduction in customs duties in a manner which will help relieve the high cost of living, and also free the instruments of production, so as to make possible an increase of production in this country.

And, Sir, they had a right to expect that the Government would introduce something of this kind, for two reasons: In the first place, because at a previous session the Government had intimated that legislation to that end would be introduced. But what has the Government done to fulfil its promise? It has taken the promissory note of one minister and in exchange for it has given the promissory note of another minister. But of what use are the promissory notes of the Government? As my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) said in his resolution, they have failed to implement the promise which they made at a previous session that a general revision of the tariff would be made at the following session.

Let me read from the amendment these words which constitute its substantive part:

"That in view of the continued increase in the high cost of living, of the greatly increased burden of taxation, of the hardship which many of the people suffer from these causes, and the unrest naturally arising therefrom; and in view of the desirability of adopting measures to increase production and effect such relief to consumers and producers as may be within the power of Parliament, the House is of opinion that, pending a wider revision of the tariff,

substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation should be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance; first, diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; second, reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country."

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) asked: Why did the Opposition not bring in the tariff platform laid down by the Liberal party at its last convention? I will give my hon. friend the answer. In bringing in this amendment the Opposition were anxious to have the Government realize that they were placing before the Government that which could be done here and now, and that which should be done here and now. Had the Opposition brought in the platform of the Liberal party regarding the tariff as laid down at the convention, my hon. friend would have been the first to get on his feet and say to hon. gentlemen "the Opposition have brought in a platform which is intended as a party platform, and which they know very well that we on this side cannot be expected to carry out at a particular session." My hon. friend would have said that we had designedly brought before this House something which it was impossible to have immediately carried out, and that in that way we had been trying to play fast and loose with the Administration.

I tell my hon. friend that we are wholly sincere when we say that the people today are demanding an immediate reduction of the duties on these necessities of life, an immediate reduction of the duties on instruments of production These two things should be done here and now. They are a fundamental part of the Liberal platform as laid down at the Liberal convention. We say to the Government: Do not delay; act immediately in reference to this resolution.

Now, Sir, let me say again that the whole effort on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite—and it is an old trick and a common one—has been to point to the differences between the opinions expressed by individual members and to say nothing whatever about the ground which is held in common and for which all are prepared to fight. They have made a great deal of the differences of opinion expressed in this debate, but they have said very little about the unanimity of opinion that prevails in regard to this particular resolution. The same kind of tactics have been adopted with reference to what took place at the Liberal convention. Were there differences of opinion at the Liberal convention in regard to the tariff? Certainly there were. What would any hon. gentleman expect of a gathering composed of representatives from all parts of Canada representing all the different provinces, all the different industries and classes in the community; men and women from the Prairie Provinces; from the rural districts and urban centres of Ontario and Quebec; men and women from British Columbia and from the Maritime Provinces? There they were assembled for three days, discussing questions of interest to this country representing all the different interests and views of the people of the particular districts whence they came. They discussed the tariff issue; they came there for the purpose of discussing it amongst other things. It was known for months that the convention was to be called and that the drafting of a platform on the question of the tariff as well as on other questions would be one of its most important concerns. Was that gathering like a collection of Egyptian mummies? Was it of men whose minds were all cast in the same mould? Was it of men whose individualities and personalities shrivelled and shrank into nothing under the glance of a Prime Minister or the edict of a Government? No; they were free men, discussing freely their views, trying to arrive at a common basis of understanding in regard to what was most in the interests of the people as a whole. You had there exactly what you have here,—some taking extreme views in one direction, others taking extreme views in another direction. But, Sir, you had the splendid spectacle of that vast assemblage of men and women standing up as one and approving the platform of the Liberal party.

If my hon. friends opposite wish to know what was the resolution with regard to the tariff adopted at that convention and where I stand in reference to that resolution, let me read it to them at this point. Let me do so more particularly for this reason: The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) the other day read from a paper published in the Maritime Provinces, the name of which he did not give, an article in which it was said that in the Maritime Provinces I was advocating free trade. I have never advocated free trade anywhere. I told my hon. friend at the time that what I did in the Maritime Provinces was to read from the platform of the Liberal Party as laid down at that

convention. But my hon. friend went on to say that I had said one thing in the Maritime Provinces, and he gathered that when I got up to speak here I would say something else and that possibly when I went out to the West I would say something different there,—in other words, that I would be "all things to all men." Well, it is perhaps natural for my hon. friend and some of his associates who call themselves Liberals but who sit as members of a Tory administration under the name of Unionists to think that they can be all things to all men. It would take a greater than St. Paul to play that role with satisfaction in the administration opposite. I have no desire to imitate any behaviour of that kind. Hon. gentlemen are only deceiving themselves if they think that they can be all things to all men; that they can remain Liberals and yet hold the views expressed by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) during the course of this debate and applauded so vigorously by so many hon. gentlemen opposite. I have only one message to give from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I would not be worthy of the trust reposed in me by members of the party with which it is my privilege to be associated in the position that at the moment I hold, were I to be one thing at one time and another thing at another time. Sir, I was chosen for the responsible duties that I am seeking to discharge at the Liberal convention at which the platform of the Liberal party was laid down, and by that platform I intend to stand or fall. The resolution on the tariff was as follows:

That the best interests of Canada demand that substantial reductions of the burdens of customs taxation be made with a view to the accomplishing of two purposes of the highest importance: First: diminishing the very high cost of living which presses so severely on the masses of the people; Second: reducing the cost of the instruments of production in the industries based on the natural resources of the Dominion, the vigorous development of which is essential to the progress and prosperity of our country.

That, to these ends, wheat, wheat flour and all products of wheat; the principal articles of food: farm implements and machinery; farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and repair parts thereof; rough and partly dressed lumber; gasoline, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils; nets, net-twines and fishermen's equipments; cements and fertilizers, should be free from customs duties, as well as the raw material entering into the same.

That a revision downwards of the tariff should be made whereby substantial reductions should be effected in the duties on wearing apparel and footwear, and on other articles of general consumption (other than luxuries), as well as on the raw material entering into the manufacture of the same.

That the British preference be increased to 50 per cent of the general tariff.

And the Liberal party hereby pledges itself to implement by legislation the provisions of this resolution when returned to power.

Supplementing that resolution is a resolution on reciprocity proclaiming the faith that the Liberal party had in that arrangement as it was introduced, expressing regret that opportunity was not afforded to this country to obtain the benefits of it, and expressing the hope that the time might yet come when some of the benefits that were hoped for by that measure might yet be gained for the people of Canada. Just in this connection may I direct the attention of the House to what my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) said the other evening. He asserted that most of the things that were asked for under that reciprocity agreement had been granted by the Government of the day. Well, if that is true, what will the Canadian people think of the utterances of hon. gentlemen when in the campaign of 1911 they defeated that agreement on the ground that it was against the interests of Canada? I tell him that their attempt to-day to mislead the people in regard to any of the features of this platform are just as misleading and just as unpatriotic as were their endeavours to mislead the public in regard to the results they allege would be brought about by the reciprocity agreement.

Let me further point out that there is not a line in the resolution adopted by the Liberal convention which has not appeared in resolutions proposed in Parliament from this side prior to the time that the convention was held. There is not a line in the resolution which was not approved and which had not the sanction of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, or which was not advocated by him prior to his death. Indeed, at the very time that he was taken from us he was preparing to give battle to hon. gentlemen opposite on the very issues that are laid down in that platform. The last public address by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, only two or three weeks before his death, was in the main one approving a resolution passed by Eastern Ontario Liberals in words almost identical with the resolution which was adopted at the Liberal convention. If anything were necessary by way of sustaining the wisdom of a policy such as that which is true to the traditions of Liberalism, it would be, as the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has pointed out, the way in which the

Liberal policy which was introduced in 1896 resulted in the prosperity of this country. When the Liberals of 1896 introduced their platform, criticisms were levelled against it much in the nature of the criticisms that have been made against the platform of the Liberal party as adopted at its recent convention. How did that policy work out? True, in some particulars things were not done which might have been done; but let me read to hon. gentlemen, not the words of any one on this side of the House, but the words of an authority whom they will not call in question in regard to what the Liberal party did while in office towards carrying out this policy, and let us see whether or not there is reason to fear that, in the future, should the guidance of affairs be entrusted to the hands of Liberals and those of progressive thought, the affairs of the country will not prosper thereby.

I have in my hand a volume written by Sir John Willison, entitled "Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal Party." Sir John Willison is, I think, at the present time president of the Canadian Reconstruction Association, and hon. gentlemen opposite know that association and understand its purposes. This is what Sir John Willison has to say in regard to the Liberal policy as it was introduced and as it was carried out. The quotation commences on page 288:

These then were the trade issues which entered into the contest of 1896, and this the position of the controversy when the Liberal party came into office in Canada. There was undoubtedly uneasiness among manufacturers and some fear among all classes who were concerned in industrial operations and interested in financial and banking institutions that revolutionary tariff legislation would be introduced, investments prejudiced or destroyed, the business of the country thrown into confusion, labour displaced, and commerce embarrassed and depressed. It is the work of a day to create a protectionist system. It is a delicate and difficult undertaking to scale down duties, and establish freer trade conditions without doing damage and injustice to industries which have been created by tariff legislation. The Liberal ministers were bound in unmistakable pledges to proceed with caution and with deliberation, and they thoroughly understood that violent and inconsiderate action would create commercial instability and panic, revive protectionist sentiment, and discredit the cause of tariff reform. They therefore instituted a tariff commission, which met the manufacturers, traders and producers at various centres throughout the country. The commissioners gave earnest and sympathetic consideration to all reasonable representations, and in the main, the protected interests presented their arguments in cordial, candid, and straightforward fashion. They took it for granted that while the ministers were most concerned to promote the welfare of the masses of the people, they would prefer to benefit rather than to injure established industries, and that enterprise would be recognized and investments protected in so far as the interests of capital and labour and the stability of the commercial fabric demanded. These tariff hearings did much to restore public confidence, and to prepare the country for a progressive but safe and moderate measure of tariff adjustment.

On April 25th, 1897, the new tariff was brought down in Parliament, and it is not exaggeration to say that no fiscal measure of more far-reaching significance was ever framed by a Canadian Ministry. It gave substantial relief to consumers and producers.

It gave what we are seeking to-day—a tariff in the interests of consumers and producers, a tariff that will bring relief to both consumers and producers.

It was a bold step in Imperial unity. It introduced the principle of minimum and maximum tariffs, and practically adopted the Davies resolution of 1892 in favour of preferential treatment of British products. In brief, the iron and steel duties were reduced from $1.50 to $1.00 a ton, and the bounty increased by $1.00 a ton. The taxes on barb wire and binder twine were abolished. Corn was placed on the free list. The flour duty was reduced. There was a reduction equal to 22 per cent of the duties on refined sugar. Duties on the raw material of many farm necessaries were reduced. The tax on uncleaned rice was increased, as were also the taxes on liquor and tobacco. There was a general substitution of ad valorem for specific duties, and this also involved substantial reduction of imposts. The classifications were reduced and simplified. Provision was made that the duties on goods produced under trusts and combinations could be summarily reduced or abolished. There was also, as the distinguishing feature of the measure, an immediate reduction of 12½ per cent on British goods, and provision for a further reduction to 25 per cent on July 1st, 1898. In a few cases, particularly in cottons, the duties were increased, but this seemed to be necessary in order to give fair scope for the reduction of 25 per cent on goods admitted under the special tariff. This special tariff was not, as then framed, a direct discrimination in favour of Great Britain. The German and Belgian treaties, which will be discussed later, disabled Canada from such direct discrimination in favour of the mother country. It was therefore provided that the minimum tariff should apply to any country which admitted the goods of Canada at rates as low or lower than were prescribed by the special schedules. This limited the application of the special tariff to Great Britain and New South Wales, and providing Canada could secure relief from British favoured nation treaties, accomplished the purpose of the Canadian Government. It is convenient to say now that in 1898 West India sugar was admitted into Canada at the lower rate of taxation, and that in 1900 the duties on British goods were further reduced from 25 per cent to 33⅓ per cent below the figures of the general tariff.

The country received the general provisions of the new tariff with marked favour and the British preference with positive enthusiasm. The Conservative attack was directed against the constitutional aspects of the measure rather than against its readjustments of the scale of taxation. It is true that at the moment it was denounced as a deadly blow at important Canadian industries. But when it was found that

trade prospered, industries flourished, and new life was infused into all the channels of Canadian commerce, ground was shifted, and it was thought better to describe the new fiscal policy as a practical ratification of the old protectionist system. In fact, the measure has never been subjected to any consistent line of attack. It is sometimes denounced as unduly favourable to the United States, sometimes as calculated in its practical operation to crush out Canadian industries in order to facilitate British imports, sometimes as unmitigated protection. There is no doubt that the principle of protection still remains in the tariff, and that a measure of advantage is undoubtedly retained for Canadian manufacturers and producers. This is inevitable under any tariff designed to raise the revenues necessary to the financial needs of the country, and is perhaps essential to the growth and stability of commercial and manufacturing operations in Canada in face of the American method of slaughtering goods in outside markets and the lower freight rates enjoyed by many American exporters as against the charges exacted by the Canadian railways for the carriage of Canadian products. Great distances and a small population compel some of these inequalities, and twenty years of extreme protection necessarily brought into existence many industries which could not meet low tariff conditions, and could not be summarily subjected to the free and unobstructed competition of British and foreign manufacturers. Practical statesmen must deal in a practical way with existing conditions, and aside from considerations of prudence and equity, the leaders of the Liberal party were doubly pledged against rash and revolutionary legislation.

But it is vain to argue that the Fielding tariff was not a substantial measure of reform. The special tariff on British goods materially encouraged and cheapened importations from Britain, and many of the duties on farm supplies and household necessaries were lowered, to the advantage alike of the consumers and the revenue. In fact, if the British preference had not been introduced as the essential feature of the tariff, it would probably have been attacked as a relentless free trade measure, and have evoked the strenuous and enduring hostility of the protectionist classes.

It goes on to say something further in regard to the views which the English people had and ends with these words which are a quotation from an English economist:

> At the present moment it would be a step backward if taken by the mother country; it is a step forward when taken by Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman desire to conclude before six o'clock?

Mr. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: If hon. members are willing to wait, I shall endeavour to conclude in a few minutes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Go on while you have steam up.

Mr. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: What was recognized in England as well as in Canada at that time was that the step was in the right direction, but it was not regarded as the last and only step. It was not so regarded by Sir Wilfrid himself. What were the outstanding features in the record of the Liberal party while in office? First, substantial reductions in duties in a number of directions and upon a number of occasions; then the introduction of the British preference and an increase in that preference; then a fight for freer trade on the reciprocity platform. While the Liberal party has not stood for free trade it has stood for freer trade; and while free trade is not possible, in view of conditions as they are in Canada at the present time, and is not being advocated, so far as I am aware, by any political party in this country, that is no reason why, as regards the necessities of life, we should not have cheaper food and cheaper clothing and cheaper shelter, if it is possible to have these things, and at the same time get what we need in the way of revenue through such a tariff as it may be expedient to impose.

What was the attitude of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in regard to what had been done under the Fielding tariff? I have here a copy of a speech delivered by Sir Wilfrid at Hamilton on the 27th November, 1913, nearly seven years ago. At that time the Liberal party was fighting for free food and freer trade, just as to-day it is fighting for the same things. What did Sir Wilfrid say at that time? And if his words had force seven years ago how much greater force have they to-day in view of the changed conditions which the war has occasioned? These are his words:

> I told you at the beginning that new problems are continually arising; there are latent forces which, unnoticed, silent and unforeseen, work out problems which were never dreamed of. This is one of them. In this city of Hamilton, which to-day, as I understand, prides itself on a population of over 100,000, go into the homes of the workingmen and mechanics, of the clerk in the drygoods store and the clerk in the warehouse, even the professional man and the clergyman, and the question which is discussed at this moment is not the price of dreadnoughts; it is the problem of making ends meet as between expenditure and income. "It is true I might say something about reciprocity," commented Sir Wilfrid, "but I have no recriminations to make. The problem is before us. Let us bury the past and look to the future. There our duty lies. The situation requires action, prompt, unhesitating action. The policy I give you at this moment, the policy I believe every patriot in Canada ought now to support, and the policy I believe it to be the duty of the Government to immediately inaugurate, is a policy of absolutely free food—food free from customs duty. It will be said to me," the Liberal leader continued, reasoning out his proposals: "If you advocate that policy do you not advocate a revision of the tariff to that extent? Certainly I do. But

somebody will tell me that the tariff which is in force to-day is the Fielding tariff of 1897. So it is, but the Fielding tariff was made for the needs of that time, not for all eternity. It has been the policy of the Liberal party at all times to stand so far as possible for stability in tariff, but when the needs of the people call for action, action must be taken."

Now, Sir, that was the view which Sir Wilfrid Laurier expressed when leading the Liberal party, namely, that while there was reason to be proud of the golden era of prosperity, which marked the fifteen years the Liberals were in office there was yet need for action. New occasions bring new duties. Changes have come about within the last few years such as the world has never witnessed heretofore, and the need for relieving the high cost of living and for increasing production is greater than ever in the past. And while we as Liberals are proud of the record of Liberalism, going down to defeat fighting for free food and freer trade, we are determined as Liberals to keep up this fight on behalf of the people and to take up the flag where the Old Chief left it, and see that it is not furled until victory is won.

Let me say just a few words in conclusion. Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to make capital out of the differences of view that have been expressed in reference to details by Liberals here in this House, and at the Liberal convention, but they have overlooked the important fact that there is common ground on which all of us stand. Hon. gentlemen are trying to do the same thing to-day in reference to the platforms of different political parties in this country. I have a copy of the platform of the Farmers' party and a copy of the platform of the Independent Labour party. Hon. gentlemen opposite have drawn attention to differences between the Liberals and the Farmers and the Labour men. Well, Sir, there are differences to which hon. gentlemen can point, but I can tell my hon. friends opposite this, which is a fact of far greater significance, that there is common ground on which the members of those parties can unitedly stand. You will find in the Farmers' platform, in the Labour platform, and in the Liberal platform, the common demand for a reduction of the duties on the necessaries of life. You will find in all three platforms a demand that the duties should be taken off the instruments of production so that greater production may be possible. These demands, Mr. Speaker, represent the outstanding needs of the country to-day, and on these great fundamental needs we are united.

Let me address a word to my hon. friends in the Farmers' party and to my hon. friends of the workingmen's party, and let me address the same word to the people of this country: Take note of the things that you have in common and observe the tactics of the enemy you have also in common. These tactics are wholly apparent. We have seen privilege protected in almost every speech that has been made from the other side in the course of this debate. We have seen hon. gentlemen opposite seek to point to some differences that exist between men of common thought and common feeling in other respects. What do these tactics signify? They are an endeavour to keep the host in opposition divided. Hon. gentlemen opposite are saying to themselves: "We can hold all the positions of privilege so long as men who are united in thought and feeling on certain common ground can be kept apart from one another and prevented from uniting in a common effort to gain a common end." These are the barbed wire entanglements by which the party of privilege would seek to keep separated men of liberal thought and feeling in this country, and to keep them from uniting on the ground which they have in common. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) said that the purpose of the amendment was to unite these different groups. Let me tell my hon. friend that if that was its purpose, there could not have been a worthier one than to seek to give expression, in one voice, to the sentiments of three great elements. What is the object of hon. gentlemen opposite? It is to keep the progressive hosts who oppose them disunited. Word has gone out from their headquarters urging the necessity of this action and also the need of filling the war chest with gold. There are announcements already of a fund for propaganda purposes that is to run up into millions of dollars. Mention has been made in the press of such a fund for such purposes and the Government in power purposes to hold on for a couple of years and by so doing give this insidious propaganda ample opportunity to do its work. I would urge all men who think and feel alike on the great questions which affect the well-being of the Canadian people, and who deplore conditions for which the Government are responsible, to take note of the tactics of the common enemy. No matter by what name they may call themselves, whether it be Liberal, Grit, Reformer, Liberal-Unionist, Farmer or Labour, if they think and feel alike, as men who are interested in

the welfare of the great mass of men and women in this country, they should stand together where it is possible for them so to do, and fight to a successful finish the great issues that face them.

My hon. friend (Mr. Meighen—I refer to him again because he has been the chief exponent of the views of the Government in this debate—has given his interpretation of the attitude of gentlemen on this side of the House. In Hansard of May 25, 1920, will be seen his characterization of the Opposition.

> We are opposed by two wings of wholly opposite views on the tariff, two wings, however, that gather around the motion of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), two wings that hope to go before the people of this country fighting under two flags and under two leaders, to make the pretence all the better, but who hope afterwards to coalesce and entwine the two flags into one in an infamous unity, who hope after taking one camp of public opinion behind them and the opposite camp as well, to the utmost of their power to end up by deceiving both, by betraying both, because they must either deceive the one or double deceive the other.

May I say to my hon. friend that there is no deception as to the attitude of hon. gentlemen on this side. We of the Liberal party have our programme, we have right with us and we are prepared to work with the men and women who feel and think as we do. But we are prepared to carry on our work and we will carry it on regardless of the attitude of any others because we are of a party which has a tradition of 100 years to maintain, a tradition of 100 years of advance and progress to greater liberty and freedom. We will strive and seek to make our policies prevail. But may I say to my hon. friend in all kindness: Be careful, "judge not that ye be not judged." Let me repeat my hon. friend's characterization with its bearing upon the Government of which he is a member as respects the action of the government prior to the last election when he and his party came together with their two flags.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One flag.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In the Prairie Provinces my hon. friend and the Hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) were out, he the one leader, and the Hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization the other; in Ontario the Hon. the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) was leading one host and the right Hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) leading the other; in the province of Quebec the Hon. the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) was the one leader and the Hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin) the other; in the Maritime Provinces there were those who led the men and women of one party and those who led the men and women of the other. What was the motive? I will leave the country to judge. Let me read to my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) his own words as they apply to the Government at the present time:

> We are opposed by two wings of wholly opposite views on the tariff—

It was not the motion of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's then; it was the winning of the war.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Quite right, quite right; but let us see what follows:

> —two wings that hope to go before the people of this country fighting under two flags and under two leaders, to make the pretence all the better, but who hope afterwards to coalesce and entwine the two flags into one in an infamous unity, who hope after taking one camp of public opinion behind them and the opposite camp as well, to the utmost of their power to end up by deceiving both, by betraying both, because they must either deceive the one or double deceive the other.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I can let this matter rest here. My hon. friend is quite ready to impute motives to others. Perhaps he spoke a little too much out of his own consciousness when he so imputed motives to us.

All I shall say in conclusion is this. If in 1917 the people entrusted two different wings with power, which they did for the purpose of winning the war, they find them to-day united into one solid body unwilling longer to listen to the voice of the people. They will not listen to the verdict of the people as expressed in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, all the different centres in which there have been by-elections. We have a ministry which is unwilling to have the cabinet representative of Labour or of the returned soldiers in this House or to give representation in the cabinet to the Eastern Provinces of the Dominion, we have a ministry which has taken from the start a most autocratic stand in dealing with public questions. Surely we have come to the moment when in the great work of reconstruction a ministry that ignores the people and has no policy to propose should be compelled to give to the people opportunity to say whether or not they wish to have the affairs of this country any longer conducted by men who have lost the public confidence, or conducted by those who seek to express in

legislation the wishes of the people in regard to the needs of the hour and the problems of the day.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council: As I listened this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, with increasing admiration to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) who reviewed the whole course of this debate during the past two weeks; took an intimate survey of our political history from 1893 up to the present time; looked forward into the future and discussed social and economic questions, and entered into a discussion of the relative merits of protection and free trade, or rather the real merits of moderation, I was forcibly reminded of a passage of Scripture which I should like to commend to the attention of the hon. leader of the Opposition. In that hon. gentleman's absence, and as this passage is from the Old Testament, I shall ask my hon. friend the member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) to bring it to his leader's notice. The passage I refer to will be found in Leviticus, 19:9:10:

> And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest.
>
> And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard neither shalt thou gather every grape of thy vineyard; thou shalt leave them for the poor and for the stranger:—

If I do not follow the example of my hon. friend in endeavouring to glean the whole harvest of the land and to gather every grape of the vineyard, it is out of consideration for the feelings of hon. members who desire to reach a decision on this question some time to-night or early to-morrow morning. I mention this because if I fail to touch all the points of attack or criticism of the Government made by the leader of the Opposition, it is not because I should not be glad to meet them and answer them on any occasion, but it is because I do not feel justified in taking up the necessary time to deal with those points in detail. I may, however, Mr. Speaker, I think appropriately touch on a few of his criticisms, and I shall deal with them rather as samples of the whole and as indicating the position and attitude of the Government in reference to them.

The hon. leader of the Opposition in paying a well-deserved tribute to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) on the preparation and presentation of his Budget Speech quite properly pointed out that conditions to-day differ very materially from war conditions;—that in the efforts of the Government to secure the necessary financial support during the period of the war they had the earnest and whole-hearted support of the people, but now we were getting back to peace conditions, and we have in Canada as in all the countries engaged in the war, that unrest, dissatisfaction and irritation which spring to some extent at least from exhausted nervous vitality and which make the problems of government even more difficult than during the war.

But, while that is true, I think neither my hon friend the leader of the Opposition, nor the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) in discussing a similar point when moving his amendment, did justice to my hon. friend the former Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) in regard to his administration of the finances of the country during the war. Now that the war is over and victory has been achieved it is very easy to find fault; it was a different thing in the days of stress and struggle when the country was in need of funds and it was essential that money should be forthcoming if the men at the Front were to be sustained and Canada was to prosecute the war to a successful issue, —I say it was a different matter then to secure the needed funds; and I think we should all be very glad to pay our tribute of admiration to the former Minister of Finance for the manner in which he handled the financial situation of that time. As I have said, I agree with my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that it is more difficult to deal with the question of imposing increased burdens of taxation now than it was during the war period. As he has said, we then had the enthusiasm of the people behind us; now there is a degree of unrest, and if Canada is to discharge her obligations it is necessary that the people should be asked to assume additional burdens of taxation. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the minds of the people should not be poisoned with mis-information in reference to our financial position and the manner in which the Government has expended the nation's money. And my contention is this, Mr. Speaker, that in imposing these new burdens upon the people in order that Canada

may do her duty the Government, instead of having the support and co-operation of hon. gentleman opposite is met with carping criticism of the manner in which the finances of the country have been handled, and has been charged, if not with mis-application of public funds, at least with grossly reckless and wasteful mis-management.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friends say "hear, hear." I want to deal with some of those points to-night. The hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), held a brief for the Opposition in criticising the Government's expenditures of the past year. While we have had general criticism from the opposite side of the House, the member for Antigonish and Guysborough has ventured to go into details and to set out certain specific charges upon which the Opposition wished to stand in its attack upon our financial administration. And the hon. leader of the Opposition this afternoon gave his benediction to the hon. member, and stated that he had set forth the Opposition's criticism of the Government, and commended that criticism to the attention of the House and the country and virtually made it his own. I want to deal briefly with that criticism to-night.

First, the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough spoke of the increased public debt. They said that the public debt had been increased during the past year at the rate of over $1,000,000 a day, and they described that as wasteful and reckless extravagance. They were quite prepared to allow an increase of the public debt during the war, but they asked: Why increase the public debt after the war? Does not every hon. member know, Mr. Speaker, that last year this House voted $350,000,000 for completing the war services, for demobilization and bringing our men back from overseas and returning them to their homes? The increased public debt last year was the further instalment paid by our people for the defence of their country and the work of demobilization. The whole increase of the public debt was for expenditures under the demobilization vote and certain investments the Government made in connection with credits to foreign countries, as I am advised by the Minister of Finance. There was no increase in the public debt in connection with the ordinary expenditure of the country; nay, more—the revenues exceeded the ordinary expenditure by nearly $39,000,000.

Then, the hon. member's second charge was that the Government had increased the expenditure during the fiscal year just ended by more than $100,000,000 over that of the previous year—"yet they talk of economy," he says. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether the amounts that go to make up that $100,000,000 increase are expenditures to which they are opposed? If so, they are justified in criticising the expenditure, but if not, then I ask is it fair and just to the people of Canada to make any such statement or offer any such criticism, to say nothing of the Government and members on this side of the House? What are the items that make up that $100,000,000? The first is: Increased interest on the public debt because of the war expenditure of Canada, $31,000,000. Do my hon. friends say that that debt should not have been incurred to enable Canada to do her share in the war? Do they say that Canada should not pay the interest on that debt? Do they say that that is not a proper increase in the charges on the country, and that it is not proper to provide increased revenues to meet it?

Let me take the next item: Increase in pensions, $7,717,000. Do hon. members opposite put themselves on record as opposed to that increase in pensions? If they are not opposed to it, then why have they not the manliness to get up and retract the criticisms they have made? My hon. friend opposite laughs, but the women and children who get the benefit of these pensions do not laugh. The next item is $49,000,000, Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. That amount is not wholly an increase; in the previous year the expenditure for Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment formed part of the war vote and did not enter into the general current expenditures of the country. Do hon. gentlemen opposite wish to go on record as opposing this item? The next item is Soldiers Land Settlement $2,692,000. Do hon. members opposite say that the Government should not be making these advances and carrying on this work to enable the soldiers to settle on the land? I will give you only one more: Civil Service bonus, $9,497,000—to the civil servants in all sections of Canada to meet the increased cost of living. Mr. Speaker, the five items I have mentioned make up approximately $100,000,000, the increased public expenditure of which my hon. friends have complained. I say to my hon. friends on the other side: Are you opposed to that increase in the public expenditure last year? If you are, then you are perfectly justified in criticising.

Mr. McKENZIE: Order.

Mr. ROWELL: I say it through you, Mr. Speaker, to my hon. friends opposite. If they are opposed to that increase in the public expenditure, made up as I have stated, then they are perfectly justified in criticising; but if they are not opposed to these items of public expenditure, is it fair to send the charge throughout the country that the Government has been reckless in its expenditure of public money and in increasing the expenditure last year by $100,000,000?

The next item my hon. friend takes exception to is a much smaller one—but sometimes (you know) you can awaken more interest in the public mind in a small item than in a large one. I am, therefore, going to take up one or two small items, particularly as some reference was made to them this afternoon by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough referred to an item of $200,000 as being the expenditure of the Department of Public Information. He stated that this department was organized for political purposes and for no other purpose, and that:

> Whatever value it may have had as a political agency to assist the Union Government, he would be a bold man who would say that it was worth two hundred cents to the people of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friends say "hear, hear." I say, Mr. Speaker, that the statement that the department was organized for political purposes is absolutely devoid of a shadow of truth. So far as I am aware there was no country at war the Government of which did not have some kind of an organization or department for the purpose of keeping the people of the country informed as to the war efforts of that Government and of that country, in order to sustain the courage and patriotism of the people and assist in the prosecution of the war.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ROWELL: Well, perhaps my hon. friends did not need anything to sustain their courage in the war.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to analyse a little bit—

Mr. CAHILL: Say it again. Try it again.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. ROWELL: I am afraid that even if I tried it again it would not penetrate the mind of my hon. friend. I want to deal with the items covered by that $200,000. The first, and one of the most important, was an amount to provide for the cabling to England of news to be published in the Daily Record for our troops overseas. One-eighth of the total expenditure of that department was covered by cable tolls in sending news overseas, in order that the boys at the front might have some knowledge of what was going on at home and some tidings concerning their friends in the home-land.

Mr. CAHILL: Especially during the election.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must ask any hon. member who has anything to say, or a question to put, to do the House the courtesy of rising and addressing the Chair.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LALOR: Do it like a man.

Mr. ROWELL: I have here a large number of testimonials from the soldiers overseas of the value of this Daily Record to the men at the Front and I purpose putting on record, in view of the manner in which this question has been raised, a letter from the commander of the Forces, Lieutenant-General Sir Arthur Currie, written on the day that this publication ceased, in July, 1919. He said:

> As this is to be the last issue of your most interesting periodical, please grant me a small space to extend to you the heartfelt thanks of all Canadina soldiers who have served in France and Belgium for, The Daily Record.
>
> Brimful of selected items of interest from every part of Canada, delivered, as it was, free to us each day in the trenches, it brought a breath of home into our daily lives.
>
> All connected with its conception, its compilation, its issue, and its distribution, are entitled to every credit, and theirs is the consciousness of having done a real service to our soldiers, a service greatly appreciated, and one not likely to be soon forgotten.

The chief credit for this publication belongs to the men overseas, but the Department of Information did supply the news that was sent over, from about January, 1918, until its publication ceased, and paid the expense of cabling the news.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is my hon. friend not aware that that same thing was carried out from the first year of the war, the information being furnished by the Department of Militia?

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) is quite correct. In the early days of the war, he, when Minister of Militia, had news cabled over to the troops at the front. Originally the news was distributed by typewritten bulletins which were posted through the camps. At a later date the Official Record was established and printed, and this printed paper was distributed through the camps. When my hon. friends opposite say that that expenditure was not worth two hundred cents to the people of Canada, I ask them—are they opposed to the expenditure made for the maintenance of the Daily Record for our troops?

Let me take another item that has been the subject of a good deal of comment on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that is the expenditure in connection with the Canadian Official Record which involves one-quarter of the total expense. That was published in order that the people at home might be kept fully informed as to the war activities of the country, as to the Orders in Council, passed by the Government and as to the proceedings taken by the Government in prosecuting the war and the work of demobilization. My hon. friends say—"published to puff the Government or some of its ministers." I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that if you take the Canadian Official Record, you will find a fair and impartial chronicle of the period of the war giving the people of this country the information they needed. In this connection I wish to put on record one letter, not from a friend or supporter of the Government, not from a man who does not know or understand what fairness is in carrying on a journal, but from a man who was a supporter of my hon. friends opposite, a journalist whose ability, whose devotion to their cause no hon. member will question. I refer to the late John T. Hawke, editor of the Moncton Transcript. When Mr. Hawke received from the Department of Public Information notice that the Official Record was being discontinued, he wrote this letter:

November 11,1919.

Replying to yours of the 8th inst. signed by Geo. M. Ker, permit me to say that notwithstanding the fact that many newspapers criticised the Canadian Official Record, yet, personally I regret very much its discontinuance. It was well edited, and presented in a concise form much public information of real value to an editor, the call upon whose time, prevented his digging out the information for himself. As one inclined to support the principles which guided the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, throughout his useful public life, I feel it would be unjust, not to pay a tribute to not merely the Canadian Official Record itself, but as a rule to the editorial judgment and taste, which controlled its selections. Steady improvement marked it to the last issue.

I could continue quoting statements from all parts of Canada, by men of the press, by men connected with public and official bodies, by men at the head of labour organizations, who wrote unsolicited testimony to the department saying that what they wanted was more information; what they needed was fuller knowledge, and the Official Record gave it to them, and therefore, they were strongly in favour of its publication.

Let me mention one other aspect of the work of the department, and then I will pass from this item. In addition to the foregoing, the department issued and published pamphlets relating to the war, among which I shall mention only two—"Canada's War Effort," and "Canada's Part in the War." These pamphlets gave a concise account of what Canada had done in the war in every branch of the service. They were demanded by public school superintendents of the province for distribution to the teachers in the schools in order that those teachers might inform their scholars. The whole work was a campaign of education, so that the young and old alike might be fully posted as to Canada's war effort. Do hon. members say that that money was not well spent? This war was being waged, not merely by the Government, but by the whole people of Canada; every citizen was entitled to know what the Government was doing, and this department was aiding in informing the public in reference to the matter.

The hon. member made a reference to Colonel Cooper, who is head of the Dominion Bureau of Information in New York under the Department of External Affairs. I exceedingly regret that the hon. member for Guysborough and Antigonish (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) is not in the House to-night. He, in effect, suggested that Colonel Cooper had been a deputy returning officer in England in the elections of 1917; that the ballot box under his charge had been stuffed; and that the Government must find him a position and therefore appointed him to that post. The statement is absolutely false; the whole thing is concocted out of whole cloth, and I want to say a word or two in reference to it. Colonel Cooper had been in the Militia of Canada from his early manhood. He served in one of the Toronto regiments. In the fall of 1916 or early in 1917 the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes),

then Minister of Militia, commissioned Col. Cooper to raise a battalion. He raised one of the finest battalions ever raised in Ontario; indeed, no finer battalion ever left the city of Toronto or this province or the shores of Canada than the one Col. Cooper raised. When the Fifth Division was broken up, this battalion had to be disbanded and the soldiers went to other regiments, and Col. Cooper reverted to the rank of major in order to get over to France and take part in the struggle there. He went over and he has a fine record in the war. The hon. member (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) quoted the Order in Council under which Col. Cooper was appointed, and that Order in Council referred back to the Order in Council authorizing the opening of the office. The latter Order in Council shows that in the month of February, 1919, it was decided that an office should be opened. For four months we were trying to get a man thoroughly qualified for the post, a newspaper man with military experience. After consultation with a number of the principal newspaper men in Canada Col. Cooper was sought out because of his qualifications for the service. A cable was sent overseas to ascertain if he was willing to accept, because we thought he was the best man, having had overseas service, to fill the position.

Mr. PROULX: Why the necessity for military experience?

Mr. ROWELL: It is the settled policy of this Government to give returned soldiers the preference in all important positions. When an appointment of this kind was to be made, we felt, if there was a soldier who had served overseas qualified for the post, he should have it, and it was our duty to search him out and find him. Moreover, we believed that, being a soldier with a military record, he could render more efficient service and would have a position and standing in the United States which a mere civilian who had not served in the war would not have, and it would be in the interest of Canada to have him there.

The hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough referring to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment said that a large number of payments had been made to officials which appeared in the Auditor General's Report, as unaccounted for and he cited some twenty or more names with certain amounts set down opposite them and some such words as "unaccounted for," and he sought to convey to the House and to the country the impression that a large number of officials of this department of the Government had received moneys for which they had given no account, and that the Government had not endeavoured to secure an accounting from them. What are the facts? These officials, I think, with scarcely an exception, were military officers or officials of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Department. They were travelling, many of them coming from the Old Country to Canada, others travelling in Canada. They received their travelling expenses before the end of the fiscal year; they had not returned so as to render their account when the financial year closed, and, therefore, the money was unaccounted for. But since then, just as in all cases, the department has taken the matter up and has had the accounts adjusted. My hon. friend would have received the information if he had gone to the department and asked for it, or to the Auditor General and made inquiry to find out with reference to these items.

But without any such inquiry he gives this story to the House.

But the big complaint is the $121,000,000 which it is said has disappeared in some unaccountable way. I want to deal with that because it has formed a subject of discussion and debate in this House. Three hon. members of the Opposition, the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) and the leader of the Opposition himself (Mr. Mackenzie King), have all put themselves back of the statement that the sum of $121,000,000 has disappeared and is not accounted for. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) mentioned this also, but I think it only fair to him to say that he expressly gave the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough as his authority for the statement. Let me quote what the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough said in reference to this matter:

> The amount that has disappeared without any account having been given is, roughly speaking, $121,000,000, and the question is, what has become of this $121,000,000? The minister does not know; the deputy does not know; the department does not know; the Auditor General does not know; and Parliament does not know. There is apparently not a scrap of paper in the possession of the Government to show what has become of that $121,000,000.

The hon. member prefaced that statement by reading a certain letter from the Auditor General written in September, 1917, which had no relation whatever to the item under

consideration, having reference to a wholly different transaction—the overseas payments of a previous year. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a deliberate charge that $121,000,000 of this country's money has disappeared and that there is no record of it, that no one knows what has become of it—that it is utterly unaccounted for. You will be surprised, however, to find that this statement that the money has disappeared is not at all borne out by the Auditor General's Report. I will quote the exact words, because it is important that hon. members should see precisely what the item is. It is to be found on ZZ-228. It is headed:

Overseas Department of Militia and Defence.

It is the only item under that head.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the report?

Mr. ROWELL: The report is for the year ended 31st March, 1919. The item is as follows:

Expenditure by the Chief Paymaster on account of pay and other expenses of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, vouchers for which have not been received.

Observe, Mr. Speaker, that the item does not say "unaccounted for." The words are: "vouchers for which have not been received." Why have they not been received? For three reasons which I shall state. An arrangement was made, for reasons which I shall give, that they should not be sent to Canada. Two ships carrying vouchers had been sunk by German submarines and it was deemed in the public interest that these vouchers should be kept in England until the war was over. Further, by an arrangement to which the Auditor General himself was a party, it was agreed that, instead of sending the vouchers over and attempting to audit the accounts in Canada, building up a special audit staff here to handle these particular accounts, the matter should be dealt with overseas by having there, under the minister, an audit branch which would carry out the audit in England. Who was the Paymaster General? Brigadier-General J. G. Ross of Montreal, the head of the accounting firm of P. S. Ross and Son. I appeal through you, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), who will tell you that there is no more honourable or efficient accountant or auditor in the city of Montreal or in the province of Quebec than Brigadier-General Ross. He was in charge of the pay office and had under him chartered accountants who checked every item in order to see that not a dollar was paid that was not due, thus protecting the public interest. Furthermore, an audit branch was established overseas under Colonel Dowie, a skilled chartered accountant and auditor, who reported direct to the Deputy Minister. And every night when the pay staff left the office, having concluded their work, the audit staff went in and every account was audited. The day's work was audited every night before the staff returned the next day.

Mr. ROBB: May I ask the minister if the auditors, Brigadier-General Ross and Colonel Dowie, were there as official representatives of the Auditor General of Canada?

Mr. ROWELL: No, they were not. Brigadier-General Ross was paymaster of the Canadian forces overseas, and in the performance of his duty was responsible for every dollar expended. My hon. friend knows Brigadier-General Ross. Will he question that gentleman's ability, or his honesty, or his capacity for the performance of those responsible duties? There is no answer. There can, of course, be none, because Brigadier-General Ross stands at the head of his profession, and the Government could not have chosen a better man for the duties which were discharged by him. I shall explain how the work was done, and every commonsense man will realize that the Government took every precaution which a Government could take to prevent the loss of a dollar of the people's money and to see that every dollar reached its proper destination and that not a dollar was wasted. In addition to the audit staff under Colonel Dowie, on the recommendation of the Auditor General, Mr. Sutherland—who has since become Auditor General of Canada—was appointed Assistant Auditor General for the express purpose of visiting the Old Country and examining conditions on the ground with a view to seeing that everything was carried out satisfactorily. Mr. Sutherland spent the greater part of the year 1917 in England, and he visited the Old Country again in 1919, doing that very work. He is not an official of the Government, he is an officer of the Parliament of Canada; he is the Auditor General of Canada and is not removable except by an Order of the Senate and the House of Commons. He is therefore absolutely independent of the Government and hon. gentlemen opposite can go to him and ask him how the work was carried out in England under Brig-

adier-General Ross and Colonel Dowie, and he will tell them that every precaution was taken to protect the public interest and to see that not a dollar of the people's money was misspent.

Mr. VIEN: Were they not obliged to make a detailed report somewhat similar to that which is submitted by the Auditor General of Canada?

Mr. ROWELL: They could not make a detailed audit without sending the vouchers. They did make a monthly report of the disbursements and I am going to inform the House in a few moments what those disbursements were. They made a monthly report to the Auditor General in order that he could keep track of the whole business from month to month, but without sending the vouchers there could be no means of checking the details. Let me say, further, that there is another reason why the vouchers could not be sent. Soldiers returning from the front on furlough or in case of disability or discharge desired to settle their accounts in England. How could they settle those accounts if the vouchers were over here? The soldiers often had doubts about payments of which they had forgotten the details, and the only records the department had were those signed by the soldiers, and they had to be kept for purposes of administration as well as for the other reasons I have mentioned. What the Auditor General's Report means is exactly what it says, that he has not received these vouchers. Any hon. gentleman can get from the Auditor General a full statement in reference to the matter. The vouchers are now here; they have come over since the war and there are a thousand boxes filled with vouchers. There are over 5,000,000 of these vouchers to be gone through if hon. gentlemen wish to go through them. The Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) told me the other day that in his department they had been checking through these vouchers, that they had spent weeks of time and $20,000 in payment of staff and that in the whole time they had only discovered an error of $300. I am going to read a letter from the Auditor General dealing with the matter.

Mr. JACOBS: Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that a very large number of these vouchers had been lost at sea—that they had been torpedoed?

Mr. ROWELL: No, I did not say so. I said that two vessels carrying vouchers had been lost at sea.

Mr. JACOBS: Do I understand that these are duplicate vouchers that are now being received?

Mr. ROWELL: These particular vouchers that have now come over were not lost, of course. The vouchers contained in these thousand boxes were not lost.

Mr. JACOBS: Can we be provided with duplicates of these vouchers as well as the vouchers that were lost at sea?

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot say that, but if my hon. friend will ask the Auditor General he will inform him; I cannot do so. I want to read this letter from the Auditor General dated May 26, 1920, and written to the Minister of Finance in reference to this item:

SIR,—Expenditure by Chief Paymaster, O.M.F.C. in London, $121,640,016.62 shown in Auditor General's Report, 1919—page ZZ 228. The bulk of this is composed of pay and allowances of our troops and separation allowances by dependents amounting to over $102,000,000.

The late Mr. Fraser, Auditor General, visited London at the close of 1916 to look into the matter of accounting and audit. On his return he wrote to Sir Thomas White as follows:

"As instructed in the Order in Council of the 16th September, 1916, I made an examination into the affairs of the Overseas Pay Office, in order to ascertain whether it was advisable to establish a branch of the Auditor General's office in London for a more complete and speedy audit of the war accounts.

After a thorough examination of the system in vogue and consultations with the Chief Paymaster, the General Auditor and members of the staff as well as with the Minister of War for Overseas, I came to the conclusion that certain changes were necessary to safeguard as far as possible, the expenditure of the public funds. One plan was to have certain changes made in the keeping of the accounts and the checking of the same by the existing pay and audit staff and the other, the organization of a large staff at Ottawa for audit purposes. The first plan seemed to me to be the better one, on the ground that it is better to prevent losses before they are made than to discover them afterwards. I want to feel that the work is done in such a manner that I can accept the same with a certain amount of confidence that the losses are reduced to a minimum. A certain amount of loss is inevitable. I found that the Imperial Government with all its experience and a well organized staff of experts are unable to prevent these losses.

A staff sufficient to make a thorough audit would cost at least $300,000 per annum while the recoveries might not be $5,000. It is useless to find out after a man is dead that he has been overpaid.

The changes that I suggested and that have been agreed upon with the Chief Paymaster and General Auditor are such that if faithfully carried out, ought to produce satisfactory results and I propose sending over a representative of this office to see that every reasonable means is taken to secure correctness and to render such assistance as he can to settle such questions as arise from time to time without awaiting for the slow process of submitting them to Ottawa and awaiting replies."

That is what the Auditor General himself says. There are two courses open—to accept the work of the pay and audit staffs over there, subject to certain changes which he said he would direct, or to establish a staff which would cost $300,000. The Auditor General himself recommended that the first course should be pursued because he thought it would save the money of the country.

An hon. MEMBER: Who was the Auditor General then?

Mr. ROWELL: That was Mr. Fraser. This is Mr. Sutherland's letter:

> I was sent to London and spent the greater part of 1917 there, and again in 1919 for some months.
>
> The Pay Office and Audit Office were under the direction of two thoroughly experienced men, viz.: Brigadier General J. G. Ross, (P. Ross & Sons, Montreal) and Col. L. A. Dowie, chartered accountant, Canada and London, with a large staff attached to each office.
>
> An individual ledger account was kept for every man on the overseas forces so that it can readily be seen how impossible it would have been to carry on an audit here.

You see the present Auditor General says it would have been impossible to carry on the audit here.

> It had to be done on the spot and kept up to date. This office was furnished month by month by the Paymaster General with a statement showing the expenditure under various heads, but owing to the risk of loss of vouchers during ocean transport, it was considered advisable to discontinue sending them to Ottawa.

It is not my statement but the Auditor General's statement is that owing to losses through ocean transportation it was considered desirable to discontinue shipping the vouchers. My hon. friend asks: "Why were the Auditor General's requests in the letters of 1917 not complied with"? Because, in view of this German submarine warfare the vouchers upon which the accuracy and certification of the accounts of the Government of Canada in relation to the overseas forces depended were too precious to be at the disposal of German submarines on the Atlantic. Therefore, they were not sent to Ottawa. Then he adds:

> Two shipments were lost in transit. I understand that all Overseas Military Forces of Canada vouchers and records are now in Canada.

I have just one or two further comments to make. The letter which the hon. gentleman referred to as being written in 1917 asking for the vouchers was written while Mr. Sutherland was in England. Mr. Sutherland cannot explain why it was written because he was there at the time as the representative of the Auditor General for the purpose of checking these accounts. He was appointed specially as Assistant Auditor General for the purpose of auditing these accounts. I have given to the House the facts in connection with the whole transaction. I have pointed out that the $102,000,000 was pay and allowances of the men. These payments extend from the first of April, 1918, to the 31st March, 1919. The transaction did not need an explanation. My hon. friends have only to turn up the Auditor General's report. They will find no item in that report for the pay of the men overseas except this item. Did my hon. friend from Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) think that our gallant men went from 1918 to 1919 without pay? There is no other item but this to be found covering the pay of our men overseas. Then I say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough, the hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres, and now the leader of the Opposition, having put themselves behind the statement that the sum of $121,000,000 has disappeared and is unaccounted for—

Mr. DEVLIN: That is right.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend says, "That is right." Does he consider it right that these hon. gentlemen should put themselves behind that false statement?

Mr. DEVLIN: No. I say that is right because the minister has been arguing that the submarine went to the bottom of the sea.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DEVLIN: That is that the vouchers went to the bottom.

Mr. ROWELL: I repeat having put themselves behind a false statement prejudicial to the interests of Canada they should now withdraw it. I have in my hand a statement furnished by the Auditor General of the details of this item, compiled from the returns received by him here in Ottawa, from month to month, during the year, and I will read it, giving only the round numbers so that it may be placed upon Hansard. The statement is as follows:

Department O.M.F.C., page ZZ-228 Auditor General's Report, 1918-19.

Expenditure by Paymaster General—Gross..	$129,308,233 14
Less refunds..	7,668,216 52
	$121,640,016 62

Details of this amount are.—		
Pay and allowances	93,019,592	86
Separation allowances	9,497,120	83
Maintenance of Canadians in non-Canadian hospitals	1,388,597	35
Civilian pay	730,716	25
Food and subsistence	8,267,428	19
Rent, water, light and fuel	862,930	94
Transport and travelling	2,149,085	08
Veterinary equipment, stores and expenses	473,872	44
Ordnance stores and supplies	3,002,124	39
Purchase of remounts	1,159	84
Guns and ammunition	2,770,670	23
Engineer services and works	535,832	75
Clothing and necessaries	929,316	42
Boots	256,638	19
Outfit allowance	1,789,396	70
Drugs and surgical instruments	288,278	26
Printing and stationery	39,930	93
Cables, telegrams, telephones and postage	199,623	39
Conservancy and contingencies	87,853	97
War service gratuities	85,374	39
	$126,375,543	40
Maintenance Canadian troops in France		
Maintenance Canadian troops in England		
Subject to recovery from Imperial Government	705,040	18
	$127,080,583	58
Sundry credits	30,944	71
Carried forward—net expenditure	$127,049,638	87
Paymasters' and Disbursing Officers' cash balances on hand 31st March, 1919, refunded to credit of Receiver General and credited in accounts of 1919-20	2,258,594	27
	$129,308,233	14
Less received from sales and other sources, deposited to credit of Receiver General during 1918-19	7,668,216	52
	$121,640,016	62

Mr. EDWARDS: Another bubble burst.

An hon. MEMBER: Worse than a bubble.

Mr. ROWELL: Now that is the position with reference to that item. I make this appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite. At a time such as this, when the country must impose new obligations, when there must be new burdens of taxation, when my hon. friends find they have made a wholly false charge and false statement, they owe it to themselves, to this House, and to the country to publicly retract and withdraw that statement. It reflects on the credit and honour of our overseas military forces, on the whole of the paymasters' branch; it reflects on the credit and honour of the Auditor General who himself made the arrangement; it reflects of course on the administration of the Government of the day, but that is not so important.

More important by far is the fact that it reflects upon the Dominion of Canada. For if $121,000,000 of the country's money has disappeared without any account for it, it suggests gross incompetence, or maladministration, or graft in handling public funds by your overseas military forces. Therefore I say to my hon. friends opposite that they owe it to the House and to the country to make a public retraction and withdrawal of that statement.

An hon. MEMBER: They do not retract.

Mr. ROWELL: The hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough made one more statement to which I desire to draw attention. He took an answer that was given to a question in reference to appointments to the Civil Service since the Armistice was signed, and he says that the answer shows that 27,130 were appointed, and he assumes that of this number 25,000 are still in the public service. The hon. gentleman estimates that these appointees would get an average of $2,000 apiece and in that case, he says, the addition to our public expenditure on that account for the year would be $50,000,000. He asks, "Is it any wonder that the country is going into debt at the rate of a million a day?" Mr. Speaker, the House and the country will be surprised to learn that the total salaries of the entire Civil Service of Canada, permanent and temporary—I am not now dealing with seasonal employments, that is, men who are employed on ships or otherwise merely for the season, nor am I dealing with the country postmasters paid under different conditions—the total salary bill will not exceed, apart from bonus, $50,000,000. Let me point out the situation: Dealing with the classes that I have mentioned the approximate number of employees, permanent and temporary, at the date of the signing of the Armistice was 43,000. The approximate number of employees, permanent and temporary, of the same classes, on March 20 of the present year, was 48,000, an increase of 5,000. Now let me tell you how that increase arises. There has been an increase of 657 in the Department of Finance caused by the imposition of new forms of taxation. It was absolutely essential that the necessary staff should be appointed in order to administer those laws. There has been an increase of 1,257 in the Soldiers' Settlement Board, and it was absolutely essential that that board should be manned to carry on its important work. Does any-

body question that? Then there were 6,296 appointed in the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, which is so essential for the re-establishment of our soldiers in civil life; and 275 on the staff of the Board of Pensions Commissioners. Thus there was an aggregate increase in those four departments of 8,485. Those were necessary increases; they were for purposes that arose after the war, not during the war—purposes growing out of the war, for which the staffs had to be created. But the Government has set itself to the task of reducing the staffs that were built up during the war, and let me give you some facts in that connection. Since the Armistice, the Department of Customs has released 160 employees; the Department of Militia and Defence has released 2,627; the Department of Naval Service has released 103; the Post Office Department, 248; and the Printing Bureau—including 40 that went out yesterday—356, or a total of 3,494.

It is much easier to get in new employees than to get them out. But the Government has set itself resolutely to the task of decreasing the staffs in the various branches of the Civil Service to the minimum required for efficiency. One branch in which the Government has acted is the Printing Bureau, and I want to give to the House one or two facts to show what has been accomplished there. We have, as I mentioned, released 356 employees from the Printing Bureau. In October, 1919, the payroll was approximately $115,000 a month; in March of this year it had been reduced to $90,000; by June it will be down to $73,000—a total reduction of $42,000 per month. In other words, we will have the payroll on a basis per month that will show a yearly saving of not less than $500,000 for this one branch of the service alone. The re-organization which has been brought about, placing the Printing Bureau on a sound business basis, will enable us to reduce the annual expenditure by $200,000 more, and we estimate that when these savings have all gone into effect the total annual saving in this particular branch of the service will be not less than $700,000. And with what result? To-day we are turning out more printing and better printing, with a smaller staff after effecting that great saving in public expenditure. That is but an illustration of what this Government is doing to put the administrative organization of the country on a sound business basis and to save money for the people.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, when the Government is engaged in this difficult task of protecting the public interest, what does it meet with from hon. members opposite but captious criticism and false statements as to the facts?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CANNON: Order. I ask the hon. minister to withdraw that statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. CANNON: I will not sit down.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) has risen to a point of order, and is asking that the hon. minister withdraw the words "false statements"?

Mr. CANNON: Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unless the hon. minister attributes a false statement to an hon. member, adding that it was made deliberately, knowingly or maliciously, I cannot rule that the expression must be withdrawn.

Mr. CANNON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister said—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry if the hon. member did not sufficiently explain his point of order before the ruling was given. Under the rules, it cannot now be discussed.

Mr. CANNON: I think it would be better if we were allowed to discuss it.

Mr. ROWELL: It is true the war is over, but the use of poison gas does not appear to have ceased.

Mr. PARENT: Is that a false statement?

Mr. DEVLIN: It is one of those mean insinuations that the minister makes. Oh, it is mean. Take it back. That is too mean.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend will cease his murmuring and grumbling under his breath—

Some hon. MEMBERS: It is getting under their skin.

Mr. ROWELL:—I will say again that if hon. members make statements without due inquiry or without taking the trouble to ascertain the facts—

Mr. WHITE (Victoria): That is not what you said.

Mr. ROWELL: I make the statement—

Mr. CANNON: Order.

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

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. McMASTER: I ask, Mr. Speaker, if it is in order for a hon. minister or an hon. member—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. McMASTER:—to accuse other members of making false statements.

Some hon. MEMBERS: He did not.

Mr. McMASTER: When he does that, in my humble opinion not only is his language unmannerly, but it is unparliamentary—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. McMASTER:—and the hon. minister is out of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have already decided what is practically the same point. The ruling of the Chair is that an hon. minister who is in possession of facts which an hon. member may possibly not have, can state in this House that a statement is false, or untrue, provided he does not add the words, "knowingly," "willingly" or "maliciously" or other words having the same effect and meaning.

Mr. ROWELL: So much for the charges that have been made with reference to public expenditure, Mr. Speaker, I have given you a sample of the character of the criticism that is being launched against the Government, and I think I have satisfied both sides of the House that there is no basis for such criticism. I now return to a more congenial task, for I confess I would rather explain some matter not so controversial as is an exposure of the inconsistencies and inaccuracies of my hon. friends.

Now, I want to refer to the current Estimates and to put on record one or two facts in connection with a matter which I conceive to be of importance in view of the suggestion made, particularly by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar), that the Government is not yet paying its way. I think my hon. friend misunderstood the financial statement made by the Minister of Finance, because I am sure he would not knowingly misstate the situation.

The total Estimates brought down to the House so far, including the Supplementary Estimates for Civil Service bonus, amount to $549,000,000. The Minister of Finance pointed out that we had maturing obligations this year amounting to $74,000,000, making a total of $623,000,000 which the Government must provide for, in addition to such sums as may be included in the further Supplementary Estimates. Now, how is that money to be provided? Let me point out that included in the $623,000,000 are what may certainly be termed productive investments. Hon. members may differ as to some of these, but I think it is a fair description of them. First come loans to the provinces for housing, $13,300,000. Then there is the actual expenditure on the building of ships to be owned and operated by the Government, amounting to $20,000,000. There is an item for advances to the Soldiers' Settlement Board in carrying on its work, amounting to $50,000,000; I believe the returned soldier will make good and repay this money. For the construction and betterment of railways there is an amount of $6,000,000; and for railway equipment $17,000,000. These items make a total of $106,000,000. I would describe those as "productive investments." Then there is $74,000,000 of obligations maturing which must be met, giving us a total of $180,000,000. The Minister of Finance has estimated that he has from cash on hand and accounts outstanding, including balances due from Great Britain, assets from which he expects to realize not less than $190,000,000. It is money coming in, and it is capital payment. It is simply a conversion of our assets from one form into another. We have accounts payable to Canada which we propose to collect and invest the proceeds as I have mentioned, and this we believe to be in the public interest. We have other accounts coming in which we propose to use to discharge this obligation of $74,000,000 maturing; it is simply the discharge of an obligation and the conversion of one asset into another; we have the money in hand, or coming in, for the purpose.

Now, let us look at the balance. We have an estimated income of $381,000,000, less the reduction in the tariff tax by reason of the dropping of the 7½ per cent, estimated at $31,000,000. We shall not lose the whole of that $31,000,000 this year, because the tax has been on for a month and a half. But assuming that we lose the whole of it and deducting the $31,000,000, it leaves us, on the basis estimated by the Finance Minister an income of $351,000,000 entirely apart from all the new forms of taxation imposed. The Minister of Fin-

ance has not given the House an estimate of the amount he will receive from these new forms of taxation, because of the extreme difficulty of forming an accurate estimate. How much we will get from the luxury tax, the sales tax and the other taxes it is difficult to say, but I am quite sure that the Minister of Finance does not expect to get less than a clear $100,000,000 from these new forms of taxation. I believe he expects more. I am going to put another $100,000,000, therefore, under the heading of income; and that gives us $451,000,000 to meet the balance of the Estimates amounting to $443,000,000. In other words, the Minister of Finance has brought down a Budget by means of which he undertakes to provide through current taxation a sum more than sufficient to discharge all the expenditures he has proposed to the House, apart from this conversion of assets and payment of the maturing liabilities to which I have referred.

Now, let me point out the character of the expenditures included in that $443,000,000. In providing from taxation $443,000,000, what is the hon. minister achieving? He is covering not only all the ordinary expenditure; he is providing the whole cost of completing demobilization, $38,000,000, which in past years was the subject of a special vote; was added to our capital expenditure, and formed part of our war debt. This year the Minister of Finance proposes to meet that out of current taxation. He provides in the Estimates for loans to the Canadian National Railway, $48,600,000, and other capital expenditure, $15,189,000. So, I repeat, the statement submitted to the House shows an honest and courageous effort on the part of the Minister of Finance to secure revenues not only to meet all ordinary expenditures but to meet these other very large expenditures which in the past we have considered as capital expenditures.

One word further Mr. Speaker, about our position at the present time. We have, as you are aware, not only accomplished this, but our public debt to-day—by way of comparison—is substantially less than the public debt of Great Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, every country which was engaged in the war except the United States, and she was only a year and a half in the war. When conditions were unsettled in the early part of last year the Government adopted the courageous policy of asking the people to carry on, and under conditions which looked as if there might be a cessation of industry, made provision for credits to enable the country to carry on. And what has been the result? Our foreign trade last year was $166,000,000 ahead of our foreign trade of the year before. Our total foreign trade reached the enormous sum of $2,351,000,000; in addition, of course, there was the enormous home trade. The Minister of Finance has pointed out that in the five years, ending 31st March, 1915, our excess of imports over exports was $825,000,000. That is to say, the balance of trade was adverse during those five years to the extent of $825,000,000. In the five years ended 31st March, 1920, we wiped out that adverse balance of trade and have to our credit for the five years a favourable balance of $1,803,000,000. If you compare the two periods, taking the five years before the war, with an adverse balance of $825,000,000, and the five years since, with a favourable balance of $1,803,000,000, you will see that the balance of trade changed during that period a total of $2,628,000,000, or over $500,000,000 a year.

Something has been said about inflation. There has been inflation of credit in all countries engaged in this war. But we have maintained our gold reserve, as the Minister of Finance pointed out, in our banks and the Government at 43 per cent, as compared with Great Britain's 26 per cent, and the United States' 55 per cent. The Federal Reserve Bank requirement in the United States is 40 per cent, and we have maintained ours during the war at 3 per cent above that requirement. Our bank deposits, as the Minister of Finance intimated, have almost doubled in the last five years. During that period we have added to the bank deposits of Canada a sum almost equal to all the accumulated bank deposits from Confederation up to the beginning of that period. Our debt is funded, after the liabilities that I have mentioned are disposed of, over a twenty-year period.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) painted a picture the other evening in speaking on this matter. Referring to the statement of the former Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) as to conditions in 1912, he made this statement:

> That, Sir, is the story of fifteen years of Liberal fiscal policy as described by my hon. friend: fifteen years of peace and plenty, fifteen years of blessed peace, fifteen years of joyous plenty, fifteen years of splendid progress, fifteen years of wonderful prosperity! Let us frame and glaze this statement; let us post it on the walls of the country; let

us frame and glaze it and put it into every household, and office and factory, so that men may look upon it and say, "Ah, yes, that is the story of the good old days. Pray Heaven that it may come back again."

I am not disposed to criticise that statement of the hon. member. That was a great period of peace and progress in Canada's history. But I want to ask my hon. friend, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), and I am sorry he is not in his seat, what he would have said if, instead of being a member of the Government during a period of peaceful progress and uninterrupted development and expansion in Canada, he had been a member of a Government which at a time of grave national stress carried forward to a victorious conclusion the greatest war in history; which completed the raising, training, equipping, sending overseas, and finally demobilizing of 600,000 men; which ended the war with our national debt funded over a twenty-year period, with our war securities practically at par, as against the United States substantially below par, and with our national debt much smaller by comparison than that of Great Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand or any other country at war, with the exception of the United States, which had been only a year and a half in the war; which so administered the business and financial affairs of Canada and stimulated the productivity of our people that for the five-year period ending 31st March, 1920, our foreign trade showed a favourable balance of over $1,800,000 as against an adverse balance of over $800,000,000 in the preceding five years; which practically doubled our bank deposits and brought our borrowing largely within our own borders, so that the Canadian people hold practically 75 per cent of our Government securities.

If the hon. member had been a member of the Government that had accomplished this, would he say: "Let us frame it and glaze it and hang it up? If my hon. friend had been a member of a government during those years of stress and had accomplished that result, he would have said: "Nay, blaze it upon the skies so that all men may see." He would pray not that old times might come again, but thank God that in the hour of the nation's need, in the struggle that Canada faced and in the throes through which she was passing, she had a Government with vision, courage and practical ability—vision to see the need, courage to apply the measures necessary to meet the need, and ability to execute those measures, so that to-day both at home and abroad Canada stands in a higher position than at any previous time in her history.

I had expected to conclude my remarks by this time; but I should like to say a word or two in connection with our financial proposals and particularly in reference to the address of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). The hon. member explained to the House in great detail why the Opposition had not submitted the tariff platform adopted last August. He said: " Why, if we had submitted the platform adopted in August, we could not have expected you to accept it." In effect he said "we submitted a proposal which we thought you might accept." The hon. member is not such an amateur in Parliamentary and constitutional practice as not to know that the Government cannot accept any amendment to the Budget, but he gave another reason, it was the real reason—it was the only thing they could all agree upon. I have before me the speech of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), in which you will remember he practically said that he was in search of a sound and safe tariff policy. He used the words "sound and safe." He said that he could not expect such a policy from the Conservatives. He said that he could not expect it from the farmers; that their policy was neither sound nor safe. This is what he said as reported on page 2584 of Unrevised Hansard:

> Where, then, are you going to get it?

That is referring to the "sound and safe" tariff policy.

> Shall we get it from the platform of our farmer friends? Sir, I do not think their platform if carried out would give us the sound policy which I desire, and I hope to be able to show them—at all events I hope they will find that it is wise to modify some of their views.

The hon. member in moving his amendment was repudiating the Farmers' platform, was moving a vote of want of confidence in the policy of my hon. friends. He said that they did not provide a sound and safe policy. Then my hon. friend came to the platform adopted by the so called Liberal convention of August last, and he said, referring to the Liberal policy:

> I do not even think we can expect to get a sound and safe tariff policy by a too rigid adherence to every line and every letter of the Liberal tariff platform.

This amendment is a vote of want of confidence in the platform adopted by the Liberals last August. It is submitted in the present form because it is all they can agree

upon. My surprise is that my hon. friends of the Agrarian Opposition are supporting an amendment the mover of which says, in effect, that it is a vote of want of confidence in their platform. I am even more surprised that my hon. friends in the Liberal Opposition are supporting an amendment the mover of which says that it is a vote of want of confidence in the platform adopted by them last August, because that platform does not provide a sound and safe tariff policy. The hon. member (Mr. Fielding) provides what he considers a sound and safe tariff policy, and in some respects there is no very great objection to it, if we were now revising the whole tariff schedules. The hon. member, when in power, made certain revisions of the tariff with which I will deal in a moment, revisions which I approved and supported, which I still approve and support. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark), in speaking on this amendment, said that the reference in the amendment criticising the Government for failure to revise the tariff this session was not fair nor just to the Government. I do not recall his exact words, but that was the substance of them. He said that under the conditions which existed, it was not reasonable to expect that the Government could bring down a revision of the tariff at this time. The reason he gave for supporting the Opposition amendment was that it spoke of a revision downwards, whereas the Government had promised a revision but did not say that it was downwards.

I want to look just for a moment at the tariff situation. My hon. friends on the other side are professing to be the sole representatives of those who are concerned for the welfare of the masses of the people. The leader of the Opposition, dealing with this matter at great length, said that the Government had not lightened at all the burden upon the consumer; that they had not in any way relieved the people of this country from the burden of taxation, nor done anything to diminish the high cost of living. My hon. friend gave as his method to accomplish those particular purposes a reduction in the tariff. I am not going to enter into a discussion to-night as to how far the one affects the other.

I desire to submit to the House certain facts in connection with the matter. When the tariff was revised in 1897 the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), then Minister of Finance, in his Budget Speech estimated that the total reduction in revenue due to the tariff revision would be $706,000. In 1907 he estimated it at $300,000, but he stated that he was putting on another tax on sugar equal to $300,000 so that the one would offset the other. I am taking the $300,000 however as a reduction. In other words there was a reduction of $1,000,000 in those two revisions of the tariff in 1897 and 1907. In 1911 the hon. member submitted to this House an agreement which, if adopted, would have reduced the tariff taxation by $1,412,000. Now, I am quite prepared to give my hon. friend credit not only for the actual reductions he brought about but for the reductions he proposed and endeavoured to bring about, and the two added together would give us, in the fifteen years of office of the Liberals, $2,412,000 of reduction in the tariff burden, either accomplished or attempted.

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has described the members on this side of the House by various names. We are composed on this side of two groups, Liberal-Unionists and Conservative-Unionists, who are supporting the present Administration. What have the Liberal-Unionists, in co-operation with their Conservative colleagues, done in two years? They reduced the tariff burden of taxation last year $17,000,000 and this year $31,000,000, whereas the whole Liberal party, of which I was a member, working together, effected or proposed a reduction of $2,412,000 in fifteen years. In view of this fact, Mr. Speaker, are not the Liberals on this side of the House and the Conservatives doing pretty well? Do they not deserve some credit for the fact that in two years they have brought about a reduction of $48,000,000, twenty times as much as the Liberal party did in fifteen years?

Mr. LEGER: Wonderful.

Mr. ROWELL: It is wonderful, but my hon. friend does not realize it.

Mr. CANNON: The country does.

Mr. ROWELL: We have done this without imperilling any industry in the country and, I believe, to the substantial relief of the consumer.

I turn now to the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the year 1918 and I find in connection with the imports entered for consumption the average rates of duty collected. In that report I see the average rate of duty on all goods entered for consumption from 1867 down to 1918 and upon inquiry from the Finance Department I find that the average rate of duty last year was 17.61 per cent on all goods entered for consumption. The reduction in duty made this year by the re-

peal of the 7½ per cent on the basis of the imports of last year will bring the average rate of duty down to 14.67 per cent, the lowest rate of duty in Canada since the year 1878 when it was a little over 14 per cent. I submit, therefore, that hon. members on this side of the House who believe in a reduction of duties have very strong and sound reasons for supporting the Government and voting against the amendment. I say with every confidence that men can well support a government that has done in two and a half years what I have stated, as opposed to my hon. friend's opposite who in fifteen years accomplished one-twentieth of our achievement. In addition, I believe that the tariff does need a thorough revision that the duties on many articles should be substantially reduced. The Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) has promised a thorough revision of the tariff, and while hon. members have discussed protection and free trade, the thing which really affects the people of Canada in the last analysis is the tariff schedule. I am not going to enter to-night into a discussion of the relative merits of protection and free trade. Hon. members will see the tariff schedules when the tariff is revised and brought down, and they will see what the policy of the Government is in this matter. If at that time hon. members find that the tariff has not been so revised as to meet the situation existing in Canada as they believe it should be met, then they will be justified in voting against the Government. But not until then will the tariff schedules be fairly before the members of the House.

One word in conclusion. The hon. member referred to the organization of this Government and stated that its mandate had expired. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand the statement issued by the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), with the full support and approval of all his colleagues, at the time the Union Government was formed. That statement sets out quite clearly the objects for which the Government was formed and the task to which it committed itself. I am not going to read the statement to the House to-night, but I may point out that the first plank, and the first plank only, dealt with the vigorous prosecution of the war, every other plank of the platform deals with problems either growing out of the war or relating to peace, showing that it was the clear intention at the time the Government was formed that while its main and chief duty was to prosecute the war, the other tasks resting upon the Government should not be shirked or ignored, and that the Government must face them and undertake to perform them. Let me say to my hon. friends that the Liberals and the Conservatives on this side of the House will not refer to hon. members opposite, who sought to prevent this Government from being formed and from securing the mandate necessary to prosecute the war, the question of when that mandate should expire.

Mr. ROBB: Are we to infer that the ex-Minister of Public Works stated the position when he resigned from the Government?

Mr. ROWELL: Every hon. member of the Government is entitled to take whatever position he considers to be right, and if he desires to withdraw from the Government he is entitled to do so.

Mr. PARENT: A happy family.

Mr. ROWELL: Let me say this to my hon. friends. The hon. gentleman knows that the Prime Minister promised that the War-time Elections Act should be for the period of the war only and that a new election law would be passed for times of peace; and this Government could not have been dissolved and a general election held at any time since the Armistice was signed up to this hour, because there is not yet a franchise law on the statute book under which an election could be conducted.

Mr. DEVLIN: Whose fault?

Mr. ROWELL: The fault this session has not been due to the members on this side of the House.

Mr. CANNON: What about last year?

Mr. ROWELL: There was an understanding last year between the leaders that the Franchise Bill would be introduced at this session and that there should be no election until the Bill was passed. The time has not yet arrived when the Government could have resolved into its original elements or dissolved and gone to the country because there has been no election machinery available under which an election could be held. The members on this side of the House recognize their duty to the country and they will discharge it. My hon. friend said that the Government should be defeated because it had a war mind. I do not think anybody will charge my hon. friends opposite with having a war mind. Certainly when the war was on it was a good thing for Canada that we had a war mind but in the days

of peace and reconstruction we have a mind for peace and reconstruction.

We submitted progressive masures to this House last session and asked the House to adopt them in the interests of the country. Who has opposed those progressive measures in this House? We introduced the Women's Franchise Bill which has doubled the electorate of this country and given the women the franchise on the same basis as the men. The only opposition came from hon. gentlemen opposite. We introduced a Bill permitting women to sit in this House and the only criticism came from hon. gentlemen opposite. We have put through a great measure of Civil Service reform. We have introduced many measures dealing with social reconstruction. The hon. leader of the Opposition referred to the resolution of the Liberal convention relating to care for the public health. Were the delegates gathered in that assembly not aware of the fact that upon the initiation of this Government a Department of Public Health was created at the first session of this Parliament last year and that it is doing magnificent work? This Government has introduced measures providing for technical education, for housing, for temperance and for other advances in the realm of social reconstruction. The only opposition has come from hon. gentlemen opposite. Practically speaking, the progressive forces of this country have been on this side of the House. In addition to these measures of social reconstruction, the Government has dealt courageously with the railway situation, they have put an end to private railway exploitation at the public expense. They are giving Canada a truly national system of railways. Where do hon. gentlemen opposite stand on that question? Real liberalism, the real progressive forces, have been on this side of the House. The reactionary forces have been on the other side of the House. The opposition to the measures that I have mentioned has come from the other side. I exempt the hon. gentlemen who sit at the other end of the Chamber, the Agrarian group. I do not believe that they represent the reactionary elements. I think that in some respects they are a little too radical perhaps, in some not so radical, but they at least are moving ahead along certain progressive lines which they think are in the public interest or in the interest of the farmers' group.

I do not think we can settle the tariff in this country just according to the likes of the farmers on the one hand or the manufacturing interests on the other. I do not believe a tariff policy prepared and promoted by the manufacturing interests would be in the public interests of Canada any more than the policy prepared and promoted by the farmers in the interests of a class. I believe it is vastly more important that there should be a good understanding between the people of the East and the West than that there should be any particular rate of tariff. It should be the bounden duty of the Government of this country to so frame the tariff that it will meet the views of reasonable men both East and West in order that we may present a united front as Canadian people in carrying on our industrial development in competition with the great nation to the south and in the extension of our trade with the other nations of the world. I should like to discuss the other taxation proposals on the Budget but time will not permit. We must if we are to sustain the financial load that rests upon our shoulders accept the burdens of increased taxation. It may be that there should be some slight amendments to the Budget resolutions but people must be prepared to pay the cost of the war. Some of them have felt the burden very little up to this time and I have not a great deal of sympathy for or patience with any class of men who are able to pay and who object to taxation at the present time. If anybody can devise a better or more equitable basis for raising revenues than the Government has proposed, I would like him to submit it to the House and personally I am sure that many on this side would support it.

10 p.m.

What we want is a policy fair to all, with special privileges to none; a policy that seeks to unite the Canadian people as a whole, not in sections or in classes, that Canada may achieve in the future a destiny worthy of the glorious traditions of the past and of the honourable name our troops have won for her in that momentous struggle now so happily ended.

Mr. G. W. ANDREWS (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, the subject on which I desire at once to speak is indemnities for members. Seven dollars a day is not enough to pay the expense of a poor man at the present time. While it is quite true, Mr. Speaker, that the House is not in session every day, it is equally true that a member's work, like a woman's, is never done; and if he happens to be a married man and is compelled to support two homes on $209 a month, it is quite impossible. I

am well aware that war widows and many of their dependents have to do with a great deal less; but two blacks never made a white yet, and it is my experience that men who are willing to work for less than a living wage are mighty poor providers for war widows or anybody else.

The Budget makes no provision for increased indemnities either for members or ministers, and that, in my opinion, is a very frank admission of incompetence on the part of members of this House. I had hoped that the right hon. the leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden), the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) would have got together and discussed this question in a non-political way.

The second subject on which I wish to speak is this: Apparently money is more highly valued and more sacred in the eyes of this Government than human life. I have recently placed in the hands of the Chairman of the Pensions Commissioners specific cases where the whole family of sons have been killed, have been sacrificed in this war. The whole family of sons; sons upon whom had been lavished the savings of a lifetime. The poor mother of those boys applies for a pension, but before she can get one she has to prove that she is a pauper. Even after the pension of $40 a month is granted, some kind friend gives her work to eke out that pension, and along comes the Government Supervisor and takes the pension away, as by law he is compelled to do. How does this, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen, compare with a man who loaned the Government a thousand dollars? Is he compelled to prove pauperism before he draws his interest? Is it necessary before he draws interest for him to prove that he is not making more than $40 a month? We have been told by the Minister of Finance, and with him I am glad to agree, that it is time we tackled our present problems with the same spirit with which our men tackled the war. At least twice this session I have heard hon. members decry the war spirit, but I am glad to agree with the Minister of Finance that the sooner we get a little of the war spirit into this country and into this House the sooner we will progress. When the Government ran short of fighting men, what did it do? It passed a Military Service Act calling to the colours all able-bodied men between certain ages—whether they wanted to come or not. What recompense does the Government give to the parents of those sons who are lying in France? It places a tax on luxurious living—luxurious living made possible by the lack of taxation by the predecessor of the present Minister of Finance. It is not necessary for me to labour this point. It is apparent to all that just as in war some men get a lot out of it, others have got it in the neck. What attempt has been made by this Budget to adjust the burden between the two? Apparently none. The man who fought the war at great personal loss comes here to find that he is not even exempt from the special burdens of war taxes. Now to illustrate that—it seems to be very hard to get over—I will tell you a little western story: A bunch of traders were coming down from the North with a very rich pack of furs, when they were beset by Indians and surrounded. Out of their number two young men volunteered to try to break the cordon and bring relief. They were successful in getting through to a cavalry post, and they returned and drove off the Indians. But in doing so one of the men who had volunteered lost his life, and both their horses were killed. The rich traders were very delighted to think that their pack had been saved; they gave the returning man a small gratuity—and charged him up for both horses. The rich traders of this country are charging up the men who fought with their uniforms—the ones who had the luck to get back—whilst the men who enriched themselves during the war are largely allowed to hang on to their wealth.

With the permission of the House I will read a letter received from a friend of mine on this subject. I may say that I have collected all kinds of evidence of the large fortunes that have been made during the war, but I think sufficient evidence is already before the House without bothering you with any more of it. While an attempt has been made through the business profits tax, and other taxes, to get after this great wealth it is perfectly well-known to the members of this House and the people of this country that some men have made great fortunes. The letter in question sets forth:

> The impression is gaining ground that a number of corporations and companies are planning to escape their business profits tax through the agency of mergers and by increasing their capitalization, largely through the process of common stock. It is also generally believed that many of them have not paid, and are not paying, as much as they should, for the reason that they are charging up excessive amounts to overhead, depreciation, expenditure, etc. This is defeating the purpose of the tax, and should not be tolerated.
>
> A company paying dividends of 7 per cent now 10 per cent must pay 25 per cent in business profits tax, and when the profits ex-

ceed 15 per cent the tax is increased to 50 per cent.

I need not go into the details of that, they are well known to all the members, but I will take the next clause in the letter:

This means that companies paying big profits on actual capitalization must pay large sums to the Government. This was the purpose of the legislation, and Parliament had this in mind when it passed the Act. A number of big companies, apparently in order to escape these high rates, are issuing bonuses in the form of new stock to shareholders—doubling trebling, quadrupling, and in same cases increasing their capitalization by at least five times. The purpose is to give the shareholders as big a return on their money as they receive through a high rate of profit on the smaller capitalization. It is being arranged so that dividends do not range much higher than 7 per cent on the face of things, and on that basis, the Business Profits Tax is practically escaped, while in reality the dividends are in some cases four and five times the modest earning of seven per cent. In the case of the . . . . . Paper Company, the process of reorganization and re-capitalization, means that each shareholder is being given five shares under the new capitalization for each one previously held by him, the effect being to raise the actual capitalization from about $5,000,000 to approximately $25,000,000. Under the previous capitalization the business profits tax on earnings over 20 per cent would have netted the Government a very substantial sum. Under the new capitalization 20 per cent earnings will be spread over five times the capitalization, with the result that, while there is actually no more capital invested than previously the Government will get next to nothing through its Business Profits Tax.

The Business Profits Tax paid by the companies going into the British Empire Steel Corporation Merger should be thoroughly gone into. It looks as though one of the purposes of this merger is to enable the companies entering it to dodge the tax. The big ones such as the Dominion Steel, Nova Scotia Steel and Iron, Canada Steamships, Canada Foundry and Forgings, and others, will exchange their shares for 7 per cent preferred, plus a nice bonus in the way of common stock. This new stock will, at the beginning, amount to over $200,000,000, and will be further increased to $500,000,000, with a further prospect of a capitalization, of $1,000,000,000 by keeping dividends down to 7 per cent and lower, the business profits tax will be dodged. It will be a very serious matter for the country if a number af the largest companies in Canada are allowed to escape in this way. Canada Steamships, Limited, which is supposed to have paid $1,215,000 in taxes on its 1918 business, would thus practically escape altogether. The same thing applies to others. It would be nothing less than a national crime if this were to be allowed. The little fellows are paying their taxes; the big fellows should be made to pay theirs. The searchlight of publicity should be thrown on the whole subject, for Parliament and the country have a right to know the facts.

It looks to me as though the big fellows had made a rich haul and they are now salting it down.

On page 1866 of Hansard of the second session of 1919, volume 2, I find the following words spoken by the then acting leader of the Government (Sir George Foster):

No nation in the world has ever undertaken, and I do not suppose that any nation in the world ever will or ever can undertake, to make compensation for the losses incurred in war; it would be an impossible task.

In reply to those words, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the man or the members of a government who tackle a job with the words "can't" and "impossible" in their hearts are licked before they start. The people who sent me from Winnipeg to represent them here on the floor of the House understood quite well that it meant "the last man and the last dollar", if necessary, to clean up this job right; and they are still of the same opinion. I believe that is true of the spirit of our people to-day, and any government that fails to interpret that spirit of "the last man and the last dollar if need be", fails to represent this nation.

It is true that the business war profits tax is retained and with other taxes now imposed will meet our current expenditures. To this extent, at least, I desire to congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, for it is infinitely better than the system of borrowing which we had before. There is an old saying, that he who goes aborrowing goes asorrowing, and I am pretty well satisfied that our people for many years to come will not forget the borrowings of my hon. friend's predecessor.

But the Budget makes no real attempt to readjust the burdens of the war on a fair and equitable basis. The Government says that it cannot be done, that it is impossible to make such a readjustment. Take, for instance, the business profits tax. It is no secret that the Government has had trouble in collecting it. Quite naturally the men who have made money dislike to see their profits go into, let us say, railway ventures that, to say the least, have not been paying dividends for many years, but which the Government have paid for at one hundred cents on the dollar. I think if I made any money I would hate to hand it over to people who expended it in that way. (In fact, I go further and say that if some of my free-trading English friends did not sell to the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) a "pup" when they sold them the Grand Trunk, I do not know what a "pup" is.) There has been trouble in collecting these taxes, for the reason that the people who are paying them are not satisfied that their money is being used to the best advantage. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I would abolish the war profits tax alto-

gether, and in its stead I would introduce forthwith a Financial Service Act along the lines of the old Military Service Act; in other words, I would conscript millionaires. I would put men who had made $1,000,000 in class A; those who had made $500,000 in class B; those who had made $100,000 in class C. But I would not call these men to the colours as criminals,—far from it; I would mobilize them as the strong, cunning men of the race, men that we can depend on in the country's time of financial need. I would pay them $1.10 a day, with their board and lodgings, and I would keep them on for the continuation of the debt and six months' afterward. I do not want their money so much as their brains, their ability. I am frank to admit, Mr. Speaker, that they would be a pretty tough army to handle, but I am satisfied that from amongst their own numbers you would find some one who could handle them, and after they had once caught the spirit of the thing I have not the slightest doubt that they would make good just as their sons and the other young fellows made good overseas.

But you may well ask me: What kind of work would you turn them to when you got them? Roughly, my plan would be to direct them to develop the resources of this country for the nation instead of for themselves. But I do not think it is necessary to go into details at this time; I will wait until after the election. My idea is this: I would call these strong men to the colours and I would say to their leaders: The debt is $2,000,000,000; you have Canada and her resources at your back: Go to it. And I have not the slightest doubt that they would make good.

Now, Sir, it was my purpose to speak at some length on the words uttered by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) in this debate, but my physician has ordered me off this line. I am frank to admit that when those words were uttered they made me angry—righteously angry, I believe, but apparently that is just as dangerous as any other kind of anger. However, I would say in passing that I hope the hon. member has learned that protectionists can blunder as well as free traders. I must point out to him that many blunders were made in the war. But it is an axiom amongst soldiers that the army that makes the fewest blunders wins the war. Germany made blunders, and even in our own army our poor boys lost their lives through blunders of those in control—but I am not going to make the mistake of pointing out these blunders to bolster up an argument on free trade. I would point out to the hon. minister that economists and thinking men are of the opinion that the supreme blunder of all was the blunder of starting the war,—and that blunder was committed, not by free trade England but by protectionist Germany.

Mr. BURNHAM: May I ask what country it was that started the war?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BURNHAM: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. ANDREWS: Some of the arguments used sounded so painfully like the German propaganda that one heard before the war that I could not help feeling angry, and I felt it my absolute duty to speak to-night. It was a disappointment to me in many ways. Naturally we who come from the West would like to have seen as the next Prime Minister of Canada a man coming from the West. Now I can only pray God that that hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) will never occupy that position. Can you imagine a great leader of men like Sir John A. Macdonald running down British soldiers to bolster up his National Policy? Can you imagine that great leader, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, or the present right hon. leader of this Government (Sir Robert Borden), doing such a thing? I think not. I will let it go at that, and go on to the amendment.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that he who tries to do right will soon act wisely but he who merely tries to act wisely will never do right. It is in the second category that I place the amendment; they are trying to act wisely. Well, I suppose I must vote for it as a protest against the Budget which the present Government has brought down. I do ask my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), if he is given an opportunity, like this again, to follow the lead of my hon. friend the Leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar); to pull his flag up to the top, nail it there and trust the people of Canada wholly.

Mr. R. C. HENDERS (Macdonald): Mr. Speaker, it is with some diffidence that I rise to speak at this hour of the evening and at this stage in the debate on the very important Budget that has been brought down. I wish to congratulate the former

Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) on the magnificent work he did in connection with carrying this country through the crisis of war, providing the necessary finances in order that our soldiers might be properly taken care of and that the needs of the country might be properly served.

I congratulate the present Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) on the Budget which he has brought down. It must have required a great deal of courage, a great deal of nerve, on the part of the hon. gentleman to take hold of the duties and responsibilities of the office of Finance Minister and to deal with conditions as they obtain at present. For years war had done its work and had had its effect upon the finances of the country, and to come in as a new man, assume the responsibility of administering the finances of the country, and lay down plans by which we might be able to go forward, was a very important and a very trying piece of work to undertake. I congratulate him upon the degree of success that has attended his efforts in the bringing down of his Budget. I notice that a certain amount of criticism is levelled at the Government at this time. But it is always the case that a government which has big responsibilities resting upon it, a government which is breaking new ground and launching out into new enterprises, meets with much and varied opposition. Naturally there will be opposition from some people, particularly if measures deemed to be necessary call for self-denial on their part.

There are some items in connection with the Budget to which I wish to call attention. First, I should like to express my recognition of the fact that in his Budget the minister has adopted a method that has been before the people as a proper method for raising money for administering the affairs of the country. I refer to the introduction of the principle of direct taxation. I believe that direct taxation is the proper way to raise revenues for the conduct of the business of the country. There was a time when money was raised by indirect taxation; when a large part of the finances of the country was secured in this way,—secured by methods which placed the burden of responsibility as indirectly as possible on the people. But the time came in the history of this country when it was necessary that the people should be taken into the fullest confidence of the Government in connection with the administration of its affairs. This was brought about particularly by the increased financial responsibilities and obligations resting upon us in connection with the war. As I say, I have always believed that direct taxation is the proper way to raise revenue.

I wish to express my approval of some of the methods that are laid down in the Budget for the securing of money by direct taxation. First I would direct attention to the luxury tax. I have heard criticism of that tax. Some hon. members have expressed the view that the minimum amount taxable on luxuries was too low; that the taxation should be on higher priced articles. I am not of that opinion. I believe that a sufficient number of useful and essential articles are free from taxation; that the burden of taxation will not touch the people until they have reached the point where they are able to bear it. The responsibility increases as the resources of the people increase and they are able to bear responsibility. I have no criticism to offer with regard to the levying of that tax, and I believe it will prove a splendid source of securing revenue. If I were to offer a suggestion or criticism at all, it would be with regard to the method adopted in raising that money. Some incline to the belief that, instead of taxing, say, a pair of boots costing over nine dollars on the full value of the article, it would have been better if the tax had been levied upon the excess of the purchase price over nine dollars, and that the tax instead of being 10 per cent should be 20 per cent. I am not quite so sure but, perhaps there is some merit in that suggestion. It would not allow the tax to fall quite so heavily on the one who would have to pay it, and as the article was considered to be a greater luxury and the price increased, the increase of taxation would be so much heavier and, therefore, the burden would fall on those who were better able to bear it. The same criticism would apply to all similar lines of taxation, namely that the tax, instead of being on the full value, should be on the excess beyond a certain amount fixed as the minimum where the taxation should begin.

I am in perfect accord with the stamp tax. No one will suffer seriously from it, and a certain amount of revenue will be readily collected.

The sales tax is another direct method of taxation with which I find myself in perfect agreement, and I believe that good will come from the securing of money to

the fullest possible extent from that line. It could better be operated as a straight, turnover tax payable by each class of the business community and not to be passed on from the manufacturer to the wholesaler and then to the retailer.

I come to the income tax which I consider the most important and most reasonable method of taxation, in the form of a direct tax of any found in connection with the Budget. I believe the income tax is a reasonable and fair way of raising revenue; that it is a method that we should use to the fullest possible extent. As regards the amount of money to be raised by the income tax, I am inclined to think that the tax might well be increased at a greater rate after you reach an income of $10,000, and that the ratio of increase should be greater all the way up to $500,000. A man who has an income of $10,000 could reasonably pay 10 per cent; a man who has an income of $15,000 might reasonably pay a little more than 10 per cent, and he would not suffer seriously from that increased taxation. We could continue along that line, increasing the ratio of taxation between incomes of $10,000 and $500,000. In that way a large amount of money would be secured, and the people who would be making that contribution would not suffer seriously as regards enjoying the comforts and necessaries of life.

I should like to call attention to another feature of the Budget proposals which commends itself to my judgment. I refer to the removal of the 7½ per cent war tax. It has been charged against the Government that they have made this a rich man's Budget; that the rich are having the best of it and that the poor man is being burdened. I do not think so; I believe in the removal of the 7½ per cent war tax, because by the removal of that tax, $7.50 is taken off every $100 worth of goods a man buys, so that rich and poor alike receive benefit thereby. I wish also to call attention to the fact that it has been charged against the Government that, by removing that 7½ per cent war tax, they are simply bringing us back to conditions as they were before the war and, therefore, the Government deserves no great credit for removing that tax. That is a very unfair and unjust criticism. It was found necessary, during the stress of the war, to levy a 7½ per cent war tax in order to carry on the Government of the country and meet the conditions through which we were passing. An expenditure amounting to $1,000,000 a day has to be provided for. It could therefore be argued that this tax should on that account be retained. The Government has decided otherwise. This is now taken off the people, which means a reduction in the prices of the necessaries of life of over $30,000,000, a direct contribution to the people in connection with their living expenses.

I wish now to refer to the promise made by the former Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) that there would be a revision of the tariff last year. With the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) I find myself in perfect agreement on that point. If I remember rightly, that hon. gentleman's comment was that conditions were such in connection with the former Minister of Finance that he found it necessary through illness to abandon his post, to leave the Government and to go into other lines of business. This change made it necessary for the Government to secure another man to take the position. It was further felt that of conditions in connection with raising the war loan, it was necessary for the time being to abandon the promise made by the former Minister of Finance. There is no one in this House who is more sorry than I am that that condition of affairs has come about. I had staked a good deal on the promise of the former Minister of Finance, and I had taken the position with the people out in our western country that that pledge given by the former Minister of Finance at that time was part of the contract which led me to accept the Budget. That promise was an important factor in leading me so to decide. It was, therefore, a disappointment to me that that arrangement was not carried out. But the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) comes to us this year with a pledge that the arrangement which was made last year will be carried out this year. I am not among those who are prepared to receive no explanation for a miscarriage of any promise that is made; I am not among those who are prepared to say that, because it was found necessary last year on account of the circumstances to which I have referred, to abandon the promise, therefore, I will not accept in good faith the promise that is made again. I believe the promise of the Minister of Finance is made in good faith; I am going to receive it in good faith; I am going to act on it in good faith; I am going to tell the people all the facts that have transpired, just as I told them last year; I am going to tell them that this pledge will be carried out; that there will be a revision of the tariff and that before that revision

takes place—conferences will be held throughout the country and the people will be invited to appear, and present the facts of the case as they see them before the men engaged in the work of gathering the evidence, before the revision in connection with the tariff takes place.

I believe it is necessary on the people's account that this opportunity be given to study the tariff. We do not understand the tariff, and I believe that many of us here do not understand it as thoroughly as we should. We do not understand the conditions in connection with it, and I have no doubt that these conferences that will be held in different places throughout the country will bring out evidence of incalculable value in regard to the merits or otherwise of the claims of the different parties who are demanding consideration, and will show clearly the grounds on which they base their claims for that consideration. This information will be valuable, and it will also be a great source of education, which is what we need. What do we find in connection with this promise of a revision of the tariff? Do we find opposition to it? Yes, Mr. Speaker. We find opposition from two sources, and I want to call particular attention to that fact because it has been said by hon. members opposite time and again that this is the Government of the predatory interests, the Government of the privileged classes. So far as that allegation is concerned, may I ask if the reduction of 7½ per cent of the duty was an example of protection for the privileged classes? Now, who are the people that are opposing the proposal to have conferences to study this question? Where is the opposition coming from? I find that the manufacturers' associations have passed resolutions condemning the action of the Government in proposing a revision of the tariff and condemning the calling of conferences to study the subject. They say they want a revision of the tariff, but whom do they want to revise it? They want to have a board of men appointed to which they can be sure that only certain classes of people will be eligible for appointment, people who perhaps are standing close to their own interests and who will see things from their own point of view. My view, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government of the country is responsible to the people for the administration of public affairs, and on its shoulders must rest the responsibility for providing arrangements to take care of the business of the country. I say, therefore, that you cannot take from the Government and put upon the shoulders of any separate board the responsibility which properly belongs to the Government. The Government must undertake the work that lies before it. They must see that an opportunity is given for collecting all necessary information, and with that information before them the responsibility will then rest upon them to bring down their tariff policy, the wisdom or unwisdom of which the people may judge of at the proper time. I am strongly in favour of a revision, and I trust that there will be as little delay as possible on the part of the Minister of Finance in completing the arrangement he has already started for the carrying out of this part of his programme. I make an appeal now, as I did a year ago, to the people in the West, that whenever these conferences are held those who are studying the question be met in good faith. Last summer, Mr. Speaker, I encountered opposition to this proposal for a revision of the tariff, and that opposition came from sources which I had not expected. It came from those who I thought would fully endorse it. They said: "We do not want a tariff investigation for the study of this question; we have all the information we need. We know all about the matter; we understand it thoroughly. What we want is that the Government shall act and act as we want them to act." Mr. Speaker, I have no use for that kind of argument. None of us know too much about the tariff; none of us know too much about the fiscal policy of the country; and none of us can afford to ignore any opportunity that is offered us for better informing ourselves along these lines. I shall make the appeal, when I go to the West, that this tariff commission, when it appears there, shall be met by the representatives of all classes and that all the facts that are available and that can throw any light on the subject be placed before the commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I find it necessary to state my position to-night on the tariff question. It has been suggested by some that I have changed the views which I have hitherto held on this question and which I expressed on former occasions. Allow me to say that this is not correct, the statement is entirely beside the mark; my views on the tariff have not changed except perhaps on two points, in regard to which they have undergone some modification. A fuller study of the question places me, I think, beside the leader of the Farmers' party (Mr. Crerar) in one respect. A more detailed study of the whole subject has led me to the belief that we are not in a position at the present time to enjoy the

privileges of free trade. If we were establishing a new civilization and we had one simple community, I could very well understand that we could introduce the principles of free trade. But we are not introducing a new civilization. We are living in a civilization which is hoary with years, and we are surrounded by methods of taxation that introduce a principle that is the opposite of free trade; and while we have these conditions to contend with we must govern ourselves accordingly. We must make circumstances the best that can possibly obtain for all the people in the country. We must have a tariff of some kind. Some people say that we have a tariff for protection purposes, while others assert that we have a tariff for revenue. I can make no distinction between the two. If you have a tariff up to five per cent you may call it a tariff for revenue, but the fact remains that it is, up to five per cent, a protection also. If it is a tariff for revenue, it is also protection against the people who desire to come from other countries into this country to trade, and it is ten per cent of protection to the interests of the manufacturer in this country. No matter how high or how low you make it, call it by what name you will, a tariff means protection. If it is only one per cent it is so much, if it is forty per cent it is so much more, but it is protection in either case.

Mr. CURRIE: Do you call it protection in the case of tea?

Mr. HENDERS: I am speaking of industries that are indigenous to this country and are supported by it, I am not referring to articles that are not manufactured or do not grow in this country; that is an entirely different thing. We tax them directly for the purpose of raising revenue. Where shall we draw the line? I find a person who says: "I do not believe in a tariff for protection, but I do believe in a tariff for revenue." I have tried to discover where the line of demarcation is drawn between these two points.

In looking over the Budgets of the past I found one instance in the course of the last few years where a distinction was made and where one had the courage to state what was a tariff for revenue and what was a tariff for protection. The future fiscal policy of the country was under discussion in 1906 and 1907. There was a certain arrangement made for gathering information as the basis upon which the tariff policy should be framed. When the Budget was before Parliament for discussion opposition was directed against the policy of the Government that was then in power. They had reduced the tariff on agricultural implements to 17½ per cent. A resolution was introduced by those who were in opposition at that time demanding that the Government bring down the tariff on agricultural implements to ten per cent. The advocates of a tariff for revenue only said: We believe that a tariff of 17½ per cent is only a tariff for revenue and not a tariff for protection. If it be true that 17½ per cent was at that time considerd a tariff for revenue then our present tariff is below a tariff for revenue. What argument then can be offered by the Opposition in support of the amendment offered by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's?

In regard to my attitude in supporting the proposals of the Budget I will state my position in a few words. I have watched the discussion with a great deal of interest and I have paid close attention to the amendment introduced by my hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queen's. After going carefully through that amendment I found that it was beset with a great deal that was vague and indefinite. It did not appear to me to be clear cut and specific. It appealed to me very much along the line of the speech we listened to this afternoon from the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) who gloried in the fact that they had not a clear-cut specific policy. It was a policy that embraced everybody and it reminded me of the man who would be all things to all men, if by any means he might "gain some." Studying this amendment in the light of past history I find that the man who moved the amendment, and those who surrounded him at the time that he and his friends were in power, made strong protestations, before they had achieved power as to what would be their policy if they were returned. They went up and down the country declaring substantially for a definite policy. There was no mistaking their position at that time. Everybody understood what they meant. But when they came to practise what they had been preaching there was a wonderful disparity between their preaching and their practice. I find also that the

11 p.m.

Government which was in power before these hon. gentlemen assumed office was a Government that was accused of being a Government of special interests and special privileges, just as these hon. gentlemen opposite are talking about the Government of the present day being a Government of special

interests and special privileges. Who are the men who are coming to this city day after day beseeching members of this Government in regard to the tariff under discussion? Men who are going away disappointed with conditions as they find them in connection with this Budget. Men who are looked upon by the Opposition as being the foster parents of this Government are the men who are in this position. The men who are writing bitter things against this Government are the men who were looked upon as the sponsors for it.

When the Government of the late Sir John Macdonald went into power they went in with a clear-cut protective policy. Influence was brought to bear along certain lines with the object of securing changes in that policy and we find that certain changes were made. I followed the history of that Government down through the years and I found that in the year before they went out of power they made radical changes in their policy. They reduced very materially the protective tariff which was then in operation. Then, another party came into power on a free trade policy practically, and we find on reading over the record that the Finance Minister of that Government announces "No radical change this year in the fiscal policy." Year after year this is the announcement. Finally there are some little changes made and then it goes on again from year to year the same old story of no change. How about the Union Government? In the first year that the Union Government was in power a change in the tariff policy in the form of a reduction off $17,000,000, and that after the second year they come down again with a reduction of $30,000,000.

I was reminded—as I studied this over in my own mind—of a passage in the Scriptures, where a certain man called his two sons. He said to one son, "Go, work to-day in my vineyard"; and the son replied, "I go, Sir", but went not. And he said to the second son, likewise, and the son said, "I will not go", but afterwards repented and went. The question was asked which of these did the will of his father, and the answer was in favour of the latter. I am in the position of making a similar choice, and I am inclined to give my approval to the man who at first refused but finally went and did as he was requested. I find myself in this position to-night: after weighing all the evidence that is before me I am going to trust the man who has prepared the fiscal policy that has given to us a reduction of over $30,000,000, and who says: I am going to study the question and come down with a fiscal policy that will be the fiscal policy of this Government when it makes its appeals to the people. I am going to give that man and that Government a fair chance, and will reach my conclusions as to my future course after they have declared themselves.

Mr. L. T. PACAUD (Megantic): Mr. Speaker, the Budget delivered recently by the Minister of Finance has given rise to a debate which, though it little resembles in tone and in substance the debates of previous years on this vital question, will nevertheless in my opinion arouse far more deeply than in the past the interest of the people of Canada. We cannot, close our eyes to the fact that if within the walls of this Parliament there seems to be, in some quarters at least, a tendency to approach this question with the set opinion of pre-war days, there is outside of this House a public opinion more critical, more alert, more resolute, and more determined than ever to see to it that the abuses which have crept in to our fiscal system shall no longer be tolerated in this country. Little can we wonder, Sir, at this change of attitude, at this new spirit—which can so easily be detected and still more easily be explained —which has permeated, gradually but surely, throughout the country, with greater force since the advent of peace. As I was listening to the Minister of Finance unfolding to us what we already too well knew—the ghastly story of our financial situation; as I read on the one hand the appalling figure of the national debt of two and a half billions of dollars; and as I saw on the other hand notwithstanding that tremendous burden which we have to carry and to bear—a burden partly but not wholly due to the war—the unmistakable evidence of waste and extravagance in the expenditure of our public money, I came, Sir, to realize more fully that whatever may be the other causes, the real explanation for the grievances and the discontent of the people at the present day, can be traced directly to the Government and to their lack of foresight and of courage in not leading the way, or even entering into the new stage of social growth. To me it appears of far greater importance in this debate that we should note and study the feelings of unrest so prevalent amongst our people, and try to remedy a situation truly alarming in the present juncture, than that we should indulge ourselves, for party purposes, in the luxury of discussing the historical

merits or demerits of free trade or protection. For my part, Sir,—as between the extreme views of those who belong to the one school of thought and of those who belong to the other, I stand by the policy of the party to which I belong, a policy which has for its immediate object, as I understand it, to maintain our custom duties for revenue purposes only and not for giving to any class of our population an unjust preference, privilege or protection detrimental to the great mass of our people. In a word, Sir the aim of Liberalism to-day is what it has always been in the past; not to destroy, but to reconstruct and to develop. I know full well, Mr. Speaker, that this fiscal policy of the Liberal policy has been persistently assailed in the past by the Tory high protectionists in this country. Did we not hear the Minister of Trade and Commerce, (Sir George Foster) quite recently in this debate—by a change of tactics as sudden as it was surprising,—pretend to see no difference between its scope and object and that of the policy to which he seems to still adhere with the same confidence and with the same enthusiasm with which he so often in the past gave testimony in this House? But, Sir, whatever the opinions of the Minister of Trade and Commerce on this point may be, we who belong to the Liberal party, looking back to the fifteen years of its administration, can find remarkable grounds for gratification at the thought of its splendid record and achievements. By whatever name you may call the fiscal system that was in vogue between 1896 and 1911, what we do know is that never before were Canadians so prosperous, so happy and so contented as during that brief but all too short period of Liberal administration. Such, Sir, was the success of that administration that when in its last year of office—forging ahead wisely but resolutely in the path it had traced for itself—it introduced and announced its policy of reciprocity, those who are sitting to your right could find no other weapon with which to attack their opponents than to shout on every housetop what was in fact a tribute to their opponents, "Let well enough alone". Brave indeed would be the public man who would to-day step on a public platform, and, facing a Canadian audience representative of all classes in the community, calmly repeat as a remedy for our present day troubles this old worn-out doctrine. "Let well enough alone". Were a Cabinet Minister to try this ordeal, when we are witnessing at the present time such an unnatural and unprecedented ferment spreading throughout the country, he would soon realize what he now feigns to ignore, the full sense and full feeling of indignation and alarm throughout the country provoked and accentuated by the folly, the ignorance, the lack of policy and the sad mismanagement of this Government.

Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing a remarkable change in this country. Canadians have come to learn, to better compare and to digest what passes before their eyes. They know, Sir, what they want. No mere promises will again satisfy them, or divert them from their course. Let us look, Sir, at the case of the farmer. He still remembers his unsuccessful pilgrimage to Ottawa He is still resentful of the cold reception that was then given him by the members of this Government. Can we restore his confidence, so badly shattered by the unfortunate events to which I have just alluded?

Let us look at some features of his programme. The farmer comes forward once more with a just and reasonable plea that if there is any sincerity in the appeal of this Administration for "production and still more production" as a cure for many of our present day troubles, the Government should immediately facilitate the work of our farming population by removing the duties on farm implements, thus cheapening the cost of the instruments of production and eliminating the chief obstacle to the successful achievement of their labour. Sir, that is a request which amounts to a sane policy, and which should be adopted by this House—a policy which is embodied in the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), and which, I may venture to say, is endorsed by the unanimous voice of Liberalism in this country.

But what does the Government do? Their attitude in this respect resembles their conduct on other questions of public policy. They hesitate, they linger, and finally they drift into the easier course of evading a decision and doing nothing. In 1911 they promised a tariff commission—nothing came of it; in 1919 there was to be an investigation preliminary to a tariff revision; this year a new Minister of Finance comes forward and promises to redeem the broken pledge of his predecessor. Strange would be this attitude were we not familiar with its true underlying causes. The weak protest of a small group whose interests seem to be merged with the fate of this Government, clinging desperately to a privilege which they feel is slipping from their

nngers, is sufficient to paralyze the efforts of this Government and to prevent justice being done to the great bulk of our population. It is said, Sir, that great men do not always know their well-wishes. Better for our Cabinet ministers would it be could we but rescue them from their friends!

Sir, there is another phase of this situation closely and intimately connected with the question raised by this amendment. We believe that substantial reductions in the tariff along the lines suggested by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's would contribute to solve, without ham or injury to any legitimate business in this country, the two most pressing economic problems of the hour: In the first place, diminish the high cost of living; in the second place, encourage the vigorous development of our national resources,—essential not only to procure us revenue, but essential also for the progress and prosperity of this country. Needless for us sitting here as representatives of the people to idly lament over the people's sufferings. A greater effort is expected from us than a casual glance at some newspaper which will inform us, day in and day out, that the high cost of living is still persisting in its ascending course. We may not please the present rulers of Canada, but we would surely be rendering a service to the cause of government could we but suggest a probable method of removing the cause of the present troubles and discontent amongst our people, which no honest and sane man would care to dispute or to deny. It is in this spirit that I have approached the perusal of this amendment; it is in this spirit that I intend to give it my hearty support.

I summarize my views, Mr. Speaker in one phrase: Greater production would mean more prosperity for the producer, greater relief to the consumer, and by tending to raise the purchasing power of the dollar proportionately to the reduction of the prices of commodities would eliminate the dangerous necessity of indefinitely increasing the wages without corresponding benefits to the wage earner. But, as usual, we are doomed to disappointment. The Government, after having taken the initiative in this campaign of production, fails to support it in the only practical way in which it could be supported. Instead of a policy founded on common sense, they prefer to lavish the people's money on commissions;—commissions for the regulation of prices which do no regulating—commissions for stimulating of production which fail to do any stimulating.

Not only does this Government fail to do its duty, not only does it fail to relieve the consumer by reducing the high cost of living, but it has the temerity to introduce a Budget which by the form of taxation proposed will leave unmolested the war profiteer to better crush the man whose only crime is to have preferred to remain honest rather than to become rich. This Budget is a direct challenge to the public opinion of Canada. But what cares this Government? It does not rest on public opinion; it knows and feels that it stands on private humour, that the foundation of its administration is on a quicksand.

What a pitiful position for a Government to be in! We heard the other day the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) make a vain attempt to save the sinking ship, to restore order in his own household, to desperately appeal to his supporters to remain steadfast as the members of a rapidly vanishing crew. Sir, I would pay this tribute to my hon. friend, that usually when he enters into a debate he is well armed with every sort of argument that would tend to strengthen his case. But there is a limitation to the resources of man, and when the hon. minister suddenly realized that his mission was to defend the record of this Government, and that he held in his hand but the slim material upon which to build his case—the promise of a tariff revision at some future date—he quickly sidestepped before such an arduous task, to enter into the easier course of finding fault with those who in this House disagreed with him. He attacked the Farmers' party; he did not spare the Liberal party. The former he reproached for their free trade principles; the latter he chastised because he seems to have found in the speeches of some of their leaders a tendency towards moderate protection. But free trade—moderate protection, will never satisfy the hon. Minister of the Interior. It was the voice of a staunch Tory, somewhat indignant at the thought that there may be some men in this country who fail to see the wisdom of maintaining intact the high protectionist policy of his party.

Mr. BURNHAM: Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. PACAUD: There lies the line of demarcation between the Government and those who oppose them. We see more clearly the true position of parties in this

country. May it help to bind more closely the forces which by the very nature of their programmes should be united and not divided. This Government, Mr. Speaker, is growing weaker and weaker. The popular torrent is gaining upon it every hour. Its fate is definitely sealed. From every nook and corner of the land is heard the wide clamour for a general election. To this chorus is added quite recently a new voice by no less a body than the Great War Veterans of Canada.

We are witnessing, Sir, a strenuous tug-of-war between those who, representing the last vestige of autocratic rule in this country, blind to the popular will, will not disgorge until they are dislodged, and those who, still mindful of a successful war for freedom, demand the restoration of the fight to a free election, indispensable to the renewal of our work of peace.

To make this country safe for democracy, Mr. Speaker, we can do no better than to turn towards Liberalism, to find in the glorious pages of its history the principles of sane and sound government. They have never failed in the past; they will not fail in the present instance to restore to the people their freedom, so badly shattered during recent years.

Mr. F. L. DAVIS (Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, any member who rises at this hour, after two weeks of debate of the tariff question, surely has assurance. But I feel that the occasion must not be allowed to pass without my saying at least a few words, and I shall endeavour to be brief.

The first Budget of our new Finance Minister is certainly breaking new ground, not only in Canada but perhaps in the world of finance. The method adopted has been discussed in recent times, but I know no case in which similar taxes have been imposed, save, perhaps, in France, where they are now considering a Budget which proposes a tax of one per cent on turnover and ten per cent upon luxuries. Possibly one of the things we have now to consider is whether a sales tax or tax on turnover is the better. Possibly the Finance Minister is not wedded to this particular method; he is willing to consider, I imagine, the adoption of that method which will get the money with the least expense to trade and the least expense to the Government.

At the bottom of any consideration of taxation proposals lies, of course, the present outlook in business. That is far from satisfactory, in spite of the figures which have been quoted again and again in this debate. An examination of the amounts or quantities of goods or commodities that we produced during the past year indicates a disappointing result, although the money values have increased. That certainly is small ground for satisfaction. Again, our money is at a discount in the greatest market which we have—that is, where our greatest buying is done—and that also is unsatisfactory. Another cause for dissatisfaction at he present time is the fact that the market in which we do most of our selling is not readily reached by our buyers. Our importations from England have not balanced with our exports to that country, and, in consequence, have muddied the situation.

On the other hand, there are certain grounds for satisfaction, or at least for hope that we will deal with the situation to our satisfaction. There was throughout the war an immense use of credit, mainly by the Government. As one English author says, perhaps as a result of that use of credit, we are inoculated against a panic or crisis at this time. Indeed, looking back over the history of other wars we see that usually from two to eight years elapsed before the crisis came. Probably the shortest period was the crisis of 1857, following the Crimean War. I believe that in about six years the crisis followed the Napoleonic wars, and after the Civil War in the United States the panic did not arrive until 1872 or 1873. From that, perhaps, it would be a reasonable deduction that we have before us a few years in which to readjust our finances.

Now, that these finances are not satisfactory we all admit. We have even, this year, not balanced our expenditures with our taxation, and it is questionable whether we shall do so next year. More taxation was needed during the war. The great cause of our troubles to-day is that inadequate taxation was then imposed. This was not peculiar to Canada; it was the case throughout the world, because I think we were all optimists; we were always hoping that the war would end within six months or a year. It was hard to adapt our taxation and our expenditures to a continuing state of war. That consideration stands, and the man who to-day comes forwards to criticise the financing of the five years of war must remember that he is looking at it with the wisdom of hindsight and that the man who was actually dealing with it had only human foresight to guide him. Nevertheless, there were men who during the war dwelt upon

the necessity for greater taxation than we had, and I do believe that the Government which preceded this Union Government was slack in not adopting other methods of taxation before they did.

At present we need, first of all, to balance our expenditure with our taxation. This Budget promises a prospect of so doing. Next, however, we need a surplus. I have not been in the House during the whole of the debate, but I have heard no one yet mention the necessity for providing a sinking fund in the very near future. I had hoped, indeed, that the Finance Minister would be able to tell us how soon he expects to have any considerable surplus and how he proposes to use that surplus. It is plain that if a change in values takes place we have a very considerable inflation of currency and that that surplus may be needed first of all to remove that inflation; next we must undoubtedly establish sinking funds for the redemption of our debt. How soon will that be reached? Will we reach that before we run into the storms which certainly will follow the vast waste of five years of world war? It is necessary that we should; otherwise we shall run into difficulties thereafter.

Something has been said about the necessity for reduction of expenditures, and upon that I wanted to speak this evening; I doubt whether I would have risen at all but for that. I wish especially to deal with the project which has been recommended to the British Government by the Select Committee on National Expenditure of 1917 with regard to a Committee on Estimates. That great man, Gladstone, said that it was very difficult for a minister to control the expenditure of his department at any time. I know that our Finance Minister has found it very difficult to get the reductions in Estimates that he has got this year. There are four points at which financial control may apply. Two of these are departmental with us, the officer having the expenditure in hand and the departmental auditor. Then the matter comes to the Minister of Finance and finally it must come to Parliament. I take it that in the Cabinet the ministers stand more upon an equality than ministers do under the English system, where the Treasury has a predominant voice in all these matters. That being so, our Minister of Finance cannot have full control, and he needs some means beyond what our present system gives him. No man has sat in this House through four sessions—and most of those around me have been here at least as long as that—without being impressed with the futility of the proceeding of passing Estimates. If an hon. member were a company director and authorising the expenditure of sums in connection with his company with no more knowledge of the requirements of the service than he has when passing Estimates, he should be committed to a penitentiary and probably he would be. The real reason why that is the case is that at the present time Parliament lacks the machinery for getting that information, and the proposition of a committee on estimates would provide Parliament with that machinery by which it could be informed. When the estimates were once submitted to and passed that committee and came before the House, the House could vote upon them with some measure of knowledge and assurance. It does not so vote now. The British House endeavoured to apply the idea of a committee of estimates in the year 1912. This was just a House committee without any machinery, and they found it would take them about thirty or forty years to get around the departments, and therefore, at the beginning of the war it was laid aside. But when the matter was examined by the Hon. Herbert Samuel's committee, a machinery was devised consisting of an Examiner of Estimates, having an office of practically equal rank with the Auditor General and a staff which could go into the various departments under the direction of the committee in the recess and gather the information which the committee would require to act upon. At this time our lack of such machinery is a defect in our system, and if we had such machinery, it would get us the reduction in expenditure we all know is necessary. For instance, a few weeks ago a statement was issued that there were 70,000 names on Canada's list of employees, and when you look over it you find 6,000 employees or thereabouts still in the Militia Department and thousands in the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. These departments have not been greatly cut down since the war, and it is very difficult for the minister or for the permanent officials to make the necessary reduction; but I take it that if that duty were laid upon Parliament, it would be done.

I wish to make a remark or two more directly in connection with the Budget, and I shall have finished. The present reduction in prices is rather coincident with this new taxation than an effect of it. The

reduction had begun before the taxation was imposed, and possibly it would have proceeded without our taxation. There is no doubt that a fall in prices to-day is the most desirable thing that could happen to allay unrest. If prices go down, wages will not follow them for some time, and this will do more than any other thing could to bring us out into more peaceful times.

Let me depart for a moment from my line of thought and refer to this matter lest I should later forget it. It seems to me that the Government at present should watch with a very jealous eye the many mergers and new issues of capital which are now occupying the financial world. After five years of war, disturbed business conditions such as we have had and enormous profits, it seems to me that an attempt is being made to capitalize the situation which attempt it is the duty of the Government to prevent big finance from putting across. These companies have been paying large dividends; the change in the value of money has greatly increased the apparent value of the properties, and it is undoubtedly a tempting time for the launching of such enterprises. If we cannot deal with this matter, we are going to leave one of the greatest causes of unrest not dealt with. There is no doubt that the ordinary man is quite willing to see capital get a fair return in the shape of dividends, but what is continually disturbing the workingman, the farmer, the community generally, is to see unearned amounts, hidden assets, converted into visible and real assets, and melons cut. A company is after all a creation of the legislature and it can be dealt with. There is no doubt whatever of our power to take hold of the question, and it is one of the great things that is now facing us. The limited liability company has a history in England—(and there it had its origin)—of only about 95 years. It was in 1825 that the Bubble Act was repealed in Great Britain and the incorporation of a limited liability company—there were chartered companies before—then first became possible. We have not learned how to control the device and we must learn how to control it if we are going to have any degree of satisfaction in our handling of big finance.

Last year I found it necessary to vote against the Government on its Budget because no new taxation had been imposed, no new areas of taxation had been opened, and regard was not had to the demands of the West in the reductions that were made. This year, because the Government has entered upon a course of opening up new areas of taxation in which we need experience and organization, out of which we learn something with every application, and because a real effort has been made—when we are increasing our taxation by 25 per cent in one year, I think that is a very real effort—it seems wise to me to support the Government. I have said that at this point because I have one or two other things to say in regard to much of the debate to which I have listened during the past two weeks. It has been comparatively easy to accept the Budget; it has been relatively difficult to accept the arguments in support of the Budget. The fact of the matter is that when we argue this question of protection and free trade, surely the stalest and most unprofitable question which this House ever deals with, never is even one instance exhausted; it is largely a case of "after this" and "therefore on account of this" when protection is alleged to have been the cause of prosperity. Let us examine for just a moment what occurred in Germany which, perhaps, is the great and classic example of what is claimed to be the great success of protection in our time. In 1834, the German Zollverein was formed; free trade was introduced into an area which before had been cut up by conflicting tariffs. In 1879, the Germans adopted a protection policy. But Germany's industrial success had begun before the adoption of her protective policy. Something which I have never heard referred to in this debate, and which I am sure had a very large share in the shifting of trade from England to Germany, is concerned with the currency. When England adopted free trade in 1846 she was the only country in the world that had a gold currency. Germany adopted a gold currency basing it upon the indemnity which she received from France in 1874. England had been for many years a manufacturing country and was a large buyer of raw materials and foodstuffs, and down to 1874, and even a little later—the Latin union was not dissolved until 1876—the best use the seller of these commodities could make of his money was to spend it in the English market. England was already a wealthy country. She had plenty of money and where money is plentiful goods are dear. Money was scarce in Germany and goods and services were cheap, and when the money was freely transmutable from English into German currency the seller of these goods took his money to Germany and bought cheaper

goods. The result was that Germany's increase in trade began before her protection came into force. More than that, it was just about 1870 that the iron ores of Germany were made accessible to the iron trade. Her iron ores are largely phosphorous, and it was not until the Gilchrist-Thomas process of smelting was adopted that she was able to use her ores and build up her iron trade. I do not propose to follow the matter through all the ramifications of finance and science. Germany had just won three great wars, and in such circumstances it is impossible to hold a people down. Psychology, science, finance and political economy came to her aid at that time and her industrial prosperity began. So far as England is concerned, it certainly seems to me that when we survey Europe, with every protective country on its last legs trembling even yet on the verge of bankruptcy as a result of the war, and find England their support and the hope of civilized Europe, England being a free trade country, there is some reason to doubt whether protection has all the virtues that have been ascribed to it by some members on this side. Nevertheless, I must say this, that when our forefathers founded this Dominion of Canada, which otherwise might have been four separate communities, there was probably, in the then state of political and economic knowledge, some excuse for the application of protection to build up the consciousness of mutual interest. It at least was an obvious way and it would probably have taken longer under free trade to do the same thing. But even if that were so, it is no justification for the continuation of the process, after the lines have been laid down upon which we now have trade east and west and have a community who have fought through this war in such a manner as to consolidate the country to a greater extent than had been possible by reason of the economic efforts of the last fifty years.

Mr. CURRIE: What about the United States?

Mr. DAVIS: In what respect?

Mr. CURRIE: As an example of protection.

Mr. DAVIS: The hour is getting rather late and I would rather discuss that question with the hon. member in private, I do not wish to impose on the patience of the House. Let me say, however, that it was impossible that England should for all time have dominated the market, for there must have come a time when her mines would be exhausted, when there would be greater expense in working mines, and when other countries, with vast stores of raw materials, would begin to open up. It was upon her iron trade that the United States afterwards built her commercial success; and incidents connected therewith which could not be foreseen when she adopted protection, were essentials to the upbuilding of that industry.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that in my opinion the present taxation may prove to be a makeshift—we may find that it will be necessary to make changes if we are to get any great result from it. I think that our income tax needs revision and that a super-tax should be applied to replace our war profits taxes. Further than that, I am inclined to think that as our farmers pay only $5,000 our of each $1,000,000 of income tax it will be necessary to modify that tax say by a tax on rentals as in England so that we may get a proper proportion from them. I am sure that that expresses the feeling of the West, and I will leave others to speak for the East. The great leader on the other side who has passed away said on one occasion that the twentieth century would be Canada's and we have every reason to hope that it will be. A country cannot have gone through the experience which has been Canada's lot during the past few years without gaining a very great impetus. Old prejudices have been and will be examined by the new and vigorous generation which has borne no small part in the effort which resulted in the winning of this great war. Henceforth, I think, we shall find in this country a class of men who will resent the suggestion that we cannot compete with the United States or any other country, a class of men who will go into the markets of the world to take what is rightfully Canada's, a class of men who will develop the industries of Canada and make a success of them; and we trust that the future of Canada may be a great and successful one.

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. SPEAKER—

Mr. McDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I am sure I have listened during the last two weeks—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; Mr. Jacobs has the floor.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): Mr. Speaker, a story is told of the late Duke Devonshire when as Marquis of Harington——

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: This is not in accordance with the arrangement that was made. I do not know whether it means anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Mr. Jacobs has the floor.

Mr. JACOBS: I was about to relate an incident in the life of the late Duke of Devonshire when as Marquis of Harington he was a member of the House of Commons. On one occasion during an address that he was delivering before the House he put his hand to his mouth and tried to suppress a yawn. He was actually yawning at his own speech. I am very much, to-night, in the position of the late Duke of Devonshire, and feeling as I do myself, I can very well imagine what hon. members of the House must feel when they are obliged to listen to my remarks at midnight.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. JACOBS: An hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." I feel exactly the same when he speaks. Representing as I do, Mr. Speaker, numerically one of the largest urban divisions in the Dominion of Canada I feel I owe it to my electors on this occasion to make a public profession of faith and to declare that I intend to vote for the amendment proposed by my hon. friend for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). It is surprising how opinions differ in large cities. I am a next-door neighbour to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne). He was elected by a very large majority and he sits on the other side of the House, while I, whose constituency is about fifteen or twenty feet away from his, was elected by a majority three times as large to oppose his views in this House. These are some of the curious features in the psychology of the people who reside in urban districts.

I had intended, if I had been able to obtain a hearing earlier in this debate, to speak about the tax proposals and other matters which have been brought up by the resolutions proposed by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). But these have been discussed in the past few weeks and threshing old straw would be of no service. On an occasion of this kind, however, knowing that any member of the House is permitted to talk on almost anything on the Budget debate we have the privilege in the words of the English nonsense rhyme, of talking about "ships and shoes, and sealing wax,, of cabbages and kings." Perhaps I may be permitted to start with ships. The Minister of Marine is here and I will take the opportunity of telling him that I am unalterably opposed to his policy in obtaining from this Government already something like $70,000,000 for the purpose of starting, his merchant marine enterprise.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is $75,000,000.

Mr. JACOBS: Well, $75,000,000—$5,000,000 is neither here nor there in these days; it was hardly worth the interruption. When every person is supposed to exercise thrift and economy, when we are told that we must save, when all kinds of luxury taxes are imposed upon the people, not so much for the purpose of obtaining revenue for the Government as for the purpose of preventing people from buying commodities, this embarkation upon an entirely new policy of sailing into uncharted seas with these vessels cannot appeal to men who have the interests of the country at heart. We are obliged to pay six per cent for our money and yet the Minister of Marine is able to obtain an appropriation of $75,000,000 for an enterprise of this kind the result of which is, to say the least, doubtfull. Last year the Government obtained credits for something like $100,000,000 for the Balkan States. We were going to foster trade with the Balkan States.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Only $25,000,000 for the Balkans.

Mr. JACOBS: There was $25,000,000 for the Roumanian loan, $25,000,000 for Greece, and other States were also to be looked after. I understand that $25,000,000 was passed for the Roumanian loan of which $17,000,000 has already been paid out for this purpose. We were shown yesterday by the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) that a very large portion of this money went into the hands of supporters of this Government many of whom are members on the other side of the House. What is the view to-day of the former Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), the immediate predecessor of the present Minister of Finance, as to the wisdom of that loan, that he advocated so vigorously when it was presented to the House. Does he still think it is good business? Is Roumania in a position to carry out its obligations? Is he aware that that country is practically in the hands of the Bolsheviki? Have we forgotten that last year the Minister went on with this policy regardless of the advice which we proferred him on that occasion? There has been a practical waste of this money. We are

12 p.m.

obliged to tax the people in order to obtain these large sums? The policy of the present Minister of Finance, the policy of the former Minister of Finance, the Canadian National railways policy, the Grand Trunk policy—these are the reasons why we are obliged to impose taxes upon the people of this country. Last year, when the Grand Trunk proposal was before the House, we opposed it as vigorously as we could. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) was strongly in favour of the policy of the Government in taking over the line and in paying the British stockholders a substantial sum for their interest in the railway rather than that the company should be expropriated in order to pay the debt that was due to the Dominion of Canada by reason of the obligation contracted by them for the Grand Trunk Pacific.

In this connection I would like to read a passage from the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer. I was not in the House when he made his speech. This is the first opportunity I have had to call the attention of the House to it. At page 1495 of Hansard, second session 1919, I find these remarks by the hon. member for Red Deer:

> If I am right in that conclusion, the bald fact is that, debating in the Parliament of a country which we all belive to be great and which we hope to see much greater, we should surely not approach this question as the worst type of a Jew Would, but we should try to approach it with some element of statesmanship.

The first question I have to ask the hon. member for Red Deer is: "What is the worst type of a Jew?" Perhaps I could enlighten him. A bad Jew is a man who fails to observe the tenets of his religion, a bad Jew is a Jew who fails to observe the law of Moses and the teaching of the Rabbis. Is that the type of Jew the hon. member had in his mind? If so, then Benjamin Disraeli, Lord Burnham and Alfred Mond, the latter a great apostle of free trade, come in the category of bad Jews because they fell away from the teachings of Judaism. A little later he went on to say:

> Are we going to increase the good opinion of the Old Country people; are we going to increase our standing in the eyes of the world and of the Empire if we drive what I venture to call a Jewish bargain instead of trying to look at this with the eyes of statesmen?

A little later my good friend, the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) —for whose amendment I am going to vote; I have got some of the elements of christian charity in me, and I am going to return good for evil—made use of this statement, which is to be found at page 1496 of Hansard of the second session of 1919:

> Mr. Fielding: With nearly everything my hon. friend has said I can cordially agree. . . . The stock, I venture to say, in the past six months, has fallen largely into the hands of some of those Jews in London, whom my hon. friend would not have us take as models to follow in bargaining.

While it is true, Mr. Speaker, that the Grand Trunk Railway stock was watered to the point of saturation, does my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's think that because it was thus watered to the point of saturation it should be entirely in the hands of Baptists? Mr. Speaker, I cannot but deprecate leading members of Parliament making statements of that kind in the House. I can understand that sort of language being made use of by cheap politicians outside of Parliament during the stress and turmoil of an election, but in the House of Commons I would expect something different from these gentlemen, and I hope that so long as I am member of Parliament I shall not have occasion to again rise again and rebuke them for what I think was an act unworthy of their own dignity or of the dignity of the House.

I, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the attack which was made this evening by the President of the Privy Council upon our good friend, the member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), the former stated that the language used by the latter was false, and he did not qualify it in any way. The Deputy Speaker, who was in the Chair at the time, held that inasmuch as the Minister did not say that the language was false and malicious it would have to go and we have to accept it at that. I wish to point out, however, that the President of the Privy Council did not take heed or pay any attention whatever to, the letters from the late John Fraser, Auditor General, which were read into Hansard with reference to these very items. What the member for Antigonish and Guysborough did say was that he had been attempting since 1917 to obtain some information with regard to these vouchers. He interviewed the late Auditor General on a number of occasions and in his address placed on Hansard letters written by him which will be found at page 2724 of the unrevised edition. For instance the first letter is as follows:

> AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE.
>
> September 15, 1917.
>
> Sir,—With reference to vouchers for expenditures in England, I have received no

vouchers for 1917-18. It is necessary that these vouchers should be forwarded regularly to enable this office to properly check the accounts. Kindly let me know when I may receive vouchers covering expenditure for as late a date as possible.

I am sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. FRASER, A.G.
Deputy Minister, for
Militia and Defence.

On September 24th, 1917, a letter in reply to the foregoing was written by an official of the Department of Militia and also appears in Hansard.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend said that I made no reference to the letters. He is in error. I did make reference to them, but I said they related to accounts other than the $121,000,000—that they had no relation to that item.

Mr. JACOBS: I was not in the House at the time, and therefore I accept the explanation of the President of the Privy Council, but I have this to say of the whole transaction: We heard for the first time, to-night, that the reason these vouchers had not been produced and filed in the office of the Auditor General is that the ship which carried them had been torpedoed. If I am not correct, I wish to have it stated.

Mr. ROWELL: I am sorry that my hon. friend was not in the House at the time, but I stated there were two or three reasons why the vouchers were not sent over. One was that two ships upon which there were vouchers were torpedoed, and it was therefore considered undesirable to run the risk of sending any more vouchers over during the war. There were two other reasons if my hon. friend wishes me to give them.

Mr. JACOBS: All I have to say is that we heard for the first time, to-night, of the torpedoing of vessels carrying vouchers —we knew nothing of it before. My hon. friend (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) spends a great deal of his time digging into matters which are of interest to the House and to the people, and he had been attempting since 1917 to ascertain what had become of these vouchers. He saw from time to time in the Auditor General's Report memos that no vouchers had been received for this vast sum of $121,000,000, and he was justified in bringing the matter before the House as he did. Up to the present moment we have not yet had the vouchers for the immense sum referred to, notwithstanding the long speech which was made to-night by the President of the Privy Council. I hope, however, that the debate which has arisen on this matter will have the necessary result, and that in due time the vouchers will be on file so that everyone may take communication of them.

I was going to say a word or two with reference to the Canadian Northern Railway.

Mr. ROWELL: Will my hon. friend permit me? Before passing to that, to prevent any misunderstanding, I may say that I communicated with the Liberal Whip and intimated that I was going to deal with Mr. Sinclair's statement with a view to having the hon. gentleman in the House to-night when it was dealt with.

Mr. JACOBS: So long as my hon. friend was not able to produce the vouchers that the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough required, I do not know that any mere statement that the President of the Privy Council was going to deal with the matter would really satisfy the hon. member.

I want to say a word or two with reference to the Canadian Northern Railway, which we now own, and to point out to the House something with regard to the extravagance —wasteful, wanton, wilful extravagance— shown by that company before the line was turned over to the Government of Canada. We are responsible for that extravagance. We permitted the Canadian Northern Company to go on in their mad way until they reached a position where we were obliged to take over the line. These people came to Parliament year after year for the purpose of obtaining money. We handed this money over to them and seemed to be entirely unregardful as to what they did with it. Before the Canadian Northern was merged into the Canadian National Railway System the Company obtained a charter from Parliament to build a tunnel through Mount Royal, and I understand the cost of that was $11,000,000. We permitted that to be done, Mr. Speaker, we gave the company this power, and we allowed them to pierce this mountain, costing the people of Canada $11,000,000, when that work could have been obviated by forcing the Canadian Pacific, or the Grand Trunk Railway Company, to allow the Canadian Northern to negotiate the mountain by going about a mile or a mile and a half outside of their present line. Now in order to pierce the mountain the company were obliged to undermine valuable property in the city of Montreal, and as a result of the construction of this tunnel the buildings along the streets—shops, houses and so forth—fell into ruins, and the com-

pany were obliged at the cost of very large sums of money to settle with the owners. At the present time the Dominion owns on McGill College Avenue, which is the street I refer to, a number of stores and houses and in addition a Jewish Synagogue. I suggest that my good friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) might utilize that Synagogue for the purpose of converting bad Jews into good Jews so that the Government might in that way obtain some use for this Synagogue. But the point I want to make particularly is that we allowed this company to do what they liked with the money we gave them. We had no supervision over it, we allowed them to build a station for their Transcontinental railway on Lagauchetière street about a hundred yards from the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk stations. We now own two of those stations, and I say it was criminal on the part of the Government to have allowed the money to be expended on that new station and finally to have it unloaded on the country. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company should have been forced to allow running rights to the other two lines so as to give them access into the city of Montreal, which would have obviated the enormous expense of building these stations and tunnels which have had to be taken over by the Government. I say that the Government—not particularly the present Government, but the Government of yesterday, and perhaps, the Government of the day before—will be held to account by the people for the manner in which they allowed the Canadian Northern Railway Company and Mackenzie and Mann to deal with these railways that we have been obliged to take over.

The immigration problem is of great importance to this country at the present moment. Without a proper immigration policy this country is bound to go into bankruptcy, for we must have immigrants if we are to live financially. At the present time we have a population of about 8,000,000 and a national debt of $2,000,000,000 and our annual expense is something like $400,000,000. It does not require much of a mathematician to discover that if 8,000,000 people bear that debt, 16,000 would have to bear only one-half, and if we had a population of 32,000,000 people they would have to bear only one-quarter of that debt. We must have a proper immigration policy, and I submit that the present Government is not adopting a policy calculated to attract proper immigrants. We have placed all kinds of stumbling blocks in the way of prospective immigrants. Whatever may be said of Sir Clifford Sifton—and I am not here to be his protagonist—I want to say that the immigration policy he adopted was the policy for this country, and since his time we have had no Minister of Immigration who came near to him in the wide vision he had in regard to a national policy in that regard. At present we raise every kind of objection to immigrants; we encourage only a certain class; they must come from a certain district; they must be farmers and domestics. That is not the right policy. To-day a man may be an agriculturist; to-morrow he may be a shop-keeper. To-day a woman is a domestic servant; to-morrow she may become the wife of a profiteer. There is no guarantee that the people we bring in are going to remain in the same avocation, for this is a land of opportunity and those who come to this country naturally expect to improve their lot, otherwise they would not leave their native land.

The unfortunate part of the whole thing is that we are aping the United States in the matter of an immigration policy. But the conditions in the two countries are not comparable. They have 110,000,000 people and can pick and choose their immigrants; but we are not in that position, and yet we blindly follow the regulations of the United States in respect to immigrants. If to-day the United States pass an immigration law, to-morrow it is put on our statute books. They take the snuff to-day, and we do the sneezing to-morrow. So long as we follow that policy, just so long will we be a land without people.

When immigrants arrive on our shores what do we offer them? At this late hour I am not going into the question of our naturalization law. But suppose a man comes from that hated tyrannical country, Germany; he wants to forget the life he led there. He has read about this great land of opportunity. What does he find? On his arrival he has to wait ten years from the date of the signing of the Peace Treaty in 1919 before he can become a fully enfranchised Canadian citizen. And before that is possible he must obtain from Germany the consent of that Government that he may shed his allegiance to the Fatherland and become a British citizen; if he does not obtain that consent he remains for all time an alien in this country and can never aspire to the rights of British citizenship. Why does he come here? He can go to the United States where no questions are asked, and where after five years, if he has been a good citizen, he can become a fully naturalized American citizen

and hold his naturalization against the world. In the United States they put no obstacle in his way, certainly nothing like we have here under the proposed Franchise Act. We have that Act, we have the Naturalization Act, and we have the Immigration Act—all tending to keep the new citizen an alien as long as possible. So long as that alien can go across the border and obtain all the rights and privileges of citizenship it is not likely that we shall ever increase our population by immigration.

I would like to say a word or two with regard to the new imposts, but perhaps these can very well stand until the resolutions go into committee. I would, however, point out one peculiar anomaly with regard to the excess profits tax which I think ought to be brought to the attention of the Government now. Under the present taxation law a man with a million dollars, we will say, goes into business, and in a year he makes a profit of half a million dollars —which is a large profit, every one will admit, but we will say that he is a friend of the Government and is supplying goods to Roumania and the other Balkan States —what has he to pay the Government under the new Act? He has to pay $120,000. We will take another case of a man who goes into business with $500,000 of his own, but he is unable to continue with that amount of capital, and having good credit at the bank he borrows another $500,000, and with this $1,000,000 he goes ahead, and, we will say, he also obtains some of the credits extended to the Balkan States and makes $500,000. How much, think you, do the Government get from him? They get $250,000. I was going to say that that is a clear proof of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer, although probably that statement would not be accepted as it perhaps should be, inasmuch as even in these days a man with $500,000 cannot be declared to be a poor man. But there is the anomaly in the law—that a man who has half a million dollars and makes half a million pays fifty per cent of it to the Government, whereas the man who has a million dollars and makes half a million pays only $120,000. That is something which can be discussed in committee and corrected at that stage of the procedure.

This afternoon when the leader of the Opposition was talking about the coalition of 1917 he said that the promise was given by certain members of the Government that this union or coalition was only to be for the period of the war, and for no longer. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) challenged the leader of the Opposition to state when that promise was given and by whom. The leader of the Opposition was not in public life at the time and the incidents in connection with the speeches made at the time of the election must have escaped him. I have, however, a memo of the promises made by members of the Government that this union was to be only for the duration of the war and for not a day longer. Hon. Mr. Carvell, then Minister of Public Works in this Government, speaking at Sarnia in the fall of 1917—immediately after he was sworn in he went there to give a hand to the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Pardee) who now sits on this side of the House—made the statement, with all the responsibility attaching to his position as Minister of the Crown, that so far as he knew this Government was going to last until the war was over and not a day longer. He has carried out his promise; he is no longer a member of the Government. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) on various occasions made the statement in public that he was going to retire from the Government immediately the war was over. Has he kept his promise? He has.

Mr. BUTTS: For the benefit of the Government.

Mr. JACOBS: For the benefit of the Government—"he left his country for his country's good."

Mr. BUTTS: Exactly.

Mr. JACOBS: Well, that may be the view of my good friend from Cape Breton, but I scarcely think it is the view of the front benches, judging by the attention which the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) paid to the member for Marquette in his remarks this evening. I speak now subject to correction, but I believe that the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) made a statement of that kind or said something which could be construed into a statement of that kind on various occasions, and if the matter is of sufficient importance his remarks may be found on reference to Hansard. But I qualify my remarks with regard to the Minister of Immigration because I am not so certain that the statement he made could not be construed into something else.

The member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. MacLean) who occupied the position of property man or maid-of-all-work in this Gov-

ernment, is also no longer here. I understand that pending the taking of this vote he has taken to the tall woods of Newfoundland where he is hunting or fishing or doing something of that kind. The hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mewburn) who was Minister of Militia and Defence,—where is he now? He is certainly not a member of the Government. So that I can say in the words of the famous poet, Mrs. Hemans:

They grew in beauty side by side,
Where are those dreamers now?

In connection with one of the taxes proposed I wish to make a reference which may perhaps be considered by my hon. friends as a little picayune, and that is, the beer tax. We still have beer in Quebec of a certain consistency.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Don't say anything about it.

Mr. JACOBS: I suppose it makes my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) thirsty when I mention it. But if he will come down with me to the province of Quebec I will send him back to Ottawa and say nothing about it. This tax, Mr. Speaker, is certainly directed against the poor man. The poor man and his beer have been, I was going to say, synonymous terms for years. In England you can scarcely mention beer without thinking of the poor man or the poor man without thinking of his beer; they are almost inseparable. If any attempt were made to impose a similar tax on beer in England just now it would probably produce a revolution. The Minister of Finance is a very kindly man, and I am sure it was not this suggestion that caused this tax to be placed on beer. The tax under the new proposals is 30 cents a gallon. I have made inquiries from saloon-keepers and I am told that about twelve glasses form one gallon, which would mean that 2½ cents is the tax upon beer per glass. Formerly the price of beer was five cents per glass.

Mr. KEEFER: Could the hon. member telle me how much per schooner?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Ask the Minister of Marine.

Mr. JACOBS: The Minister of Marine could possibly give my hon. friend the information. But we are dealing with glasses at the moment. Two and a half cents is the present tax on beer per glass. As I say, the former price of beer was five cents per glass, 2½ cents was paid to the brewer, the profit to the saloon-keeper was 2½ cents, and the beer was sold at 5 cents. Now, with the 2½ cent tax the beer costs the saloon-keeper 5 cents, and instead of making 2½ cents profit as he did before, he has raised the price to 10 cents, so that when the Government takes 2½ cents the saloon-keeper waits for his opportunity and jumps his price another 2½ cents, and there we have a 100 per cent advance charged to the workingman for his beer. Does the Minister of Finance ever expect to go before the electorate of this country? If he does, how does he expect to show them that 10 cents per glass is a reasonable price to pay when the price before this tax was imposed was only 5 cents per glass? I think that he will have some difficulty in convincing them of the justice and righteousness of his cause. I should not mind being pitted against him in any division in Canada where beer is drunk, he with his advocacy of 10 cents per glass and I with my advocacy of 5 cents per glass.

I would like to refer for a moment to the election in East Elgin. The House will remember that last year a Bill was passed declaring that by-elections must take place within six months after the seat is declared vacant. When I introduced my original Bill I had it at sixty days, but when the Bill went into Committee it was urged by the Solicitor General, the present Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) that in the Hudson Bay region and in other remote districts it would be almost impossible to have an election within sixty days, for various geopraphical reasons, particularly in winter. The member for Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer) pointed out clearly that in his division, if, God forbid, there should be a by-election, it would be absolutely impossible to get the writs out and have everything done within sixty days, so we finally reluctantly agreed to fix the period at six months. Well, the Government are taking every day of that six months in connection with the East Elgin by-election. Is that the spirit in which the matter was discussed at the time? I say that the Government is acting in bad faith in not bringing on that election within a reasonable time. During this entire session there will be no representative from East Elgin, and that division is to be left unrepresented purely to satisfy the whim or caprice of something ulterior of the Government. These are matters which I leave to the Government to think about, and I feel confident that, when the gravity of the situation with regard to the election is brought before the Government, particularly when it was

promised that that election would be brought on within a reasonable time, they will act at once.

I feel that I have taken up too much of the time of the House. I did not rise to make any set speech; any views that I had at the time the Budget was brought down were so thoroughly discussed previously by hon. members on this side of the House and by Government members, that when I came to speak I was in the position of my good friend the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell), who said that there was nothing left to glean. But my hon. friend found that his gleaning was pretty effective as he spent two hours in discussing matters which he found were of interest. If the President of the Council had to do some gleaning when he rose to speak, what shall be said of me when I have to speak after the President of the Council has spoken? He has covered the ground thoroughly from his point of view, and I must congratulate him on the speech he made. It was a vigorous fighting speech, and I must say this for the President of the Council, that he evidently forgot that the war was over; this was a speech which he evidently had in stock, and he wanted to get rid of it before the taxation proposals went into effect, fearing that if he had to pay a 10 per cent tax on that speech, he might have to carry it in stock and not be able to dispose of it before it became shelf-worn.

Mr. WILLIAM S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N.B.): Mr. Speaker, before I enter upon a discussion of the matter before the House, might I be permitted to extend a word of welcome to the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) who has returned to this House, I hope, so thoroughly restored to health that he may be able to continue in the good work in which he is engaged? May I also express a word of congratulation to the Speaker of the House and to the Deputy Speaker of the House, that they are the first two gentlemen to occupy the Chair in this wonderful chamber of this magnificent building.

Mr. Speaker, as I wander through these spacious halls—marble halls, may I say?—I am reminded of the conflagration that took place so short a time ago and of the wonderful deliverance some members had on that occasion. It is fitting that I should congratulate the people of Canada for giving the lawmakers of this country, not only the present lawmakers but the lawmakers for generations to come, such a beautiful chamber to occupy.

May I have this opportunity of congratulating the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) on the Budget that he has presented to the House? It is the first Budget that he has delivered as a member of the House of Commons, and it certainly is one of the best that I have ever heard.

Let me refer for just a moment or two to a statement he made. He told us that for the past year he has a surplus of $39,000,000, and in that regard he has done very well. But he told us also that he will require altogether about $541,000,000 for the coming year. That, of course, takes up some treasury bills to the extent of $74,000,000, which, I think, mature during the present year. We find from his statement that he expects to receive from the customs $167,000,000 for the current year. But last year, that is the fiscal year ended March 31, 1920, he received from the customs no less a sum than $187,520,613. Those figures clearly show that, over and above any amount that is added to the customs tax, he is reducing the customs tax during the coming year by an amount of upward of 20 million. And yet the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) told us this afternoon that the Government had not taken any duties off the necessaries of life. He also said that the Government have taken no steps to make it possible to relieve the cost of living, and further, that the Government were protecting the profiteers instead of the consuming public. If I were to use unparliamentary language, I could, perhaps, say something that I ought not to say, but I will say in the meantime that those statements are inaccurate. If we have taken off $20,000,000 more than we are putting on through the customs, then surely we have reduced the duties. I may be asked, what we are reducing them on. We are certainly reducing them on the necessaries of life. Let me point to one item of the necessaries of life. For a number of years we have had a war tax of 7½ per cent on raw cotton, and I am sure that every hon. gentleman present will admit that cotton textiles are a necessary of life. Do hon. members know how much duty the consuming public paid into the treasury during the past fiscal year on raw cotton? Nearly $3,000,000. Yet, as was pointed out by the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell), during the fifteen years of the Liberal regime a reduction of only about $2,400,000 was made in the way of tariff. taxes. A reduction of some $125,866 has been made in the duty on nails, which are a necessary of life. If you go right through the schedule, you will find that we have reduced the duties on the necessaries of life and, to that extent, have reduced the cost

of living. If that be true, is it statesmanlike for the leader of the Opposition to say that this Government have not taken any duties off the necessaries of life?

Then he goes onto say that we have protected the profiteers and ignored the consuming public, but he gives no proof in substantiation of that statement. It is a mere allegation, and so far as I can see it is not in accordance with the facts. The hon. member further says that we tax the middle and poorer classes. Well, of course, it is a matter of dispute as to who are the middle and poorer classes who will pay this tax, but I venture to say that all the people in Canada will share in the benefit that will be derived from the net reduction of $20,000,000. Then the leader of the Opposition says that we are safeguarding the rich and their friends. I do not know what ground he had for that statement, but I can see not the slightest shadow of actual fact in it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me point out what a constructive tariff policy is. The Minister of Finance tells the people of Canada that he intends to have a thorough revision of the tariff; and, more than that, he tells them on what basis that revision and investigation will be made. It is to that point that I wish to direct attention particularly, because if the Minister of Finance carries out his proposal on the basis which he has stated, then I say that the effect will not be such as has been suggested by the leader of the Opposition. I say that the policy of the Minister will tend to reduce the duty on the necessaries of life and will be a step in the direction of relieving the cost of living. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it will not protect the profiteers instead of the consumers, nor will it unduly tax the middle and poorer classes any more than those who are better able to bear taxation. Indeed, Sir, there is every indication that those best able to bear taxation will be asked to shoulder the brunt of it. Now, the first plank in the minister's platform—and this will surely bear out my statements—is an undertaking to prevent the abuse of the tariff for the exploitation of the consumer. I would ask the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) whether he does not approve of that plank. That hon. gentleman would protect infant industries, but I am sure he will agree that it is an eminently wise provision of this plank that the consuming public are not to be exploited. The first plank of the minister's platform therefore announces the fact that the consumer will be taken care of. The second plank is to stabilize legitimate industries and encourage the establishment of new industries essential to the proper economic development of the nation. Perhaps some hon. gentleman will contend that these cannot go together. My view is different; I think they can and ought to go together. As to details of the way in which the matter is to be carried out I shall have a word or two to say later on.

The next plank is to develop to the fullest extent our natural resources. I am sure there is not much opposition to that on either side of the House. On the question of developing our natural resources I think we are all at one. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), in order to do that, wants to have the duty taken off agricultural implements. He asks us to take the duty off the instruments of production, but he says not a word about taking the duty off farm products. I cannot see the consistency in this.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: May I tell my hon. friend that the first plank in the platform of the Dominion Council of Agriculture is absolute freedom of all food?

Mr. LOGGIE: I am very glad to take this opportunity to state that I cannot entertain any such proposal for one moment, and I will give my reasons. There are very many manufactured food products in this country, and if you let goods of that kind in free you will destroy those industries. I challenged the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) last year to go to Montreal and tell the Clark Company there that he would let Kansas City and Chicago send in canned goods here free. I contend, Sir, that you connot let these goods in free without destroying the industries.

An hon. MEMBER: What about fish?

Mr. LOGGIE: Fish can come free. There is no reason in the world why there should be a duty on fish, so far as I can see. There is no duty on fish going into the United States and that is the greatest boom that has come to the fishing industry in the last decade.

There is another plank that I want to give my concurrence to; it is to assist in providing adequate revenue. I am glad that the minister has put that forward. It would be silly to put it in any other way; it would be silly to say that we can have a tariff for revenue these days. There was a day when a tariff for revenue might possibly have met the case. In 1897 our total customs receipts were under $20,000,000—to-day we have reduced the customs rev-

enue by that sum. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about tariff for revenue, but when you consider that we have to raise no less than approximately $500,000,000 for some years to come and that $140,000,000 of that is for interest you will surely not say that we can raise it from the customs. If you destroyed all your industries and let all the goods we consume come in under a reasonable duty, I suppose you could get a very large sum, but I do not think you could get anything like $500,000,000. The minister was wise when he laid emphasis on the fact that the customs taxes were to assist in providing adequate revenue.

Then, the next step he takes is to specially promote and increase trade with the Mother Country, sister dominions, colonies and Crown dependencies. I have not heard any opposition to that; therefore I presume this is a plank that hon. gentlemen would not object to vote for.

The next is to secure the interests of the Canadian people in the existing world struggle for commercial and industrial supremacy. In this young nation with the natural resources that we have, it does seem to me that if we are to grow, if we are to become a great nation, we surely ought to manufacture the most of the goods that we consume. We should do more than that. We should endeavour to export goods as well. Let me here illustrate as to the cost of goods. To-day hon. gentlemen claim that the consumers pay the manufacturers the duty in their price; that is to say that the manufacturers charge a rate for the goods that includes the cost of a like commodity plus the duty. If that were so years ago I can tell hon. gentlemen that is not so to-day.

Prints and cottons are practically as cheap to-day in Canada as they are in the United States or the United Kingdom. There is a good reason for it. If the United States attempted to send their cottons over here, the buyer would lose about 11 per cent because of depreciated currency. The United Kingdom cannot get the raw cotton of the United States to advantage because it takes £1 to buy $3.80 worth of cotton, where a few years ago £1 would buy $4.80 worth of cotton. The manufacturer in England is at a disadvantage and in so far as I know there is not a dollar's worth of English or American prints in the large warehouses of the great cities of Canada. If the proposal of the amendment were carried out and there was an immediate reduction in the rate of duty on cotton textiles, these good,s in my judgment, would not be any cheaper to the consuming public. The proposal of the Minister of Finance will be fair to consumers, will protect the great industries and will foster and conserve those that are young and infantile. They will enable our manufacturers to get their raw material free and they will make all citizens pay some share. I think that is a very desirable point in the platform—that all citizens pay some share of the expenditures of the country. They pay into the revenues to some extent and it is only fair that they should pay some portion but the greatest burdens are on those best able to bear them.

I have already explained how the proposals reduce the tariff to the extent of $30,000,000 based on the imports and values of last year. While they reduce it $30,000,000 they add $10,000,000 by way of customs super or sur taxes. Inasmuch as this money did go into the treasury it will be a real reduction. I give the Minister of Finance credit for the courage that he displayed in reducing customs taxes of this kind. Remember that the total customs taxes in 1897 were under $20,000,000. I am quite sure that the consumers not only paid the duty on raw cotton when they bought their textiles but they also paid the difference in currency which, hon. gentlemen will recall, was as high as 17 per cent.

1 a.m. They paid 7½ per cent and also the amount of the depreciated currency. Placing raw cotton at forty cents per pound, taking 7½ per cent of that sum, then the adverse exchange and then the profit, by the time the article gets to the retailer, you have a reduction in the cost, because the duty is taken off the raw material, equal to about 5 per cent on the finished product.

True, the most of it went into the Treasury, and many of us will say, "Well if it goes into the Treasury I do not mind." The objection raised by some hon. gentlemen is that the Treasury does not get the benefit, but that millionaires profit. I am not so sure that is the case at the present time. The conditions at the present time are abnormal. Labour in the United Kingdom is as high as it is in Canada, and the same condition prevails in the United States. If we could get our raw material in free of duty I do not see why we cannot produce the goods very nearly as cheaply, at any rate, as they can on the other side of the line. We are doing it at the present time. What may transpire later if business becomes normal I cannot say; but at present

conditions are abnormal, and the prices of textiles in the United States and in the United Kingdom are practically as high as they are here.

Let me illustrate that in another way. I was in Winnipeg a few days ago and I went into a knitting factory there, and I was surprised to see them packing up knitted goods to go to New Zealand, goods that were sold at the same price as they were sold to Canadian consumers, or to the Canadian trade. Now, if it be true that that knitting company sold those goods to go to New Zealand, did they not sell them at the world's market value? At any rate they sold them on the basis of the price they could get them for in England, and surely that demonstrates the fact for which I have been contending. Whether they sold them cheaper I do not know—all I know is that the buyers, as business men, were purchasing them to the best advantage, and the goods were going from Winnipeg to New Zealand.

Now this proposal of the Minister of Finance—and it is to my mind the most important fact—stabilizes the general tariff and places businesses on a firm foundation. In that policy you have the interest of the consumer, and the industrial life of the country looked after. If you can frame a tariff based on these two principles then I think you can have a stable tariff. You will not get the revenue that is necessary from a stable tariff, but the minister has very wisely proposed a new plan for that purpose; let me tell you, I think it is a very important plan. Before I make any observations as to that let me read what I said last year in that regard, and the extract shall only be a very brief one. My words on the occasion referred to were as follows:

> If we frame a tariff and reduce the cost of living and we are short $50,000,000, how are we to get the money? If you refer to the imports in 1918 you will find that we imported into Canada about $860,000,000 worth of goods, and if we framed an adequate tariff on the basis I have indicated,—and by adequate I mean in the interests of manufacturers and consumers alike—

Mr. Speaker, you will admit, I am sure, that I have not changed my mind this year in regard to the matter; I am arguing to-night exactly the principle I argued last year—

> I would add a surtax of, say, 2 per cent on the $800,000,000, and would get $16,000,000 thereby. But I would still be short $34,000,000, and to raise that balance I would do this. I find by the Canada Year Book of 1918 that we manufactured $1,381,547,225 worth of products. I would put an excise duty of 2 per cent on $1,700,000,000 of Canadian manufactures and obtain $34,000,000, and that together with the $16,000,000,000, would give me my $50,000,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in congratulating the Government upon having adopted a policy that will enable them to get the money they need without interfering unduly with the industrial life of the country. That is to say, they get a portion of the money from the manufacturers and the importer of like commodities must pay that additional tax. It is a fair and businesslike proposition. If our values fall and if our imports decline our tariff may remain stable and you can change the surtax and the excise tax to meet the circumstances in which you find yourself. If you have too much money you can decrease these taxes, and if you have not enough you can increase them without interfering with, and upsetting, the business of the country. I think the minister was wise in not putting any tax on food products. You wil remember, Mr. Speaker, that in the new taxes that we are imposing—the excise tax and the surtax—food products are not included, and yet the leader of the Opposition contends that the Government is taking no steps to make it possible to relieve the cost of living. Why, we are raising $90,000,000 of extra revenue, and we are not getting a dollar of it out of the food products. I must say, therefore, that the leader of the Opposition was not at all accurate in his statement. The hon. member did not say upon what his statement was based; he merely made the allegation, and allegations without proof are, of course, not very reliable and do not carry very much weight.

Some hon. gentlemen thought taxation should be applied to exports. Would it be fair to the manufacturer of this country to pay an export tax when he had to compete with the manufacturer in another country? I think the minister was cautious and wise, and acted the part of a statesman, in not making exports subjects to taxation. I did not suggest these additional exceptions last year, which I think are an improvement—at any rate for the present. The Minister of Finance is imposing a straight tax of one per cent on imports, and proposes to collect an additional one per cent from wholesalers. Personally I would have preferred that a rate of two per cent be levied upon imports, and leave the wholesaler alone; but the minister has thought it wise to do as stated, and after

all there will not be very much difference. Then again the minister is collecting one per cent from domestic makers, plus one per cent again from the wholesalers. Personally I would have preferred collecting two per cent from the manufacturers. However, I understand there were difficulties in the way, and I can conceive that such is the case. Let me illustrate what I mean; it will only take me a moment. This is my objection to placing the 2 per cent on the manufacturer: Supposing I manufacture automobiles, of course I do not make all the component parts that enter into the complete machine and I have to purchase from my friend here rubber tires, and from another manufacturer wheels; those wheels and tires are subject to the excise tax, and when I build them into my automobile the Government will collect another 2 per cent on the finished product. However, I think this anomaly might be rectified in the revision of the tariff, and I am sure the Minister of Finance will consider the matter. I would suggest as a means of overcoming my objection that the manufacturer of the wheels should get his tax receipt from the Inland Revenue people, and the manufacturer of the tires should do the same, and when the automobile was completed the tax so paid on the parts could be deducted from the excise on the assembled machine. Possibly other commodities would be affected in the same manner. But these are only suggestions, and it gives me a good deal of pleasure to support the proposals made by the Minister of Finance in such a business-like manner. And I venture the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that when the people understand the financial condition of the country, they will welcome a stable customs tariff on business principles, and will be perfectly willing to bear the burden of these special post-war taxes. Again I say I most heartily approve of the tariff proposals; in my opinion none better could be devised.

Now a word or two on the amendment. I submit that to carry out the proposals it contained would be to precipitate this country into chaos. For the present we do not know what commodities we are to reduce the taxation on. If we reduce the duties on grey cotton, white cotton or any other cotton, I do not think the people of this country will be able to buy those commodities any cheaper than they can be purchased under present conditions. If the amendment suggested our taking ten cents off the tea duty, I would say that would be a step towards reducing the cost of living; but nothing of the kind is suggested. The amendment asks for relief to the consumers and producers, without giving to the people anything tangible whereby that result will be brought about.

Then the amendment proposes to make substantial reductions on the burdens of customs taxation. The Government is doing that. I have already explained that a net reduction of $20,000,000 has been made. In effect the amendment asks us to take a leap in the dark,—to take so much off prints, so much off woollen goods, so much off knitted goods—goods, as I mentioned a few moments ago, that we are producing in Canada about as cheap as they are produced in England.

The amendment also proposes to reduce the cost of the instruments of production. Yes, it will reduce the cost of those instruments, I presume, that are used on the farms. But what about the instruments of production for making prints, cottons, knitted goods? The amendment ignores those instruments; they are to be left under the same duty as they bear at present.

I see my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) right opposite, who spoke the other night in this debate, but this amendment does not contain any of his ideas regarding free trade, so he must be running counter to what the amendment proposes; and the same with respect to my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster), and my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). If the latter were here I would draw his attention to the fact that last year he told hon. gentlemen opposite:

> I would as soon look to this side of the House—

that is to your right, Sir.

> —for a reduction in tariff as to your left, Mr. Speaker.

I am really sorry that my hon. friend, whom I esteem very much, should go back on that declaration, because under the Government's proposals he will get a real reduction on the necessaries of life,—the very thing he is asking for we are giving to him. What he is voting for is a leap in the dark. I am disappointed,—that is all I can say in regard to my hon. friend's attitude to-day.

Then again the amendment does not contain a word of how the loss of revenue is to be made up if the proposed reductions in duties are put into effect. In a word, the amendment lacks any practical basis on which the suggested reductions can be

made,—it lacks the earmarks of the declared policy of the Liberal party. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) made that so clear to-night that I do not think I need enlarge upon it. This amendment, it seems to me, would tend to the destruction of Canadian industry, in that it asks for an immediate reduction under present abnormal conditions without any investigation to determine the practicability of such reduction, so it would be a leap into the unknown future.

To-day the cost of living is not very different here from what it is in the United Kingdom or in the United States, and with textiles in Canada practically as cheap as in those two countries, any reduction in duty would not lower the cost of living. If that be so, then what duties are we to lower in order to reduce the cost of living?

I want to say just a word about the tariff plank in the platform of the Liberal party. The preamble is apparently the same as that set out in the platform of United Farmers. But to me the funny part of it is that a great party should itemize certain articles and ask that they be put on the free list when they are already on the free list. Mr. Speaker, listen: I want to tell you a secret. The Liberal party have asked that nets and net twines be put on the free list, whereas they have been on the free list ever since Confederation. Why do they ask that goods which have been on the free list for a long time be put on the free list? Do you not think Mr. Speaker, that such a course would have a tendency to deceive the reading public? Would the people not conclude that nets and net twines are now on the dutiable list? Would they not conclude that lumber, rough and planed on one side, is also on the dutiable list; that gasolene is now dutiable? Whereas all the items I have mentioned are on the free list? Yet that is part of a plank in the Liberal platform.

Now, the next thing they ask is that the principal articles of food be made free. Evidently the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) has been educated since this time last year, because in his amendment of last year he asked that all food products be made free; now the demand is that the principal food products be made free.

Mr. McMASTER: We wanted to protect the public from lobsters.

Mr. LOGGIE: Allow me to say to the hon. member that that will not be a very easy matter. If you get a lobster after you you have to look out. In my judgment it is not practicable in Canada to make all the principal food products free. Of course I am referring not to the food products that are now free, but simply to those that are on the dutiable list. I say that it is not practicable to make them all free, because if you did you would destroy a domestic industry.

Now, they ask also that mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and agricultural implements be made free. On what basis are they to be made free? Why do you ask that saw-mill machinery be made free while other machinery shall be dutiable? No basis is submitted, so far as I can see. No provision is made for the continued output of domestic-made machinery; no provision for loss of revenue incurred through abolishing duties; no suggestion for the imposition of duties on the basis of revenue. Perhaps hon. gentlemen are quite right in that, because a tariff for revenue is not practicable at the present time, although hon. gentlemen have argued in favour of it. This platform does not recognize the gigantic annual revenue that is required, nor does it suggest how we should overtake it if it were reduced as is set forth in this platform.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just a word about our friends on the other side at the end of the Chamber. They ask for free agricultural implements; they do not ask that natural products be made free. I have been in conversation with hon. gentlemen from the West who are farmers and they have indicated to me that they do not care whether or not the duty is taken off farm products. But strange to say I have never heard them argue in the House that it would be all right to put all natural products of the farm on the free list. The consuming public of Canada paid into the treasury during the past year on meat products alone duties amounting to $716,271.11; yet hon. gentlemen in their discussions would certainly lead me to believe that farm products were free. I know that wheat and wheat flour are free, but because these products are free and they must look to the world for a market, they think that everything else should be free and that they should buy wherever they can buy the cheapest. If we are to succeed in this country—and I am sure that it is our destiny to be a great country—first of all we ought to manufacture most of the goods that we consume. No country situated as we are adjacent to the United States can be a great country unless it manufactures most of the commodities which it consumes. The member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), speaking the other day, said that he saw

no great advantage in our people manufacturing cotton textiles; that we should rather devote our efforts to the production of farm products. I do not want to minimize the importance of farm production, but we cannot all be farmers. If we are to be a successful country, we must pay due attention to our industrial life as well as to our agricultural life. In our legislation respecting the farming interests we must not run counter to the interests of our industries. To my mind the Minister of Finance has set out to take care of these two interests, the consumer, and our industrial life. I cannot see how a saner, a wiser or more courageous proposal could be put before Canada to-day, when we have to obtain a revenue of $500,000,000 annually. We cannot get it through the customs; we must stabilize the tariff and then raise what we are short by an excise and super tax.

Mr. ANGUS McDONALD (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I endeavoured previously to catch your eye in accordance with arrangements formerly made by the Whip, and I regret exceedingly that this House seems a little inclined to be inhospitable to the only representative that Labour has sent to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not catch very distinctly the remarks of the hon. gentleman; but if he is calling in question the fact that the Chair recognised the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) in preference to himself, I must say that it is an old established practice of this House that where two hon. members rise, preference is always given by the Chair to the hon. member who has sat in the House the longer period, and the Chair knows absolutely no distinction either as between parties or as between representatives who may be on the floor.

Mr. McDONALD. I wish to thank you, Sir, for your kind explanation. I am the latest acquisition to the House and what the Western man would term a "tenderfoot" to the rules of Parliamentary procedure. I am like everyone else, human and prone to the mistakes of human nature.

For the last ten days I have listened as attentively as I could to speeches on both sides of the House on the Budget. Some of those speeches I have listened to with a good deal of interest, more of them I have listened to with less interest; but I wish to state right here and now that I listened wih particular interest to one speech, namely, that delivered by the hon. member for Algoma East (Mr. Nicholson). I wish to deal with a few statements made by my hon. friend, and the first one is to be found in Hansard of May 27, at page 2894—unrevised edition. This is what he said:

> Well, let me say that when my hon. friend's leader, the member for Marquette, entrusted the campaign in Timiskaming to Mrs. Rose Henderson, of Montreal he took good care to see that even his apparent desire to stir up class prejffudice in this country would not be frustrated.

I wish to say candidly and honestly that this is the first intimation that I, as a candidate and as member for Timiskaming, have ever had that the hon. member for Marquette had anything whatever to do with sending Mrs. Henderson into that Riding.

Mr. CALDWELL: Take it back.

Mr. McDONALD: I wish also to state that I do not believe that the hon. member for Algoma East would have made use of such statements had he been in possession with the facts in connection therewith. The hon. member made this statement:

> I say that hon. gentlemen entrusted the conduct of the campaign in Timiskaming to Mistress Rose Henderson, of Montreau. Now, who is Mistress Rose Henderson?

If the hon. member were asking me that question I would tell him that all I know about Mrs. Rose Henderson, was that she was an estimable lady, well spoken of by those who, I have reason to believe, know her best. Far be it from me to cast any aspersion or reflections on anybody who wears the same kind of garments that my mother wore. If there be anything wrong in Mrs. Henderson's career, I know nothing of it, and I would state most emphatically that Mrs. Henderson was in my Riding and worked in my behalf. She was brought in there by the Independent Labour party, not by the hon. member for Marquette.

Another statement made by the hon. member for Algoma East (Mr. G. B. Nicholson) to which I should like to draw attention is this:

> That is my opinion with regard to the hon. member. But I say that the One Big Union was the organization behind the campaign that elected him to this House, and that the ideals of that Union were preached in every mining camp in that constituency.

On a previous occasion, I made my position very clear in regard to the One Big Union, and it is not necessary for me to reiterate the statement that I made on that occasion. I am quite well aware of the fact that we have One Big Union men in that riding, but I wish to state most em-

phatically that that is an erroneous statement, that it is giving a wrong impression of what was extant in that riding at that time and what is extant in that riding at this time. The One Big Union did not send one delegate to the nominating convention that nominated me, and we never used the One Big Union hall as a campaign committee room, nor as a meeting place, nor in any other manner during that campaign or since. I wish to challenge the hon. member for Algoma East to have a committee appointed by this House to look into this matter, if he so desires, and to prove to the entire satisfaction of the people of the Dominion of Canada whether I am uttering falsehoods in this House or whether I am telling the absolute truth. If there be a One Big Union in Cobalt and in the riding of Timiskaming to-day, that is due largely to the dereliction of former governments in this country to do anything for the workingman, and possibly a share of the responsibility in that regard must be assumed by this Government. The hon. member for Algoma East made this further statement:

> I will go one step further, because I want to make my position absolutely clear. I assert that the One Big Union, whose principles I have just read, was the organization behind the election of the hon. member for Timiskaming, who sits behind the hon. member for Marquette, and who is one of the latter's loyal supporters in this House.

In that connection I wish to say that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie), the Postmaster General and others, including the hon. member for Algoma East, went into that riding, bidding for that vote. I want to have it remembered that I have no quarrel with any of those hon. gentlemen who went into that riding to solicit votes. That is a privilege that belongs absolutely to them, and I would never be desirous of taking it away from them. It is their prerogative to go into that or any other constituency in this Dominion and solicit votes of Canadian and British subjects. But I am also aware of the fact that had the same vote that is being decried in this statement which was made last Thursday been cast in favour of my friend, Major Pullen, the hon. member for Algoma East would have steered absolutely clear of any reference to the matter in any way, shape or form. A little jealousy may enter into this matter. The hon. member for Algoma East was in that riding; he made on platforms in that riding, assertions and statements that the citizens in that constituency would not stand for. In his speech last Thursday he made this further statement:

> As I say, the headquarters of the Independent Labour Party associated with the United Farmers of Ontario, are in the One Big Union hall.

That is another statement that cannot be borne out by the facts nor proved by any court or investigating committee in this land. The One Big Union hall in Cobalt was never used by the Independent Labour party or the Farmers, and I as the member for that riding never made use of the One Big Union hall. The hon. member in his speech goes on to say:

> At the present time a suit is pending in the Ontario courts for possession of that particular property. The parties to that suit are, on the one hand, H. J. Everett, an officer of the Independent Labour party, and, on the other hand, an executive officer of the International Union of see the awful futility of all that sacrifice,

It is true that the president of the local branch of the Independent Labour party in Cobalt is a party to that suit, but is it because he is a One Big Union man? I desire to ask the hon. member for Algoma East (Mr. Nicholson) if he has anything to show that H. J. Everett ever belonged to the One Big Union. I am free to state the reason why he is a party to that suit. It is because he was a trustee of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, and he devoted his time and energy to a purpose the very contrary of that which my hon. friend from Algoma would wish to lead the House to believe he did.

The hon. member for Algoma East (Mr. Nicholson), in the course of his speech, used this language:

> If all the sacrifice of that awful war is for no other purpose than to bring about the condition suggested, then I say that it is in the Providence of God that those boys were taken to their rest before they were forced to live to see the awful futility of all that sacrifice.

I wish to state most emphatically, Mr. Speaker, that I am one of those Canadian and British subjects that revere the memory of the men who now sleep amidst the weeds and poppies of France and Flanders, and so long as reason remains on her throne I will do all I can for the man who went Over There and who was told by the flag-flappers and the so-called patriots of the country that nothing would be too good for them when they returned. I honestly assert that I revere the memory of my hon. friend's son, and I will go further and say that perhaps it is a blessing, so far as that young man is concerned, who sacrificed his life in the cause of democracy, that

he died Over There rather than see his illustrious father trying to saddle an autocracy on this country.

So far as the Budget is concerned, Mr. Speaker, there is no course left me by the rules of the House other than to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding).

Mr. C. R. HARRISON (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to speak on the Budget, and I can assure you that I will not detain the House at any great length. First I would like to add my congratulations to those that have been already expressed to the Minister of Finance for the very able Budget he has presented and the clear manner in which he has presented it. I cannot say that I agree with all the details as they have been worked out, but the principles are right, and I have no doubt but that we shall be able during the committee stage to have concessions granted on different articles which we do not consider as luxuries. We have an enormous war debt that has to be paid, and we might just as well make up our minds to get down to business and start to pay the same as we did in the time of war. At that time we where ready to give everything, as thousands did who had most to give in the way of splendid youth and brilliant promise.

The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould), speaking last night, said that the people were tired of bounties. I cannot agree with this. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that every encouragement should be given to the development of our natural resources. I might say that the territory east and west of Fort William, extending east as far as Temagami, is the great undeveloped section of Canada, rich in forests and minerals and agricultural resources, and a section which great iron and steel development would convert into one of the richest in Canada. Canada imports annually over 120 million dollars worth of iron and steel products, and our Canadian iron ore resources are lying in an almost complete state of unproductiveness. The ore charged to Canadian blast furnaces in 1917 was 2,176,206 tons, of which 92,065 tons were of domestic origin and 2,084,251 tons were imported. The ore through the section of the country that I have spoken of is of a low grade, and nothing would contribute more readily to induce activity than the granting by the Government of a bounty of at least 75 cents per ton on iron ore. Some regard the iron ore bounty as only of benefit to the mine operator. The reason the bounty is proposed as payable to the mine operator is because it is the only logical place to stimulate the industry at the source of the raw material. We have a growing and thriving iron and steel manufacturing industry using 95 per cent of imported ores with our own deposits unexploited. This is the situation that the bounty will remedy, by giving assistance to the actual producer and beneficiator of our ores.

Some are under the impression that a bounty is only urged in the interests of concerns that are already treating these ores. Nothing could be farther from the facts. These concerns deserve great credit for their perseverance in experimenting with Canadian ores at a loss and demonstrating that beneficiation is feasible; there are large deposits that are not in the ownership of operating concerns and these properties will benefit equally with those that have withstood ten years of experiments. The low grade ore deposits are owned generally, only small percentages of the tonnage being controlled by big interests. The benefits of a bounty to promote this development would have a nation wide application, from Nova Scotia to Vancouver Island, and many and varied sections of the Dominion are expressing the desirability and urgency of the measure as essential in a constructive reconstruction policy.

Our railways tap all the known iron ore deposits of the great undeveloped Canadian iron ranges, located principally in the section between the East and the West, where traffic originating locally is insufficient to pay operating expenses. The tonnage of ore from the mines and the reverse tonnage of supplies and material and the resultant general development of the different sections would make our railways in Canada self supporting in those vast stretches of territory.

We have in our section, Mr. Speaker, an ever increasing demand for electric power. The fact is that the Sudbury area has reached the maximum of power available from the smaller streams, and the Dominion Government holds in its control the only economic power available in that vicinity, and this could be developed in conjunction with the French River waterway; but up to the present they have failed to respond to the urgent need, when the revenue from power alone will meet the interest at 5

per cent on the total cost of the waterway, and at the same time make available 35,394 electrical horse power. This we can dispose of at over $30 per horse power. The making navigable of this river is a most important factor in the upbuilding and development of Northern Ontario. I might say that this section tributary to the French River waterway, consisting of some 30,000 square miles of territory, is being seriously retarded in its development for lack of cheap and direct outlet for its immense resources and inlet for its imports, which the improvement of this natural artery of commerce would provide. I might also say that this section to be served by the said waterway has increased in population 170 per cent in ten years, creating a purchasing power estimated at $45,000,000 per annum, which enures solely to the benefit of the manufactures of Eastern Canada who supply the market.

I might also say that this section of the country has given to Canada in that time 220 million dollars in gold and silver, 250 million dollars in nickel and is now providing 91 per cent of the total silver of Canada, 61 per cent of the gold of Canada and 81 per cent of the total nickel of the world. I would therefore urge upon the Government the importance of taking into their careful consideration the development of the French River, and the granting of a bounty on iron ore.

It was not my intention to have anything to say in connection with the criticism of the Opposition or the Farmer party, but on account of what has been said by the hon. member of Timiskaming (Mr. McDonald), I would just like to note a statement made by Mr. Nelson Parliment, U.F.O. Speaker of the Ontario legislature. Speaking before the Canadian club in New York, he stated that:

> The contest now being waged by the U.F.O. began 41 years ago, when through the operation of a protective tarriff Canada began to build up large industrial and manufacturing institutions which institutions by their nature was in a position to pay higher wages and offer better working conditions than the average on the farm, until a situation had been created that compelled farmers to make the fight now being waged in self defence.

Now what does that mean for the working man? I would commend this to my hon. friend from Timiskaming and those who preach an aliance between workingmen and the class organization being built up by the hon. member from Marquete (Mr. Crerar). It means, if it means anything, that the fight being waged is for the purpose of destroying Canadian industry in order that by reducing the opportunity for employment, cheap labor may result.

But Mr. Speaker, will it have this result? Yes, insofar as Canadian industries are concerned and insofar as reducing the opportunities for employment are concerned, but the final result will be to start once again the stream of Canadian workingmen into the factories and workshops of the United States, thus repeating what took place in Canada prior to 1879.

Canadian working men recall the conditions prevailing at that time, and they know that to go back to these conditions is to take from them the opportunity for profitable employment, that working men have enjoyed in a degree equal at least to that in any other country in the world.

This is not in accord with the teachings of labour organizations as I know them and I have been associated with labour organizations for the past thirty years. Labour stood behind this country during the war and so long as labour is treated fairly, they will stand behind this country during the period of reconstruction.

As I see it, the employer who is not square with his employees or the employee who is not square with his employer, is going to be out of step with the times. There may be a following of illogical radicals who advocate injustice as a means of gaining justice and some may selfishly oppose the progress which destiny has decreed as humanity's reward for the sacrifices which have been made; but in the end there will prevail a just and honest basis for the relations between capital and labour, and my opinion is, Mr. Speaker, that this new relationship cannot be legislated into existence. It will spring from the conscience and patriotism of the people. The time is coming when the unjust employer and the disloyal employee will share equal odium in the esteem of society at large.

But this is not to be brought about by class warfare. If Canada is to go forward she can only do so by the development of unity amongst here people. If there are wrongs or inequalities in our social or economic system, we can remedy these wrongs by approaching them with a desire to do what is in the interests of all the people and not what may alone serve to improve the condition of one class at the expense of the whole. The worst enemy this country has is the type of man who, reckless of the consequences of his words, goes up and down the country making statements that can have no effect but to create suspicion and prejudice. The body of organized

labour to which I belong knows what this means. Those in this country who outwardly express their desire to break down our organizations in order that having them out of the way, they can bring about revolution in this country feed the fires of prejudice and build their case on statements such as those to which I have referred. I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying again that we cannot build up a united country by that method.

I was indeed sorry to hear the reference which the hon. member for Timiskaming made to the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson). I want that hon. member to understand that my hon. friend (Mr. Nicholson) has, to my knowledge, been a member of a labour organization for the past thirty-two years. I worked side by side with him as a railroad man, and no one in the whole northern country has done as much for organized labour as the hon. member for East Algoma or has to a greater extent guided them through their troubles. My hon. friend from Timiskaming can learn many lessons in connection with organized labour if he would only sit down and talk with the hon. member for East Algoma.

Mr. JEAN J. DENIS (Joliette) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) began his remarks last evening by stating that he had been waiting forty-six years to have the opportunity of expressing his views in the House of Commons upon matters pertaining to the welfare of Canada. By those words I understood that the hon. member meant an indefinite time. If that is the inference which should be drawn from his remarks, I have to say that it is an indefinite time for us also to wait here until it pleases the Government to dispose of the matter now under discussion. I may be wrong, and I have no doubt that the majority of hon. members, especially hon. members opposite, think that I am wrong, but I have never been able to realize that we are doing good work when we sit up all night discussing a matter of such importance as the Budget. I have expressed my regret to some hon. members, and the answer given to me was that a considerable number of them wanted to go home. Well, Sir, I think I will not be offending anybody if I say that hon. members opposite should not be so anxious to go home because once they do they will remain there a mighty long time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DENIS: If my hon. friends opposite are so anxious to go home all they have to do is to call a general election to-morrow and they will stay home for a good while. I was not anxious to bring this matter up but it is altogether unjust on the Government's part to use their strength, their power and their weight to force this House to sit all night in order to dispose of the Budget debate. I say that it is unjust, and if the people of this country knew what is going on here they would certainly give no credit to the Government for what they are doing.

I do not think I would be fulfilling my duty if I did not join with hon. members who have already offered their congratulations to the Minister of Finance. I disagree with many statements he made, but for several things that he did he is deserving of congratulation, and I take this opportunity of thanking him publicly for the way in which he has treated me in connection with a certain matter which I had at heart and which I was afraid might be brought into the Budget—I mean the tobacco question. It has been rumoured for the past few months that there was to be a change in the duties imposed on raw leaf tobacco, and although the Minister of Finance could not commit himself, although he could not tell me as to whether he would or would not make any change in those duties, on the divers occasions on which I had the privilege of meeting him he always received me with an open mind, and with a great deal of good-will and sincerity, and allowed me to take up a considerable part of his time in the discussion of this question. For that reason I consider he merits my public congratulations, and these I am glad to tender him.

While on this subject let me say that I hope that the duties on tobacco will not be disturbed for some years to come, because this industry is one of the most flourishing we have in Canada. Last year we produced in the neighbourhood of twenty-five million pounds of tobacco which, selling in the neighbourhood of thirty or thirty-five cents, has produced for the people of this country $8,000,000. On the other hand, we are importing a like amount of tobacco from the United States; in other words we are only producing about one-half of what we consume. Under these circumstances, if we take into consideration the fact that it is essential for this country to import as little as possible from the United States—especially at this juncture when our dollar is only worth from eighty-five to ninety

cents in the adjoining republic—I think the Government should seize every possible opportunity to aid our people in producing all that they can of articles that are being imported from the United States, in order to reduce importations from that country.

Coming more directly to the subject under discussion, namely the Budget, I read with a great deal of care and attention the speech which was delivered lately by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England, and this is the way in which he opened his remarks:

> It is recognized on all hands that the present financial year is one of capital importance in the history of Europe, and not alone for those nations which emerged victorious from the late world-wide struggle. Eighteen months have elapsed since the preliminaries of peace were signed with Germany, and though peace follows with limping footsteps the time has come when each of us should set his house in order and, not content merely with facing our immediate necessities, should lay broad and deep the foundations of future credit and prosperity.

Sir, such were the words that were uttered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England, and I think they constitute a guiding principle not only for the United Kingdom but for Canada as well. These words of the great English statesman are worthy of our solemn attention. Let us now see how they apply to Canada. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says that the time has come when each of us should set his house in order.

Does this Budget provide for that emergency? Certainly to set our house in order when the national debt is over $2,250,000,000, our expenditures, to say the least, should be met by our revenue. Has this been accomplished? I must say that from my point of view it unfortunately has not. Reading the Budget speech delivered by the Minister of Finance one would be inclined to think that we were meeting our expenditures by our revenues. This is how the minister expresses it:

> With the total revenue of $388,000,000, and an ordinary expenditure of $349,000,000, it will be seen that during the fiscal year 1919-1920, the Government, after meeting all ordinary expenditure, including an increased amount for interest account and pensions over the previous year totalling nearly $39,000,000 has a surplus of approximately $39,000,000 over ordinary expenditure to apply to capital expenditure.

As I have said, on the face of it it would seem as though, leaving aside for the moment the enormous debt created by the war, and taking ordinary expenditures only, this country's finances were in a prosperous condition; but I am sorry to say that the facts are in direct opposition to the statement made by the hon. minister. Before going further, I wish to say, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, that I do not for a moment question the truthfulness of the statement made by him in so far as that statement is derived from the books of his department. But those books do not tell the whole truth. Technically they do; practically they do not, as I will demonstrate in a moment. The Minister of Finance says that we have a surplus of $39,000,000 over ordinary expenditures. On the contrary, I contend that we have an enormous deficit on both ordinary and extraordinary expenditure. I say further that the financial statement this year is the most discouraging that has ever been submitted either during or before the war.

A few days ago the hon. member for Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie) brought out the fact which, so far, to my knowledge, has not been controverted by the Government, that our revenue is composed of two parts, and that if we take the whole of our revenue we should compare it with the whole of our expenditure. In other words, we have our ordinary revenue, and we have our extraordinary revenue, or the revenue which is derived from the war taxes. The extraordinary revenue in this case, according to the figures given by the hon. member, was $118,000,000 for last year. Consequently if we subtract this amount, our ordinary revenue, instead of being $388,000,000, becomes $270,000,000, so that instead of having a surplus of $39,000,000 we have a deficit of $79,000,000.

I will now make a comparison between the expenditure and revenue for this year and the expenditure and revenue for past years. I have prepared a statement which is based upon the Budget speeches made during the last five years. It would have been more accurate, doubtless, if I had taken my figures from the Public Accounts, but as these figures which I am about to quote have been given in the Budget speeches each year, I thought it was preferable to use them:

Year.	Revenue.	Expenditure ordinary account.	Surplus Rev. over ordinary expenses.
1916 ..	$170,000,000	$ 93,500,000	$76,500,000
1917 ..	232,000,000	145,000,000	87,000,000
1918 ..	258,000,000	173,000,000	85,000,000
1919 ..	310,000,000	240,000,000	70,000,000
1920 ..	388,000,000	349,000,000	39,000,000

So that this year our surplus—if surplus there be—is very much smaller than the surplus which we find for each of the preceding four years.

Now, taking the figures again from the Budget speech delivered each year, I find that for 1916 the revenue over ordinary and capital expenditure was $46,000,000; in 1917 $60,000,000; in 1918 $55,000,000; in 1919 $48,000,000 but in 1920 we have a deficit of $31,730,912.

Those items, Sir, tend to prove that not only are we not meeting our expenditures, but that we have this year at least a deficit; and if we take the accounts as submitted by the Minister of Finance we might find that we have had a deficit in each of the past years. For instance, he has told us that $337,000,000 was lost by the fact that the country could not get anything from the items composing that sum. These items in past years served to demonstrate that we had a surplus; but now that they are stricken off they serve to demonstrate that instead of having a surplus each year we had a deficit.

It had been my intention, Sir, to speak at greater length, but at this time of the night I do not think it would be reasonable for me to proceed further. The Government should by all means try to meet the country's expenditure by its revenue, and in order to do that its first duty, in my estimation, would be to see that no public service be subsidized. I mean that no public service should have its deficit made good from the Treasury. In England, where there was a deficit in the operation of the postal service, the postal rates have been increased. In Canada the postal service has also shown a deficit, but the service in connection with which there has been the greatest deficit is the railways, and I submit that in order to make good this deficit the Government should increase the rates. Each public service should pay its own expenses, and until we make up our minds that this shall be done I do not think that we can achieve any practical results.

Upon Mr. Currie and Mr. Campbell rising in their places at the same time:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Campbell has the floor.

Mr. CURRIE: Well, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Campbell's name is next on the list supplied by the Whips.

Mr. CURRIE: I may say that there was a ruling by Mr. Speaker when he was in the Chair a short time ago to the effect that the senior member takes the floor first. A complaint was made and he settled the difficulty in that way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was not in the House at the time and have no knowledge of the ruling given by Mr. Speaker. The only name on the list before me at the present time is that of Mr. Campbell. That is why I recognized the hon. member for Prince Albert and gave him the floor.

Mr. CURRIE: I am quite willing that Mr. Campbell should proceed. I may say, however, that I have waited all through this week for an opportunity to speak but could not do so because I had a bad throat. Now I have to be put last on the list.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will see the hon. member (Mr. Currie) next on that side of the Chamber.

Mr. J. A. CAMPBELL (Nelson): Mr. Speaker, I may say in that connection that I was told that I came on next; I have had the place for some little time. I certainly do not want to interfere with anybody else. I was about to remark that it was not my intention and it is certainly not my intention now, to discuss the Budget in detail, the time being two-thirty in the morning. But I have a few observations to make in connection with two of the main features of the Budget.

In connection with the direct taxes that have been imposed by the Finance Minister (Sir Henry Drayton) I may say that I have no quarrel with the Government in regard to the principle of direct taxation; I think that the idea is all right. Taxation along this line should have been imposed long before this. It is not with the general policy in this matter, however, that the chief difficulties may arise; any criticism in connection with these taxes would rather be in respect to the carrying out of the idea and the collection of the tax in a satisfactory manner. These taxes have been named "luxury taxes." It seems to me that that is a wrong name. Either changes will have to be made in the taxes, or some other name will have to be applied to them. The question of boots and clothing has been discussed; I am, in the main, in conformity with those who have criticized the minimum taxable on these goods. But I would like to add another to this list; there is a matter of furs. Out in the West particularly, and perhaps in the northern part of the West, the wearing of furs is not a luxury; it is the next thing to a necessity. I think I am correct in saying that the minimum amount upon which the tax is collected in connection with fur garments is $100. It is absolutely impossible to get any kind of fur garment that is wearable for that sum or even

considerably more. I assume that this matter will be discussed in detail when we get into committee; doubtless the minister will see his way clear to make some variations in connection with some of these matters.

It has also been drawn to my attention that this tax bears very heavily on some particular lines and will have the effect of putting out of business some people who are engaged in perfectly legitimate businesses. I shall not go into the details at this time.

There are also in connection with this taxation onerous conditions. I would refer the Government to the case of canoes which are required by prospectors, miners, trappers, traders and so on. As I recall it, the tax must be paid when the canoe is purchased, and on proper representations being made that this article is to be used for trading or other purposes of a similar nature, the tax may be refunded. I would simply point out to the Finance Minister that when a trapper or prospector gets a canoe he usually wishes to take it a long way from the place of purchase. It is notorious that questions of refund are slow in being dealt with, and if a man purchases a canoe in this way it is not likely that he will be able to get a refund of the tax until perhaps a number of months afterwards. This works upon the purchaser an unnecessary hardship and I suggest that arrangements be made by which the purchaser may hand in to the merchant at the time of purchase the declaration referred to, in order that he may take the canoe away and have the whole transaction closed.

But I take it that the chief difficulty in connection with a tax of this kind is in its collection. As in the case of the income tax I am afraid that the collection of this tax will be unduly expensive. A telegram from the Retail Merchants Association of Canada has been handed to me since I sat down here this evening. It is despatched from Vancouver, and reads in part as follows:

> Proposed luxury taxes meeting with intense antagonism from public and will result in many proposed taxes not being collected unless Government employ host of inspectors and collectors entirely out of proportion to amount collectable. Retail trade unanimously of opinion only logical way to collect such tax is through manufacturer or importer.

Without entering upon any further discussion of this matter, I would be inclined to agree with the terms of that telegram. I sincerely hope that when the matter is taken up in committee some variation will be made to meet the difficulty. I may say that I personally know that these taxes are not in all cases being collected. Not very long ago I had a conversation in the city of Winnipeg with a merchant whom I know well,—he does not live there. He told me —by the way, this was some days after the proposals of the Finance Minister had been brought down—that he had paid no attention up to that time to the directions contained in the Budget, had collected no taxes, and did not know when he was going to start. I am afraid that this situation is altogether too common throughout the country and that there is going to be great difficulty in collecting these taxes under the plan as proposed. I trust that some more efficient scheme will be worked out under which they can be looked after with the least possible trouble and expense.

The main feature, however, of the Budget proposals so far as I am concerned is the question of the tariff. Unfortunately I was absent from the House at the time of the delivery of the Budget Speech. I was on business in the West, public business, as a matter of fact,—and did not hear the speech delivered, nor did I have an opportunity of listening to a number of others which were delivered shortly after. But I have read some of these, and from what I have read and from what I have heard since my return I have come to the conclusion that the one outstanding feature in connection with these tariff proposals is that the Government is committed to a policy of protection. It may be called by various names, but it would appear to be what has hitherto been known as the National Policy. I gather this more, perhaps, from statements made by members on this side and from press comments than from any statement made in the Budget Speech itself. The speeches of hon. members on this side would appear to convey conclusively to my mind that that is the stand which the Government takes and which members on this side wish them to take. As to newspaper comments, I simply refer you to the following which appeared in the Ottawa Journal shortly after the Budget Speech was delivered: It said that the Unionist tariff policy as shown in the Budget

> —is the old N.P. brought up to date and camouflaged a little to break the news gently in certain quarters.

The disguise is not very apparent to me, the policy sems to have been quite openly stated. I wish to state frankly and fairly to the House that I am not in favour of this policy; I have opposed it on numerous

occasions hitherto, and I see no good reason for changing my attitude at this particular time.

On the other hand, I am not a supporter of a strictly free-trade policy. I do not think there is any issue at the present time between extreme protection and absolute free trade. Some time ago, in a debate on the railway question, I had the temerity to state that I did not think the matter of public ownership was an issue at all, notwithstanding the fact that very learned speeches were being delivered pro and con. A similar situation exists now. We speak of protection and of free trade; but the issue at the present time is between those who believe in what may be called adequate protection or reasonably high protection and those who believe in a tariff mainly for revenue. I differ from the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) in his designation of what protection really means. There is a vast difference between a tariff for revenue with incidental protection and a protective policy which is mainly intended for protective purposes and which may or may not result in revenue for the country. I do not think there are in this House any hon. members who are in favour of the kind of protection which has been described as being as high as Haman's gallows, or if there are any, there are very few; nor have I heard anybody come out and out absolutely in favour of a free-trade policy. Therefore, I take it that when hon. gentlemen refer to free trade, they are referring to that term in its popular meaning or usage which covers a tariff for revenue purposes with, perhaps, occasional incidental protection. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Davis), the issues in connection with matters of this kind have been somewhat mixed. I have listened carefully to some speeches, and I find the effect of tariff, prohibition, slow work, lack of proper machinery and various other things have all been confused. The hon. member for Neepawa traced out the situation as regards Germany and pointed out just wherein protection affected the situation and wherein the situation was affected by other things. I had intended to discuss that question, but I will not do so as it has already been dealt with effectively by that hon. member.

One hon. member, in speaking the other day, pointed out that England had a policy which was bringing about her decadence, and from which serious results were likely to follow, and he said that the last thing that Canada should do would be emulate that policy. Before concluding his speech, if I recollect correctly, he produced a list of about four pages of articles in which he showed that Great Britain had imposed a considerable tariff, and then intimated that that country was not such a free-trade country as we had been led to believe.

Another matter in which some confusion existed was with regard to the situation in England in connection with steel. An hon. member, in discussing the question of production of steel in Great Britain, the falling off that has taken place there and the question of whether Great Britain would ever again be able to compete with the United States and other countries, stated to me that one of the reasons why steel production in Great Britain was not on the same plane it had been formerly was on account of what is generally known as "slow work;" that the workmen did not produce as well nowadays as they did in previous times, and in that connection he referred to an incident regarding a certain piano firm which did business in London and which was compelled to quit because it was not able to manufacture at a profit. He intimated that this firm had stated, in an announcement which was made when they decided to go out of business, that whereas before the war started it used to take five men a certain length of time to manufacture one piano, it now took twenty-three men to do in the same time the same quantity of work; or in other words, it cost more now to polish a piano than it did to manufacture a whole piano several years ago. Some people in relating that incident would give us to understand that this piano firm went out of business and that the steel situation was bad, simply because of the trade policy of the country—which would be most erroneous.

I might discuss the question of mergers, balance of trade and so on; but at this time I shall refrain from doing so. What stares us in the face at the present time is the question—what is to be the trade policy of Canada from now on? This is a period of reconstruction; we are at present confronted with new conditions, and the question that we must face is, as I said, whether we are to continue the old policy under these new conditions, or find a new policy which will be more appropriate to present conditions. Whatever may be said in favour of policies that existed in times past, what we need at the present time is

a policy of development along natural lines where the maximum revenue will result with the minimum of burden on the shoulders of the poorer classes. In this connection we, of course, must take into consideration the experience of other countries. It is in order for us to adopt those schemes which we think have been beneficial to other countries and have worked out well and to avoid the mistakes that other countries have committed. To adopt the policy of the United States holus-bolus, because the United States appears to have prospered, or on the other hand to adopt the policy of Great Britain, because a certain amount of prosperity has resulted therefrom, or to refuse to adopt the policy of Great Britain because some hon. gentlemen have said that conditions in that country are not as good as they were some time ago, is not reasonable. The fact that Great Britain has a free trade policy may or may not mean anything in particular to us. The fact of the matter is that conditions in Canada are so entirely different from conditions in England that, while Great Britain might prosper under one policy, Canada might be more prosperous under another policy. At the present time the main industry in Great Britain—how that came about I shall not discuss—is that of manufacturing, whereas in Canada the basic industry is undoubtedly that of agriculture. The situations are entirely different. In the United States great industries have been built up. It may be that the protective policy of the United States has had a good deal to do with the building up of those industries, although I am not so sure about that. It is quite possible that those or even greater industries might have resulted had the policy been different. At any rate it is unquestioned that in connection with the greatest industry in the United States, namely, that of steel, during a considerable period of time, owing to the protective policy, consumers of steel had to pay almost twice as much they otherwise would have had to do. This was the period of in the system in the United States. so that the railways cost a great deal more than they otherwise would have done, and it may be that we now see a reflection of this in recent developments railway construction in the United States,

It is a very complex situation and I only wish to reiterate that we cannot credit the progress that the United States has made to their tariff. There are various other considerations to be taken into account. I have not the paper with me, but I read in the Saturday Evening Post of a few weeks ago an editorial in which the writer expressed the opinion that it was questionable whether the policy pursued by the United States in the past had been in the best interests of that country. He raised the question concerning the situation of the agricultural class and the opinion was expressed that the farming community had undoubtedly suffered as a result of the tariff policy in that country. The policy for Canada is to make the most of the natural advantages which we have. A father raising a family does not now do what I am told was done in days gone by. He does not allocate one member of the family to the ministry, another to law and another to the military profession and train them up for these vocations irrespective of their particular adaptability to the work which they will have to perform. The responsible father who has a family to look after now uses his utmost endeavours to ascertain for what particular occupation each child is peculiarly adapted, and he trains his children along the lines in which they give evidence of adaptability. If this policy is pursued there will be experts in the country, and that is what we desire; and the same kind of policy that is adopted by an intelligent father with reference to the education of his children should be followed in the development of the country. Agriculture being the basic industry of the country, the industry which we are in the best position to prosecute, the industry in connection with which we are in advance of every other country, or at any rate, of most other countries, qualitatively and in extent; the western plains of Canada being the future granary of the world if a proper policy is pursued; it would seem to me that the line of action this House should take would be to do everything possible to take the utmost advantage of that and allied industries in connection with the development of the natural resources of the country. The farmer asks no help in this connection, but it is only fair and reasonable that no handicap should be placed in his way to hamper his operations. He does not ask for protection, but on the other hand it is unfair that other industries should be protected to his disadvantage. I fail to see the logic of the situation. Items of food, the necessities of life. should be on the free list, or be so dealt with as to have a minimum of tariff against them. In this respect I desire to draw the attention of the House to some of our natural resources, especially minerals. Next perhaps to the farming industry, mining is the most

important of the natural industries of the country. A short time ago I had on the Order Paper a resolution to which I intended to speak, but I did not get the opportunity to do so and I withdrew it, and that is one of the chief reasons why I am taking up some time to-night. That resolution was as follows:

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is in the interests of Canada in connection with the development of its natural resources that all machinery required to mine, recover and market the mineral resources of Canada (including oil and gas) shall be placed on the Free List in the Customs Tariff.

I am of the opinion that it would be the part of wisdom for the House to pass a resolution of that kind and for the tariff to be modelled along those lines. At the present time a great many instruments used in mining are on the free list; but, in the first place, some of the instruments in the tariff schedules are not free, and secondly, I would point out that there have been developments within recent times evolving new implements which are not provided for by these tariff items. I do not propose to go into the details; I will simply say that one imporant mineral that does not seem to have been properly taken into account in these tariff schedules is oil. It is questionable whether machinery that is indispensable to the discovery and development of oil can be brought in under the schedules as they at present stand, and an amendment in this connection should undoubtedly be made. That, however, is a matter that can be taken up in committee.

Something has been said in regard to the political aspect of the situation in connection with the tariff. Now, when I say that I am opposed to the policy that has been put forward by the Government, which means that I shall perforce vote for the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), I must state that I shall take this step simply on the merits of the case, and because I think that the amendment is along the correct lines which Canada should follow at the present time. As to whether it will be put into operation by one party or the other is a matter that does not concern me now. The fact that a certain party was in power for a member of years and did not carry out all its tariff pledges is not a sufficient reason why I should vote against principles which I have held for some time, and support a tariff policy entirely at variance with my ideas. I am free to confess that I was not satisfiied with what had been done under the Laurier regime in regard to relieving the tariff burden, and I might state that had it not been for the reciprocity policy introduced in 1911 I am satisfied that I would not have supported that Government at that time. I might discuss this question at further length, but time forbids.

There is, however, a question which I desire to take up and which is indirectly connected with the Budget, and that is the question of the development of our natural resources; and I wish particularly to refer the transfer to the Prairie Provinces of their natural resources. I had intended to discuss this matter in another way but I have not hitherto had an opportunity to do so, nor is it likely that I shall otherwise have that opportunity. There can hardly be too much stress placed upon the importance of developing the natural resources of the country. The results of such development are numerous. One of them is the creation of wealth. We have heard a great deal about the illimitable resources of Canada and of what use they will be in paying off our national debt. But if they are left in their present state they will be of no advantage to us. Only by full development can they be of advantage to the country directly or indirectly. I am thoroughly convinced that we have great and almost boundless resources, although as a matter of fact they have never been carefully surveyed. That is my impression, and I regret that time does not allow me to give an account of some of these to the House. But the point remains that unless a policy is adopted which will result in the development of these resources we might as well not have them at all. In the second place this development will provide raw materials as the basis for industry. Such development will help to adjust exchanges and if these resources which exist in the western provinces are developed and industries spring up as a result thereof, we will have a situation in the west similar to that which exists in the east.

My point in connection with this is that the Government does not appear to have any policy regarding the development of these important resources. The hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) introduced a resolution in which he called upon the Government to formulate a definite policy in regard to these resources.

A necessary prerequisite, in my opinion, to the formulation of a sound policy of development is the settlement of the ulti-

mate control of the natural resources of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. An anomalous situation exists at the present time with reference to these resources. The situation is such that development is being retarded. The question is up in the air. The provinces will not do very much in connection with these resources because they do not control them and the Dominion does not take such steps as we think advisable because it is in the realm of probability that the resources will ultimately be transferred to the provinces.

I have been endeavouring to find out where the Government stands in this connection. Before the election of 1911 the present right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) made the promise that these resources should be transferred to the provinces. I did not hear the promise made myself but I take the word of the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) who stated in the House a few weeks ago that such a promise had been made. The transfer of the resources to these provinces was definitely promised in the manifesto issued by the party of which the present Prime Minister was then the head. In the House some time ago I asked some questions in regard to this matter and these are the questions and answers:

Mr. Campbell:

1. Was any definite promise ever made by the Government or any member thereof to transfer the natural resources of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba to these provinces?

2. If so, was any condition attached to such promise which would affect other provinces by way of re-adjustment of subsidies or otherwise?

3. Is the Government of the opinion that the other provinces have any interest or equity in the resources of the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba?

4. If such promise was made is it the intention of the Government to carry out the terms thereof? If so, when?

5. If not, does the Government not think that it would be in the public interest to make a definite statement to this effect and thus put an end to the uncertainty which at present exists?

6. Is the proper development of the natural resources of these provinces not being seriously handicapped and retarded by delay and uncertainty in this connection?

Sir George Foster:

1. The policy announced by the Prime Minister was and is to transfer the natural resources of the provinces on such fair terms as can be arranged. The necessity of fair terms and the interests of other provinces arises from the fact that when the provinces in question were created in 1905 a special subsidy in lieu of those resources was granted them.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Yes, as soon as possible.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. The Government is not aware of such retardation.

Referring to the last question I can hardly understand the Government making an answer of that kind as it seems to be palpable to any man studying the question that the situation must result in the retardation of the development of these resources. The difficulties in the way created by this situation have prevented development in certain important instances.

This question was discussed thoroughly at several meetings of western members on this side of the House and a committee was named to draft a report. That report, which was submitted to these Western members and adopted, unanimously, has been placed before the Government. It is as follows:

OTTAWA, April 30, 1920.

Report of Special Committee on Natural Resources.

In the opinion of your Committee the question of the development of Canada's natural resources is one of the most important before the country at the present time. The financial condition of Canada makes a definite policy in this respect of immediate concern.

A necessary prerequisite to any satisfactory national policy herein is the definite settlement of the question of the ultimate control of the natural resources of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

The Government has recently announced that it is, and has been, its policy since the Government was formed to transfer to these Prairie Provinces their natural resources, on such terms as will be equitable to the other Provinces, and is apparently deferring action in this connection until such time as representatives of all the Provinces shall meet together and agree on a scheme or basis of transfer.

Such agreement is no nearer being reached than it was eight years ago, nor does there appear to be any likelihood of a settlement of the question being arrived at in this way in the future, near or remote.

The question is solely one between the Western Provinces and the Dominion. The Dominion Government is possessed of all the data in connection therewith and is in the position, and is the proper party to work out and present to the Western Provinces for acceptance an equitable scheme or proposal for the transfer to these Provinces of natural resources of said Provinces according to the promise made to them by the Prime Minister.

Therefore, your Committee recommend that representations be made to the Government that it is imperative in the interests of the country as a whole, and particularly with reference to the development of its natural resources, that the question of the ultimate control of the natural resources of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba be settled immediately, and that the Government take the necessary steps forthwith to have this done.

Respectfully submitted.

As I said before there is no string to the promise of the Prime Minister as far as I can learn or to the pledge contained in the platform of the party of which he is the leader. If there were any conditions attached it is up to the Prime Minister to state definitely what they were. If conditions have arisen since that promise was made which prevent him from carrying out the promise, or if conditions have arisen which make it advisable that these resources should not be transferred, it is in order for the Prime Minister to make a statement and then we will know what the situation is and shall be governed accordingly.

The question cannot be settled until it is settled right. It may be a debatable question as to whether these resources should be handed over to the provinces or not but certainly there is no question as to the desirability of having the matter settled definitely and having it settled
3 a.m. right away. There has undoubtedly been serious loss caused by the delay. Whether they shall be handed over to the provinces or not now, the transfer must ultimately take place in order to put these provinces on the same basis as the other provinces of the Dominion. Therefore, if eventually, why not now?

It has been argued that there is a legal reason why these resources must be handed over. It is that the British North America Act did not contemplate such a thing as a landless province. It is contemplated by the British North America Act that all the provinces shall be on an equal footing. Such is not the case in this respect. There is a national reason why these resources should be handed over because it is in the interest of Canada as a whole that this matter should be removed from further discussion. The question has certainly been complicated by bringing the other provinces into the discussion. My contention is that the other provinces have no right to a say in reference to the disposal of these resources than the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba have to a say in the disposal of the resources owned and controlled by any other province. A mistake was made by calling the other provinces in for consultation in the first instance. The Government should take the matter in hand forthwith and submit a proposal to the western provinces which the Government itself believes to be a satisfactory and reasonable one and in accord with promises made.

If it is not accepted it means that the resources will stay where they are and this Government can then formulate a policy in regard to their development. I had contemplated dealing with one or two other questions of interest to the Western country at this particular time, particularly the Hudson Bay railway, but as I may have an opportunity to do so again, and as the hour is very late, I shall defer any further discussion until another time.

Mr. ANDREW KNOX (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention at this hour of the morning to occupy very much time, but I feel that I would not be doing my duty to my constituents or to myself if I did not put myself on record in connection with the Budget.

In the first place I wish to congratulate the Minister of Finance upon at least making an effort by direct taxation for the purpose of paying our way, instead of going on increasing our enormous national debt. The Minister of Finance being a man for whom I have a great regard, I am sorry he was not been better advised as to how he should have placed that direct taxation. Had he followed the platform of the National Progressive party he would have adopted measures which would have secured a further considerable sum, and at the same time would have given relief to the great masses of the people, both urban and rural, at present oppressed by the high cost of living. For there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that if the tariff were reduced to a much lower level than it is to-day on many articles it would not only reduce the cost of living, but would bring in a great deal more revenue—that is revenue to the Government and not to the manufacturers.

A few minutes ago the member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) spoke of some protection which the farmers were being benefited by. I am not sure of the figures which he quoted, but as far as I could gather the hon. member meant to say that some $700,000 of revenue had been received in connection with this article produced by the farmers. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not protection for the farmer in any shape or form. It is protection for the packer. In proof of that I may say that the farmer sells his meat on the open market, and if this money is collected from cured meats shipped into Canada it goes to prove—knowing as I do that our cattle and hogs in the West are very often shipped to the American markets—that the American packer is buying the Canadian product, curing it, and shipping it back into Canada again which,

after paying the duty, appears to me, is not very creditable to our Canadian packers. However, I will let it go at that. The member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) said that the present Budget is the greatest combination of free trade and protection that he has ever known. The protection is there all right, but up to the present I have been unable to discover just where the free trade part of it comes in. In so far as I can see the protected interests are not interfered with in any way by the Budget.

I feel that the best thanks of the Progressive party are due to hon. gentlemen on the Government as well as on the Opposition benches for the attention given to our group, as the attacks in which they have indulged, unwarranted as they are, will have the effect of focusing public thought on the policy and platform of the Progressive party on which the broad light of day is always welcome. I particularly wish to thank the hon. member from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) for the new name, "Levites" which he has applied to us. The Levites, Mr. Speaker, as no doubt you are aware, were the spiritual advisers and leaders of the children of Israel when they were going through their period of re-establishment and reconstruction—in other words they were the "little leaven which leaveneth the whole lump," and I congratulate the hon. member upon his keen foresight in recognizing the same distinctions, comparisons and functions for this small but growing group. But, Mr. Speaker, I would rather, very much rather, be a Levite than a parasite, for the name parasite is the most fitting I can think of for those who draw their profits from the consuming public of this country under the shelter of a protective tariff.

I do not consider it wise to go into the different phases of the Budget, as they have been dealt with from almost every angle, but I would say that during a recent trip West I found continual adverse criticism with respect to it and I have received a large number of letters and telegrams along the same line.

I deplore the attacks made on the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), notably those made by the member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), the member for St. John (Mr. Elkin), the member for Algoma East (Mr. Nicholson), and the member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). Apropos of that I wish to read a short editorial from the Winnipeg Tribune of May 29, and in passing let me point out that this paper is owned and operated by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) whom I congratulate upon the fairness of the article, and I cannot help but think that this expresses the feeling of many -in fact a large majority—of those sitting on the Government side. The article in question is headed, "Unfair Talk," and reads as follows:

> Charging that Hon. T. A. Crerar, leader of the Farmers' Party, is "associated with the Bolshevik party"—as a press heading puts it—or characterizing the farmers as a dangerous class, politically, is just common, ordinary rot.
>
> Tom Crerar has been able to hold his head up among the people of Western Canada for many years. And there is no sign that he is other than a good Canadian, and worthy of the highest respect. Mr. Crerar takes his stand, out in the open, on certain fair political ground. He invites attack, and he may be open to attack, but away with the petty, personal stuff. It is cheap and unworthy in a discussion of the great principles which should enter into the government of the nation. Let us have fair play and the elimination of all pettiness of spirit.

This goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that the people who really know the hon. member for Marquette, and are honest about it, will not stand for the tactics adopted by the members whom I have mentioned, to say nothing of the cheap, petty spirit which they have displayed, and to which, Mr. Speaker, only the rules of the House prevent me from giving its proper name.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to diverge a little from this much-hashed subject, and to say that in some measure I agree with the Hon. Minister of Finance, and I admire the spirit of optimism which he displayed when he said that he does not believe that the job ahead of this country is a bigger job than Canada can look after. I certainly agree with him in that, but I believe we will have to change our method of procedure, and instead of developing our unnatural resources—as we have been trying to do for the last forty years—we should give a little attention to our natural resources. Mr. Speaker, it is now a few days more than thirty years since I landed in Canada. At that time Canada had, roughly speaking, a population of five millions of people. I was an optimistic young man in those days, Mr. Speaker, and had great visions of Canada's future. In thirty years' time the natural increase should have brought ou rpopulation to at least eight millions. During that time we had three millions added by immigration.

Yet, Sir, we find to-day that our population is still in the neighbourhood of eight millions. Surely this is proof positive that something is radically wrong. And my theory is

that when a wrong is proven to exist, we are not doing our duty if we do not try to set it right.

In the Northwest—and I have particularly in mind that part of Saskatchewan which I have the honour to represent, and which I might say in passing is one of the largest constituencies in the Dominion, and in which during my 30 years farming there I have not seen one crop failure—there is room for millions—in the northern portion of my riding, there are vast stretches of unoccupied lands, almost unexplored lands, which await the railway and the settler—I put the railway first, because we have already extended settlement from the present railways as far as it is possible to operate. Many farmers are hauling their wheat 30 and 40 miles from north of Prince Albert, and the same may be said with regard to Melfort and Tisdale; in fact, wheat is coming to Tisdale from a distance of 50 miles. Another thing that the people of my constituency ask for is the completion of the Hudson Bay Railway.

It is well known that there are great stretches of land fit for grazing and there is plenty of hay for stock extending for 150 miles north of Prince Albert. I am so confident of the possibilities of this northern country that I have persuaded the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) to attach a fully qualified man to the Indian Treaty party which is going north from Prince Albert in a few days, so that he may report on the agricultural and other natural resources now lying dormant there.

In conjunction with this, I believe we should institute a sound immigration policy, making a speciality of the immigrant who is willing to settle on the land, knowing that the development of the mines, forests and fisheries will naturally follow. And I may say that we have all of these natural resources in the territory which I have described. But to enable these natural industries to prosper, it is essential that if they cannot be given encouragement, they at least should not be penalized by having a heavy customs tariff on their instruments of production. That is where the platform of the National Progressive party would come in with advantage, and I have no hesitation in recommending it to the attention of this House as something which much better suits the needs of Canada to-day than either the present budget or the amendment. However, Mr. Speaker, as the rules of the House prevent a further amendment, which this party would gladly have offered along the lines I have mentioned, I find myself in the position of having to choose between two evils, and as I believe that the sentiment of the people, both urban and rural, whom I represent coincide with my own views I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): It is my misfortune, Mr. Speaker, owing to a sore throat and other disabilities, that I have been unable to take any part in this debate until this late hour, and therefore I do not wish to unduly delay the House as I know hon. members are all anxious to vote and get home. But the fact remains that this is the most important Budget that has been brought to the attention of this House since 1879, and as we have reversed all our previous ideas and preconceived notions of how taxes are to be imposed, I do not think that a little further discussion on this question will be lost to the House or to the country.

It is extremely fortunate that ever since Confederation one of our great parties has been opposed to the policy of developing our natural resources, and has been inclined to favour free trade, and on almost every occasion on which it has appealed to the country it has done so in a spirit of antagonism to our manufacturing interests. But the question now before the House is not a question of protection versus free trade, because the Government of the day has virtually conceded every tax that would be necessary if we had free trade in this country and I have not noticed very much objection taken to them by either of the two parties on the opposite side of the House, while on this side I have heard speeches tending towards the view that after we have had an investigation of our tariff by a commission of necessity the tariff must be reduced.

The hon. minister (Mr. Rowell) who spoke this afternoon informed the House that the tariff had been reduced to 14 per cent. In that connection I want to remind hon. members that when a merchant imports goods into this country he is allowed to deduct 5 per cent from the value of his invoice, and that advantage reduces the protection of our manufacturers generally to something like 9 per cent, which is lower than the protection in force in any other country.

Now, while that may seem very nice to some people, a very large body of public opinion in Canada do not look favourably upon any such proposition. There is a remnant of one of our great historic parties, which to my mind constitutes fully sixty or

seventy per cent of our voters, composed of National Policy men. And the National Policy is just as different from the policy that has been advanced by this Budget as day is from night. As a Liberal-Conservative who has sat at the feet of Liberal-Conservative leaders from Sir John downwards, I can only say that I was very much surprised that the views of that party have not been put before the House, and that is the reason I desire to-night to re-state the tariff principles of the Liberal-Conservative party. That question will certainly be fought out at the polls,—the Liberal-Conservative party will be united, and before another year will be prepared to meet all comers and to reaffirm its old policy, which I now wish to read to the House.

The National Policy is not a policy of high protection; nor is it a policy of free trade. It is a policy which is directed towards collecting by means of a tariff, the revenue needed to meet the national obligations and utilizing that tariff to foster native industries. Let me read the resolution that Sir John A. Macdonald in 1876 moved in this House:

> That this House regrets that the financial policy submitted by the Government increases the burden of taxation on the people without any compensating advantages to Canadian industries; and further, that the House is of the opinion that the deficiency in the revenue should be met by a diminution of expenditure, aided by such adjustment of the tariff as will benefit and foster the agricultural, mining and manufacturing interests of the Dominion.

If I were moving a resolution in opposition to the Budget now before the House I could not better express the sentiments of the Liberal-Conservatives. The fact of the matter is that the Government did not bring its proposals to make such a drastic change in the fiscal policy of this country before its supporters in caucus or otherwise. It brought those proposals before the House, and I for one was not consulted in the matter whatever. It is true that a certain element in the community seems to have risen in its wrath and said, "Let us tax somebody." We have been running to programmes and to crusades against this body and that; first the liquor sellers, then the race-horse men, and now the manufacturers are the unfortunates at whom everybody is aiming a blow. I regret that very much, because this country can never become great unless our industries are balanced and we have more team play. Our last trade statement will show that our manufactured exports ran over $500,000,000 as compared with about $250,000,000 of agricultural products. Agriculture although important is not everything.

It has been said in order to pay for this war we must produce. Suppose we all started to produce agricultural products, where would we sell them? Europe is getting back on its feet again. France is not going to take very many of our agricultural products this year. Great Britain has increased her agricultural production to such an extent that she now produces over fifty per cent of what she requires for her own use, whereas before the war the figure was only something like thirteen per cent. The United States has also increased her production—and the farmers of our West are clamoring for greater markets. To my mind the only way that we can get greater markets is by fostering our manufacturing industries so that we will consume in our own country what we ourselves grow. We must look forward to a greater population, a greater manufacturing population. Most unfortunate for us has it been that one of the great parties has constantly opposed the manufacuring interests. Some hon. members may deny that, but the fact is that a threat made by one of the parties has been hanging over the manufacturing interests of this country since Confederation and has prevented millions of people from coming into Canada and helping to build up our industries. The time will come soon, in a few months, when this question will be settled, I hope finally, at the polls. They had that same row in the United States. The question was fought out finally there in 1897 and nobody of any standing in the United States will now preach the policy of free trade, even with Canada.

I have heard a lot of free trade talk in this House. A number of members are in favour of free trade. I said to myself why do hon. members not go and preach free trade in the United States? The fact is that the United States has not shown any evidence that she desires free trade with us. It is a question of wasting your sweetness on the desert air. If you do not get free trade in everything with the United States, then what do you have? You have what Sir John A. Macdonald characterized as "Jug-handled" free trade; they have your markets free, and you cannot get into their markets. Why, hon. gentlemen opposite of the agrarian group know very well that we granted free wheat and flour to the United States in order to receive reciprocal advantages only a few years ago, and the moment our grain started to flow into the United States, what happened? They placed an embargo on

our wheat, and I should not be surprised if they did the same thing again this year. What is the use of talking folly and nonsense. The great economist, Mill, states that in a case of that kind there must be countervailing duties. He says:

"The only mode in which a country can save itself from being a loser by the revenue duties imposed by other countries on its commodities is to impose corresponding revenue on theirs."

That, Sir, is the National Policy. Sir, I am a stout enough Canadian to say I am not going to pay for police protection, light and sidewalks to give a free market to the Americans of over $800,000 a year.

Mr. W. H. WHITE (Victoria): May I ask my hon. friend where we would sell our Western cattle if it were not for the American market?

Mr. CURRIE: My hon. friend may think that he must sell his Western cattle in their market, but his greatest danger to-day is from the market of the Argentine Republic, and so with the Americans. If my hon. friend goes to any grocer in Ottawa he will find that grocer's windows filled with pressed beef from the Argentine Republic, sold in opposition to his beef.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria): Will my hon. friend answer the question?

Mr. CURRIE: You should be able to sell your beef to good Canadian working men; that is what you should do. That is the proper policy and the one that should prevail in this country.

Now, I want to say a word about cotton. Hon. gentlemen do not know that when the American States seceded from Great Britain such a thing as cotton growing was unknown in the United States. At the time of the Federal settlement when Hamilton and Washington were discussing things, the chief products for export of the United States were indigo and rice. From Wilmington and other places in the United States petitions came to the first Congress setting forth that the people could not sell indigo or rice in the markets of the world owing to the competition of India. The cotton goods that were used in the United States were then made from cotton grown in India—and that threat still hangs over the United States. Well, what happened? The United States Government, under Hamilton, placed a duty of two cents a pound on raw cotton, and from that day to this there has been a duty on cotton entering the United States. They do not even now go around asking that the duty be taken off. And what happened then? The Government provided the people of the United States with seed for cotton and to-day the bulk of the cotton of the world is grown in the United States. That is how they fostered agriculture. There are men to-day in this House who know very well that prior to 1878 the principal exports of this country were potash and wood products, lumber, etc. There was no such thing as export of grain,—nothing to speak of, at any rate. The farmers were not growing grain because the Americans were exploiting the lumber in the province of Ontario. American companies were operating here. They brought in their own horses, harness, sleighs, oats, flour,—everything that they consumed in their camps. They brought them in from Michigan and other adjoining states, and the Canadian who was trying to grow wheat or oats or hay on his farm in Ontario could not sell a pound of it to the Americans. They were exploiting this country just as they would exploit it to-morrow, if you give free trade. But it is not the American with whom you will have to compete in our factories here in the near future; it is the Japanese. I believe that to-morrow fifty per cent of the jobbing houses in Canada will have a Japanese salesman in their office trying to sell them goods which ought to be manufactured here. And with Japanese labour at 20 to 30 cents a day, how are we going to manufacture in that case?

But, reverting back to the question of the tariff, the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald put a duty on wheat, and immediately there was established in this country the wheat industry, which runs parallel to the cotton industry in the United States and is our principal industry. Hon. gentlemen who arrived in this country only a few years ago did not know that; did not look into the history of things and consequently their views on this question are distorted. I say without hesitation that if you throw open the market for wheat, in a few years your market for wheat will be taken away from you just as your market for cattle would be. Millions of dollars' worth of meat products are brought into this country—

Mr. WHITE (Victoria): Is the hon. member ready to answer the question that I put to him? Where would we sell our cattle if it were not for the United States market?

Mr. CURRIE: The market for the surplus meat of Canada is Great Britain.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria): For cattle?

Mr. CURRIE: Everybody knows that the United States produce enough cattle and meat for themselves. The statistics show that. All that the hon. gentleman and his friends get so far as market is concerned is what we call a "slush" market. They "slush" into the American West a certain amount of grain and cattle and the United States automatically slushes that same amount into the markets of Europe from the East. There is no real demand in the United States for these products. They just milk the Canadian. There is not a pound of meat produced in this country that could not be sold abroad, given the proper conditions and markets. Why is it that we buy so many millions of dollars' worth of hog products in the States? Why is it that last year we purchased over a million dollars' worth of oats in the States? They grow lots of oats in the West. These are facts that you can verify by reading the blue books. Nearly a million dollars' worth of plums were bought by Canadians in the United States last year—and the Lord knows that Ontario and British Columbia are good plum-producing countries. Why, our markets are wide open to these people, and our greatest danger to-day is not our war debt, but the debt we are running up with the United States, which now amounts to a billion dollars, on our trade balance. Some hon. members speak about wishing to go to work and pay off the war debt immediately. In Great Britain, the Napoleonic war debt is not paid off yet, and it will not be paid off for four hundred years. If the Government would not pay attention to people who are giving them wrong advice, the proper policy for them to pursue would be to fund the war debt and to set about reducing taxation instead of increasing it.

The National Policy is so different from this Budget policy that I cannot understand how any man who has made any study of political economy could get the two mixed. The National Policy was a policy of "indirect" taxation. If a man in Canada ten years or twenty years ago offered to put direct taxation on the people of this country, he would be taken out and hanged, or else he would be sent to an asylum and his wife would be given a divorce. No political party would dare to go to the country with a policy of direct taxation.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: They are getting braver now.

[Mr. White,].

Mr. CURRIE: I do not know about that. My opinion is that when hon. gentlemen go to the country and hear what the people have to say about the taxation proposals and all the free-trade discussion that is carried on in this House, there will be one grand scramble; they will be "going to the country," like the lobster about which we heard this afternoon, going to war backwards.

Mr. DUFF: Dissolve Parliament to-morrow and let us have an opportunity.

Mr. CURRIE: If Parliament were dissolved to-morrow, hon. gentlemen on that side of the House would not have ten followers, because they have not taken a stand against taxation and the country is getting tired of this yelling for taxation and the slogan: "Tax my neighbour, tax everybody."

Mr. W. H. WHITE: What about the Progressives?

Mr. CURRIE: I should be glad if the hon. gentleman would let me alone for a moment. I think I have answered him very satisfactorily. The farmers do not bother me and I represent a riding that has more farmers in it than the hon. member has in his riding. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not dare to oppose taxation, why? Because their policy is free trade, and if they give free trade, they must put on just such direct taxes as are proposed in this Budget. I am giving the old-time Conservative answers to all those proposals. I do not believe in direct taxation—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE: I believe in lower indirect taxation; I do not believe in direct taxation. This country will rise in its wrath, and it will smite in a few months everybody who proposes to impose direct taxation, and for this reason. Direct taxation is not at all necessary. The Government assume that there is going to be a demand for a big amount of money yet on war account, and, therefore, we must of necessity have heavy taxation. A luxury tax may be all right, because nearly every nation has to-day a luxury tax, but I think we were very ill-advised in putting a luxury tax on what I might call a key industry. One of our key industries is fur; millions of dollars worth of fur are produced in Canada, and we should not tax furs out of business. The country never was as prosperous as it has been for the last few months, and who has been making it prosperous? The manu-

facturers by their work and the industrial workers in the factories. Everybody is getting down to a position where he wants to do what everybody wants us to do, namely, "produce." If we are going to succeed, we must produce and sell more than we buy. Hon. gentlemen opposite want us to throw our barriers down and buy everything from the United States; Japan or Germany; but to-day we are nearly $1,000,000,000 in debt to the United States, and that is the reason why the exchange is so bad. How are you going to remedy the situation? If an hon. gentleman from the West wants to buy a cook stove, and, in particular, an American cook stove, he may get it a few cents cheaper, but the people of this country will be paying for that cook stove for years to come on bonds and things we sell to the United States. That is not a fair deal for Canada, and I do not see why I should be asked to open the markets of my country and hand them all over to the United States free of duty while we are taxed to death in this country. That, however, is what hon. gentlemen opposite wish to do. The Americans are not so gracious to us; and if hon. gentlemen opposite want to give open markets to the United States, let them preach that doctrine in the United States and they will get a very warm welcome; they will be chased out of that country, because the United States have not one man of standing who will rise in his place in one of their representative bodies and propose free trade with Canada. The great danger of all this agitation for free trade is that it is sectional. Anybody who studies the history of the United States knows that the question of free trade and tariff was fought out there in the Civil War. This was due to the agitations of the planters in the South who all wanted free trade, whereas the northern manufacturers took the other side; they wanted tariffs. The ultimate result of the whole business was this, that the country landed in civil war because both sides of Mason and Dixon's line were stirred up over every political issue that could be stirred up, until finally they flew at each others' throats. If you look over the West you will find that on the issue of free trade versus protection the next time possibly Saskatchewan may bring back a majortiy here of free traders, but none of the other western provinces will do so. An hon. gentleman who spoke to-night said that Winnipeg was manufacturing for New Zealand, and so might every city in the West do if we had a proper system of protection. Why, this country has not begun to protect her industries as it should. We have not given any protection to the glass industry in connection with which we might have thousands of workers in this country. We have ample natural gas in Saskatchewan, and we have good sand there to make plate glass and window glass. The West imports millions of dollars' worth of window glass, although all the elements necessary to make the glass are to be found in that part of the country. As regards crockery and chinaware, kaolin, feldspar and all the other elements requisite for making crockery, just as the crockery is made in the United States, are to be found in the West; but instead of making that crockery in the West, we have been importing it from Japan and China to the tune of millions of dollars a year. Every year there come through British Columbia trainload after trainload of Japanese and Indian silk, going where to be spun? Not in Canada, but in the United States. That is an industry which we might foster, because we have ample power for the looms in this country. We could have thousands of silk spinners in Canada if we chose, because our power is cheaper than it will ever be in the United States, and the great secret of developing industries in the future is cheap power. We could put electrical power on the spindles at the price of one dollar a ton for coal, and how can the United States or any other country compete with us as regards power?

The question of tin plate has been discussed in this House. At one time, away back in the early nineties, the United States manufactured only a few tons of tin plate; but McKinley put a tariff on tin plate and since then nearly 75 per cent of the tin plate of the world is manufactured in the United States. If you look up the statistics, you will find that inside of three years after the United States protected tin plate and went largely into its manufacture the Welsh price of $4 a hundred pounds was cut to $2 in the American markets. A few days ago I quoted from the Iron Age, and I pointed out that the United States Steel Corporation and other companies were selling goods there cheaper than in England or they sell them abroad. Is that a sign that protection is a failure or increased prices?

We have passed through this war, and I give all hon. gentlemen opposite and hon. gentlemen on this side credit for desiring in their heart of hearts to see this country succeed. I am not one of those people who ascribe wrong motives to anybody in that

regard; I never offered a word of criticism to hon. gentlemen as to their motives, and I do not desire to do so. But we are going into the future, and there are two roads for us to follow. One road is to smash and ruin and to be, as we were before the war, lame ducks in the face of the world. There is another line of policy for us to pursue, and that is a line that is going to build this country up with population and to make it the seat of the great Anglo-Saxon people of the future of whom we form part, because this must be the cradle of the future expansion of Great Britain. We are the premier colony, and for those reasons we must try to do our best.

Now, what are the elements that make for success in a country? First of all, a country to be great must have resources, and there is in the world no other country that has greater resources than we have. The only thing Canada requires to round this country out is tropical fruits and foods that are necessary to round out our ration, as it were. Many people have the idea that the United States contains all those tropical fruits and things. They say, look at sugar. Why, the United States has only a few townships down in Louisiana that grow sugar that will crystallize. All the tropical fruits that come here, the oranges and bananas, the oils and the cocoanuts, come from the British West Indies, with very few exceptions by way of the United States. We are this week in conference with representatives of the British West Indies, and in this connection I may point out a remarkable fact. In 1910 the United States made a treaty of reciprocity with Porto Rico, and at that date, if my memory does not fail me—and it seldom does— the foreign trade of Porto Rico was $7,000,000 a year. Last year—Porto Rico now being a part of United States territory—its foreign trade was over $75,000,000. If we entered into some reciprocal arrangement with the British West Indies I have no doubt that this country and the West Indies would benefit to the tune of at least $200,000,000 a year. Jamaica is far richer than Porto Rico and so is British Guiana, and we could carry on a mutually beneficial trade with those colonies direct. The tropical resources are all that we need so far as material things are concerned.

Our next need is an intelligent population and I am satisfied that we have such a population. We may quarrel somewhat over our political views, but after all is said and done, I think we are all desirous of seeing the country succeed, no matter what our political or economic views may be. There is no doubt that we have an intelligent population, for the war has proved that fact beyond the slightest doubt. When it came to doing anything of importance in the war the Canadians, either mechanically or from the point of view of courage and endurance, were the equal of any other race in the world. No one will deny that. Now, having these elements, the next thing we need in order to develop a great country is to have a wise and paternal government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CURRIE: Hon. members may see something humourous in that statement, but let me say that you cannot have a government run by Bolshevists and Internationalists in any country. Do you want to be Internationalists?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. CURRIE: Then accept my view. When I say paternal I mean national. It must be paternal, because the hand of the Government must assist every interest that stands in need of assistance. Hon. gentlemen forget that when the Western farmers were in trouble this Government went freely to their assistance with seed. It also rendered aid to the inhabitants of the chief city of Nova Scotia in its hour of trial. The Government, I say, must be national and must do everything in its power to build up all the industries of the country and see that everything is kept on an even keel and given fair play. If time allowed me I could tell the House what I consider that the Government should do. In the first place, I think the Government should impose a tariff such as would encourage industry. All this row for free trade has prevented any new industries from being established in this country for the last fifteen years. You cannot point to one single industry established here even by reason of the war. Why, the industry established for the making of shells, owing to the political agitation for free trade that was carried on in this country, was compelled to take its machinery out of Canada; and it would be a brave man indeed who would start a new industry here. Furthermore, I want to tell hon. gentlemen that there is not a large industrial concern in Canada to-day that has made any money within the last ten years that is not building factories in the United States. Take Hamilton, and you will find that one of the largest concerns there, that made millions out of the manufacture of shells, when it wanted to start up a new factory, did not build it in Hamilton but

put up a great plant at Albany, under protection, in order to carry on a business that should be conducted in Canada. Then there is the manufacture of motor tractors.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Those are luxuries.

Mr. CURRIE: Does the hon. gentleman say that traction engines are luxuries? They may be luxuries around the North Pole and in the Peace River country, but I can inform the hon. gentleman that traction engines are highly essential industrial machines. However, what I have stated is a fact and instead of these industries being solidified in Canada, and instead of a dozen new industries being started here to keep Canadian people working in the factories, those who would undertake to establish industries are driven out of the country. Members supporting the Government have been charged with taking Government contracts. Well, Mr. Speaker, members of the House have a perfect right to take Government contracts for the companies they represent if they desire to do so, and if you go back over the history of the Liberal party you will find out where such contracts used to go. I could take the hon. member for Victoria to Rosedale in Toronto and show him a fine lot of beautiful homes in one of the loveliest places in the whole of Canada or, for that matter, in America. There are beautiful homes there, and the hon. gentleman will find that sixty per cent of the owners are Liberal manufacturers. They knew very well that under the hon. gentleman who was leading the Liberal party they could get into any line of business they wanted to develop and even start new industries and they would get ample protection. They were sure of the Liberal-Conservative protection.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. CURRIE: I could name a dozen industries which the Liberal party started in this country and which are flourishing.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. CURRIE: There is no use in protesting against that statement. I have been in politics too long not to know what has happened. Now, the policy hon. gentlemen are taking now is to oppose the manufacturers, and I am glad that they are showing their colours. We have never failed to meet them on that issue and they have never failed to go down to defeat; and when they come along at the next election with their anti-manufacturer policy we shall leave them in a worse position than they were in in 1911. I was criticising the Government, Mr. Speaker, and it does a government good once in a while to be criticised a little.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE: I must say, however, that I never heard hon. gentlemen on the other side criticise their party. There were just three solitary bolters on the reciprocity pact and that is all the sentiment they could show. Now, I disapprove of these taxes because they are in opposition to the old National Policy. In the first place, the luxury tax tends to make a class distinction. It divides the country into two groups. It distinguishes the man who can afford to wear a $50 suit from the man who can wear only a $35 suit.

Mr. CANNON: Or none at all.

Mr. CURRIE: I am afraid that the hon. gentleman, politically speaking, will not have any suit at all after the next election. It also divides the ladies into two classes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CURRIE: It divides them into the class that can wear silk stockings and the class that can not.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CURRIE: But hon members opposite have cried for this tax. Their newspapers from one end of the country to the other clamoured for the luxury tax, and it seemed that every one wanted to tax every one else and every one else's wife and relations.

Oh yes! they want a tax on every one else; they want to tax their wives' relations and everybody but themselves. They have declared themselves to be the great party of taxateers. They want to conscript wealth. They want to take a certain amount of the money that everybody in this country has. They are an aggregation—I would not like to say—of socialists but their press is largely dominated by socialistic editors.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CURRIE: Yes, I know what I am talking about. We had the leader of the Opposition talking about the depopulation of the country. If the honorable gentleman will go to the Library he can look up the literature of the Fabian Society of Great Britain. That is a socialistic society. And he will find pamplet after pamphlet about rural depopulation. That is one of the things that the socialists are preaching in order to subvert the loyalty of the farmers of Great Britain. They are preaching depopulation. They are doing the same here. The other is reforestation. You will get

socialistic pamphlets edited by Bernard Shaw and Sidney Webb on reforestation and rural depopulation. These are the topics they spring upon the farmers of Great Britain, and their followers are preaching the same doctrine to our own farmers. What is the result? The result is that some of the farmers are seeing red.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CURRIE: Yes, that is quite right. They are preaching subversive doctrines of that kind, and there is no answer from the other point of view the public will respond. They will respond to the socialistic preaching. It was the preaching of subversive doctrines that brought about the French Revolution.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, no.

Mr. CURRIE: Yes. I am quite willing that hon. gentlemen opposite shall be taxateers but I want them to remember one thing and that is that in so far as people of the Anglo Saxon breed are concerned they do not take kindly to taxes and they have not done so from the days of John Hampden. Charles the First found that they did not like taxes. There was a tea party at Boston because they did not like taxes. Yet, if you are going to have free trade, you must have these taxes. I have listened patiently to find out from the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), who is the boss free trader here——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE: ——I have been listening patiently to hear how he was going to make up the revenue. An hon. gentleman who rises in his seat to criticise anything should be prepared to criticise constructively and to say what we are going to do. But, he has not shown yet how we are going to raise the revenue. And we do need revenue. Another idea that seems to have come from these hon. gentlemen and which they have been preaching from one end of the country to the other is that of a tax on sales. I am sorry to see that some of my hon. friends from the west are going in for the sales tax. I believe in Adam Smith the same as do hon. gentlemen who are free traders. Adam Smith never was a free trader. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMaster) never believed in his Adam Smith or he never would have brought this question up before the House. It shows his ignorance. I am going to ask the hon. member for Brome to tell us if Adam Smith has ever favoured a tax on sales. I will wait for his answer.

[Mr. Currie.]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Brome has already spoken.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member for Brome is so fond of bluffing and talking about free trade I want to show that he does not know anything about it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. CURRIE: Now I will read Adam Smith on this very tax on sales question. I think it will show that I am right in the position I have taken: Adam Smith in The Wealth of Nations, says:

> In consequence of the notion that duties upon consumable goods were taxed upon the profits of merchants, those duties have, in some countries, been repeated upon every successive sale of the goods. If the profits of the merchant importer or merchant manufacturer were taxed, equality seemed to require that those of all the middle buyers who intervened between either of them and the consumer should likewise be taxed.

That is what we are doing.

> The famous alcavala of Spain seems to have been established upon this principle. It was at first a tax of ten per cent, afterwards of fourteen per cent, and is at present of only six per cent upon the sale of every sort of property, whether movable or immovable, and it is repeated every time the property is sold.

Surely that is the tax we have here.

> The levying of this tax requires a multitude of revenue officers sufficient to guard the transportation of goods, not only from one province to another, but from one shop to another. It subjects not only the dealers in some sorts of goods, but those in all sorts, every farmer, every manufacturer, every merchant and shopkeeper, to the continual visits and examination of the tax-gatherers. Through the greater part of a country in which a tax of this kind is established nothing can be produced for distant sale.

What is going to happen to the farmers in the West?

> The produce of every part of the country must be proportioned to the consumption of the neighbourhood. It is to the alcavala, accordingly, that Ustaritz imputes the ruin of the manufactures of Spain. He might have imputed to it likewise the declension of agriculture, it being imposed not only upon manufactures, but upon the rude produce of the land.

Now, if hon. gentlemen who are such great students of economy have read their Adam Smith as some perhaps have—the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who is not in the House is a great authority on Adam Smith—they would have seen this reference. I think that possibly Adam Smith is right there. I believe this form of taxation is wrong. There is no other country that has adopted this method of taxation. It remains for us to stand out prominently as the country that has adopted it.

The one great thing we need if we are going to reduce our per capita debt is population. The easiest way to reduce our per capita debt is to double our population which will produce for us. If we are going to get population we must make this a cheap country to live in and call a halt on direct taxation.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE: "Hear, hear," hon. gentlemen say, but I have not heard one single word during the course of this debate to show that it was not the people of this country who paid the duties on commodities brought in but the other fellow who brought the commodities in here. For that statement we have the authority of the best economists in the world from Bismarck to Mill. They all say that if a man wants to get into a foreign country where there is a duty, he must pay the duty. The manager of the Barrow Steel Company a few years ago said that it cost him £160,000 to get his steel rails into the United States. The Agrarian party out west, a few years ago, were filling the air with their lamentations because they said in order to sell their wheat at Minneapolis they had to pay the United States duty.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE: Exactly, that is true. Well, then, who pays the duty? It is not pleasant to have to pay a duty to get in here, and that is what will happen if you impose a countervailing tariff. How are you going to develop or build up this country if you adopt free trade? Are you going to open your markets and let the American farmer walk over and exploit you whenever he wants to? I am a good Canadian, and I believe in a national policy, and for that reason I do not approve of anything of the kind.

Now, I have to offer some criticism to the Government. I pointed out to them the difficulties with regard to this new tariff. This is a new imposition of taxes of which I do not approve. I do not wish to object to it now, however, for this reason: I think it will do this country good to have a few months of this free trade tariff. I think, then, that from one end of the country to the other they will be so sick of trying to collect this taxation, of trying to finance this country directly out of their pockets, that they will be quite willing to take sides with the good, old Liberal-Conservative party, and wipe out all the people who want free trade and who want to turn us over to the Americans. The hon. member for Victoria, Alberta, will get a run for his money up in his riding—do not forget that.

Mr. WHITE: I always did.

Mr. CURRIE: Yes, and you came through the last time, did you not?

Mr. WHITE: Yes, I did.

Mr. CURRIE: Because the hon. member is such a good fellow. I never heard him open his mouth before in this House to interrupt.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would like to ask the hon. member a question.

Mr. CURRIE: Another county heard from.

Mr. PEDLOW: We are hoping to hear from the county of Simcoe. The hon. member says he has no faith in the new tariff. Will he vote against the Budget?

Mr. CURRIE: I said that I had no faith in a free trade budget, and that this is a free trade budget—I have no hesitation in saying that. The Government have stolen the clothes of hon. gentlemen opposite—that is the trouble. That is why they were stunned for two or three days after the Budget came down. They were so stunned that they did not know which way to turn. What will happen will be this: These taxes will go to the country and the question that will confront hon. gentlemen will be to put up an argument to show how the money can be raised under free trade except in this way. The country will be so sick and tired of all this taxation that they will be glad to vote into power the party that goes in for low indirect taxes, the party of the National Policy.

Mr. DUFF: Why do you not go to the country?

Mr. CURRIE: Go to the country! If we went to the country the hon. gentleman would never see the inside of this House again. He knows that he got into Parliament at the last election by subterfuge, and we will see that he does not get in by subterfuge again.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CURRIE: That is true, he stole the riding.

Mr. DUFF: I did not do any such thing.

Mr. CURRIE: Any man that comes into this House on an anti-British cry is not fit to be answered.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Ran like a hare.

Mr. CURRIE: Yes, he ran like a hare, and hunted with the hounds.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Somebody else did that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. It is quite in order for hon. members to ask questions with the permission of the hon. member who has the floor, but I must ask those who desire to do so to do the House the courtesy of rising and addressing the Chair.

Mr. CURRIE: There is no necessity to intervene, Mr. Speaker. As far as answering hon. gentlemen opposite is concerned, I am quite capable of doing that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He is the man.

Mr. CURRIE: My hon. friend (Mr. Pedlow) desires an answer. He has asked me if I would not oppose the Budget.

Mr. DUFF: Will you go to the country?

Mr. CURRIE: With respect to the hon. member who is interrupting, I know what is wrong with him. I do not need to tell him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I understand the hon. member for Simcoe correctly, he is proceeding to answer a question which has been asked by the hon. member for South Renfrew.

Mr. PEDLOW: After that I am sure he will allow the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) to put his question.

Mr. CURRIE: I have already said the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg is not quite himself, and consequently the best thing for him is not to ask any more questions.

Mr. DUFF: I will ask the hon. gentleman if he is willing to go to the country and prove whether I am right or whether he is right.

Mr. CURRIE: Go to the country?

Mr. DUFF: Yes.

Mr. CURRIE: Wild horses could not drag the hon gentleman to the country. This is the best job he ever had. We are accustomed to that kind of talk. The hon. member is new to this House, but I have been here a few years, and while I have often heard clamours to go to the country I never yet saw an Opposition or a Government that wanted to do so very gladly. Now, returning to my hon. friend from South Renfrew, I said I would answer his question. Yes, I will support the Budget most gladly; I want the hon. gentleman and his friends to have a taste of a free trade Budget of their own medicine.

[Mr. Archambault.]

Mr. PEDLOW: Yet you have no faith in it.

Mr. CURRIE: I have no faith in it? I have faith that it will act like medicine—similia similibus curantur. That is the reason I intend to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding). It is very nicely drawn in order to try to put a little salt on the tail of the agrarian bird. My hon. friend drafted it before he had heard the Budget and then—old parliamentarian that he is—he was very intent on his speech. I watched him memorizing his speech almost, instead of listening to the Budget. Had he listened closely to the Budget I do not think he would have spoken as he did. He could have put up a much better criticism had he done so. As far as his proposals are concerned they are nothing but camouflage. It is a great platform which they produced last year. I remember sitting in the chamber when the late hon. member for Brant, Mr. Paterson, in 1911, got up to speak on the reciprocity question. He put his hand down into the tail of a long, black coat, and produced a document, and said solemnly: "I have here before me the platform of the Liberal party of 1895. I was in Toronto this week and went into a store and found this platform that the Liberal party had in 1895." That was it, 1894 or 1895. Somebody asked him, "Did you find it in a pawn shop?", and the House roared. Evidently the platform that the Liberal party promulgated last summer has been relegated to the pawn shop and a new platform has been produced now. It is not quite so drastic as the free trade platform of last year. That would not be acceptable, especially in Quebec which my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) knows very well. You could not get him to adopt free trade as they have it in England, even if you tried. Now I said that I intended to vote against the amendment because I think that it is pure camouflage, it does not strike at the questions or the issue straight. It has made no objection to these taxes which to my mind are obnoxious. As a red hot Liberal-Conservative they are obnoxious to me. Of course the country must have its dose—it is getting it and will get it—and for that reason I am going to vote against the amendment and vote for the Government's Budget. I think every Liberal-Conservative here will do the same thing, and we will try it out. We will try it out on the dog, and see what the people think of this direct tax free trade tax policy. I am satisfied that in the next session of Parliament, when it

meets next fall, there will be some new light on all these questions, and there will be a new alignment. Hon. members, whether they follow the Liberal-Conservative party or not, because of its political leanings towards protection, will have some new light. I have followed this National Policy question. I have heard it discussed by Sir John Macdonald, by Tilley, by Edward Blake, and by Sir Richard Cartwright, who was perhaps the ablest critic of that policy my hon. friends opposite ever had, and I was never otherwise than convinced that the National Policy was the proper policy for Canada. To-night I proclaim that same old policy—not the "National Policy made up to date," but the old National Policy that I read to the House to-night which discloses the best way in which we can carry on the business of this country. If you want the people of a country to be happy and contented, you must not grind their noses off with taxes. I had a call from several soldiers the other day in the city of Toronto. They called me up by phone and they said, " Colonel——

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Colonel!

Mr. CURRIE: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. They called me up on the 'phone and said: " They are charging us 35 cents luxury tax on a string of ribbons on which we hang the medals that we won in the war." That is a fact, and that is one of the things we will have to remedy. There must be some adjustments made when these resolutions are discussed in committee. The proposals so far are too drastic, and we must modify them. But if I had my way and were playing politics, I would say: " Make it a little bit stronger, and let the Grits and Free Traders have a taste of their own medicine." Then you would see everyone of them squirm. I know many of them are good men, engaged in manufacturing and other interests, and yet some of them will speak on the platform in favour of free trade and practice protection to beat the band. And I am sorry to say that some of our Conservative friends will advocate protection to " beat the band," and then practice free trade when they want to get something into the country a little cheaper. The only effective way is to face this thing squarely. So far as I am personally concerned, I do not pledge myself to follow this policy further than the next session of this House, for the simple reason that I am opposed to it in principle. And the only reason that I shall vote for it now is that I want to see hon. gentlemen opposite get a dose of their own medicine.

Mr. P. R. DuTREMBLAY (Laurier-Outremont): Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the night—

Some hon. MEMBERS: It is morning.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: —well, at this early hour of the morning I do not propose to make any lengthy address on the Budget and the amendment before the House, but there have been many manifestations of objections on the part of the people of the city of Montreal whom I have the honour to represent, and therefore I feel that at this juncture it is my duty to offer certain criticisms and objections to the proposals of the Government.

The eloquent speeches delivered by hon. members on this side of the House has proven beyond doubt, I believe, that the proposed taxes will not decrease the high cost of living. On the contrary, I believe that they will increase that already high cost, and at the same time will act as a deterrent on our trade and commerce. One of the principal reasons for the high cost of living to-day is that we have less production than formerly. There is an old English saying that if you put more taxation on dogs there will be fewer dogs. And if you put more taxation on industry, there will be less industry, and consequently, less production. That, I believe, will be the effect of this one per cent Sales Tax and the ten per cent Luxury Tax—they will be detrimental to the consumer and will discourage production, and it seems to me that the Government should have devised some other means of taxation to fill the gap between expenditure and revenue.

Recently the manufacturers and retailers of Montreal met and expressed their dissatisfaction with the taxes proposed by the resolutions of the Finance Minister. A report of that meeting which I have before me states:—

> Much criticism was expressed of the new Budget proposals at a meeting of representative members of the Canadian Manufacturers Association, the one per cent sales tax being particularly objected to as likely to repeat itself until it became a burden to the consumer.

This one per cent tax is only apparent, and in practice it will undoubtedly work a hardship on the consumer. In my opinion the Government should make the manufacturer pay this tax. In many cases the manufacturer sells his goods to a jobber or a wholesaler, who in turn sells them to retailers, with the result that the one per cent will be paid two or three times on the same goods, and of course eventually the

consumer will have to bear the burden, which in some cases will be aggravated by the luxury tax of ten per cent.

To-day there is a general clamour throughout the country against the minimum values above which this luxury tax becomes operative. At a meeting of those interested in the clothing trade held in this city on the 25th of May a resolution was passed urging that the minimums be raised, and I presume the hon. Minister of Finance has received a copy of the resolution. In the United States most of these articles that we consider as necessaries of life are exempted from such taxation. I have in my hand a list published by the Toronto Star Weekly, I believe most hon. members have received a copy enumerating a large number of articles which in the United States are exempted from any luxury tax.

I hope that when these proposals are taken up in Committee the Government will see that these minimum amounts are raised so as to protect the public. I may point out that in the United States the tax on luxuries is paid not on the whole amount of the purchase but only on the amount in excess of the minimum. But under the present proposals of the Finance Minister if you buy a pair of shoes at $16 you have to pay the tax not merely on the amount in excess of $9, but on the whole purchase price of the shoes, that is, $1.60. Surely that does not meet the purpose of the taxation as stated by the Minister of Finance, who states that it is a tax on luxury only. I say again that I hope this matter will be adjusted in Committee so that the middle classes and the poorer classes in this country may be protected.

I should like to say a word with regard to the income tax. I know that members on both sides have advocated still further increases in the income tax. At the last session the Government saw fit to bring in further income tax legislation putting our system on the same level as that of the United States. Our income tax law was already a very drastic measure, for this country has not the means, as has the United States, to recover the money in all cases. The raising of the rate on certain amounts to five per cent may bring in a few million dollars more, but the effect on the country will be detrimental, because there will be a tendency on the part of investors not to put their capital into enterprises in this country. It is true that we need capital for the develpoment of our industries and our different enterprises, and this increased income tax will have an influence upon their decision to invest their money here. I warn the Government that they should stop moving in that direction, if they desire not to interfere with future investment of capital in this country.

It has been shown that we must economize in order to meet our expenditures. The argument of hon. members on the other side in support of the imposition of these taxes is that revenue is needed. I have no doubt that their principal aim and intention was to get revenue and not to increase the already high cost of living, but this legislation, while not decreasing the cost of living, may injure trade and commerce and decrease production. It may be said that it was necessary to impose these taxes in order to get the $70,000,000 that was needed to meet our expenditure. But it would have been easy for the Government to cut down expenditures in the different departments by at least $25,000,000. I am confident that if all the ministers got together they could cut down expenditures to that extent and save that amount to the ratepayers of the country. Then, there is the Department of Railways, where there is a deficit of $48,000,000, and the Post Office Department, where there is also a deficit. It seems to me that these departments should be so administered as to pay for their own operation. Why charge to the ratepayers of the country the cost of operation and the amount of deficits resulting from the operation of the National Railways? Why not charge such rates on these railways as will make them pay their own way? Why not have those who use the railway pay for the service which they get? The same applies to the Post Office. In this way the Government could get another $50,000.000, and this, with the $25,000,000 that I have mentioned, would make up the $75,000,000 that is required for this year.

The speech of the Minister of Finance, as I said a moment ago, was more a general taxation of all persons and things in the country than a statement of fiscal policy. Actually, business men in Canada do not know what kind of a tariff will come into effect next year, and that condition of affairs is harmful for trade and commerce and it is harmful for manufacturers in this country to be in such a position. It is all very well for the Government to say: We will appoint a commission; but this commission should have been appointed immediately after the war. Two years ago I believe the Government were asked by the Opposition to appoint such a commission;

but this year I hope this commission will be appointed; that it will be independent of party politics; that it will be permanent, and that it will be composed of business men of different classes of our community and representing different provinces of the Dominion. I hope they will go throughout the country, studying the needs of every manufacturer and making comparisons with similar industries in the United States and in England. There is no doubt that to-day certain Canadian industries have too much protection while others do not have enough. I hope all these matters will be adjusted, and at the same time the needs of the other classes of the community will be taken into consideration.

After the war the people of this country expected that the Government would put into effect some kind of programme of reconstruction, and the fact is that the Government said that they were remaining in power for the purpose of reconstructing this country. So far I have not seen any reconstruction programme, but I hope in this reconstruction they will not forget the important industry of shipbuilding that was started during the war. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that in this country we have a new industry of shipbuilding comprising different shipyards that employ more than 25,000 men, with an additional 25,000 or more other men who are employed in manufacturing articles that are essential in shipbuilding. We are to-day in a position in Canada to obtain from France and Spain many contracts for building ships at a good profit, and people from these countries are coming to this country asking the owners of shipyards to accept contracts for ships. As a matter of fact, the world is short of ships at the present time; the shipyards of England have contracts for building ships sufficient to keep them busiy for more than five years, and the same condition exists in the United States. During the war the Government, under the present Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne), took some steps toward creating this industry, and to-day we have a large number of skilled men able to create a permanent shipbuilding industry. A few days ago I had occasion to meet some gentlemen who are building ships, and they see in the near future the possibility of employing in this industry on a permanent basis more than 60,000 workmen and if you consider that there is an average of five persons in a family, that means about 300,000 people. There is a new industry that we must not let go. The programme of the Government is nearly completed; and if the Government do not protect this new industry and see that it develops, the result will be that in the end it will disappear. A large amount of capital is invested in this enterprise, and I wish to draw particular attention to this industry of shipbuilding which is of national importance to Canada

The last question that I wish to bring before the House at this early hour of the morning is one that is near my heart, namely the German indemnity. It has been hard, I must say, for the last couple of years, to find out from the Government much information regarding this important question. In Canada we have made very important financial sacrifices in order to help England in this war, and according to the memorandum sent by the Government to Sir George Perley, the representative of Canada in England, the amount claimed by Canada is about $1,800,000,000. But according to the understanding between the Allies and Germany, the only indemnity to which the Allies would be entitled would be for damages which have been incurred on account of the violations of the laws of war. If we examine the memorandum prepared by the Government and sent to our representative in England, we find that Germany would be entitled to pays us only about $31,000,000. If that be true, such an amount would be a joke. According to the understanding arrived at between the Allies, France is to receive 55 per cent of the indemnity that they will be able to get from Germany; England is to receive 25 per cent, and the balance will be divided between the other nations that took part on the side of the Allies in this war. The aid that we gave in this war was given especially and solely to England, and that was the understanding on which this country went into the war. The principle that was put forward was that when England was at war Canada was at war. This principle, which was enunciated by my late chief Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was accepted by the right honourable the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), and we went into the war to assist Great Britain, making sacrifices that brought us very nearly to the verge of bankruptcy. It is not necessary, Mr. Speaker, that I should state the immense, the appalling liabilities which this country has incurred by reason of its participtation in the war. The interest on our debt and pension amounts to about $160,000,000, which is about half of the entire debt which we had before the war, and this tremendous burden will have to be borne not only by ourselves but by our

children and our children's children. We spent these vast sums of money and contributed our best manhood for the purpose of assisting Great Britain. But Mr. Speaker, it is not of the sacrifice of life that I am now speaking. That phase of the subject I shall not touch upon now. Let me say, however, that the monetary aid which we contributed to Great Britain was given on an understanding from the Prime Minister that Germany would pay this country an indemnity that would cover every cent we expended and on that assurance Canada was prepared to spend its last dollar. Now, is England in a position to pay this country this sum of one billion and three quarters? A conversation is reported in the press in which Mr. C. W. Hingham, a member of the Imperial Government, is credited with the statement that England is not much worse off now than she was before the war and that her trade is very prosperous, the people in that country being able to go back to work in the factories. He goes on to state that an era of prosperity has now dawned in that country such as has never before been known in its history, and that the London market will once more be the gold market of the world. I believe that statement, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad that England has been able to recoup her losses and that her commercial possibilities are now so promising. By the treaty signed at Versailles Great Britain has received many advantages. Everyone is aware of the enormous sums which have been spent by the English treasury to maintain the British fleet so that it might compete not only with Germany but with all the other nations of the world, but these vast sums which she has had to pay in the past will be offset in the future to a great extent by the advantages which will accrue to Great Britain as a result of the settlement. To-day England, through her ships, is still Mistress of the Seas and is in a better position, from the maritime standpoint, than any other nation of the world, as this member of the Imperial Government stated a few days ago.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that this statement is applauded so hartily by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, for it shows the loyalty which everyone of us feels towards Great Britain. Now, Sir, shall we not under these circumstances turn to Great Britain and ask her to pay to this country, if the German indemnity is not forthcoming, the sum of one and three quarter billion dollars which we spent during the war? If the hon. Minister really had this matter at heart and, as he should do, gave to it his best consideration morning and night, we would probably obtain a great part of this sum from the British Government. But so far as we have been able to judge of the enterprise of this Government, they do not seem to give the question any consideration at all. It would be a matter of great importance to Canada, Mr. Speaker, if this amount were paid by Great Britain. We would wipe out our immense indebtedness and be in the position in which we were before the war; and it is but due to this country that something should be done to bring about this condition.

The amendment that has been moved by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) is clear and precise, and I shall be pleased to support it when the time comes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Some hon. members are applauding that statement. Well, I hope they will see their way clear to vote with us on the amendment. In so doing they would, I can assure them, receive the heartfelt gratitude of the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker, know very well that there is a general demand throughout the country that the high cost of living should be decreased, and they are well aware that the Budget as introduced by the Minister of Finance has nothing in the way of relief to offer the suffering consumers.

The Budget has been brought down by the Finance Minister, but we know very well that he is not responsible for the present financial position. I wish to join with other hon. members in congratulating the Minister of Finance upon the manner in which he presented the Budget. He must be given credit for performing a hard task in bringing this Budget before the House. No doubt he had considerable difficulty in bringing the different elements of the Council to an agreement upon this question. But it must be remembered that this Budget does not in any way lighten the burden of the high cost of living. Hon. members on the other side of the House know that there is a clamour from ocean to ocean against the high cost of living. We are here as the representatives of the people and we have to face the responsibility of dealing with the demand that the people have put before this Parliament. We must, by some kind

of legislation, act or deed, do something to diminish the high cost of living. The amendment of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) meets the demand of the people of this country. I am glad that it comes from the Liberal party, which, with its splendid traditions, can be depended upon, when it again comes into power, to render justice to all the people of this country. When that time comes we will have a return of that prosperity which the country enjoyed when the Liberal party was in power.

Mr. J. W. KENNEDY (Glengarry and Stormont): Mr. Speaker, in following this debate as it has proceeded day after day, I have been very much struck by the fact that there exists in this House such a great variety of opinion on such an important and oft-debated subject as "The Tariff."

One would naturally expect that on a question such as this, one that has been to the fore almost constantly during the last forty years, there would be laid down certain distinct lines or principles, and that hon. members would have by this time made up their minds where they stand on those principles. Such does not seem to be the case, however, and there seems to be as much variety of opinion as there are members who speak on this subject.

First, we have the spectacle of the hon. member for Queens and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding), an avowed free trader, making a protectionist speech and submitting an amendment, which demands a lowering of the tariff. Then we hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) making a protectionist speech, insisting that his opponents have always been and are now inconsistent. He declares that he is and always was a protectionist, but insistently declares that he is a moderate protectionist. He places much stress on that word "moderate," and would have the country believe that at this time he is particularly moderate. He, however, is unfortunate in qualifying the word "moderate" by saying that by moderate protection he means "such as we have had in this country since 1867, which ranges anywhere from 15 per cent to 45 per cent (page 2618). "Moderate protection with favour to none and justice to all" (page 2607)—is another rather paradoxical way in which he sets forth his position on this very important subject.

Again, we hear the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), who has always been an ardent protectionist, laying particular stress on the "moderateness" of his views. He argues valiantly for protection, mercilessly denounces free trade, and then points with pride and words of commendation to the action of the present Administration in reducing the tariff on many goods to the point where protection is almost eliminated and placing many other articles on the free list. (Pages 2780, 2781.)

It was surely a noteworthy acrobatic feat to extol the merits of protection in one breath and praise the free trade tendencies —little though they are—of the present Administration in the next; it was a feat for which his mental acumen is particularly well fitted. It was with a great deal of satisfaction that I noted the applause from the Government benches, which greeted every point he made in respect to reductions in the tariff. When he pointed out that the Administration which had killed reciprocity in 1911 and imposed an additional 7½ per cent tariff during the war, in spite of the oft-repeated assertion that the tariff was too sacred to touch during war time; when he pointed out that this same Administration had reduced the tariff on certain articles to as low as 12 per cent, and placed many more on the free list; when he showed that the present Administration had gone even further than reciprocity, the enthusiasm of his followers and the satisfaction which they showed would almost lead one to believe that at this particular time they would like to have the country believe that they are the free trade party after all.

Then we have the venerable Right Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), whose whole political life has been devoted to the support of a protective policy, asserting that after all the indirect method of taxation is not the best for the country, but that there should be along with it certain forms of direct taxation. I have no doubt that the right hon. minister was speaking what he had learned in his own long experience, and that out of the richness of that long experience he is gradually approaching the position which we hold and the policy which we advocate of a greater measure of direct taxation substituted in part for our present indirect system.

There are those who believe in a high protective tariff and who have no hesitation in saying so. They would surround the country with a tariff wall as high as Haman's gallows; keep out foreign goods and smother our trade; their idea is that Canada should be a self-contained country, independent of other nations and developing her activities within her own borders.

To all those, I would simply say that nations, like individuals, must live and grow and develop by producing and trading, and to throttle a nation's trade is to strangle her life at its most vital spot. They are the extreme high protectionists, and although they are at present being kept in the background, I feel that we have too many of them yet in this country. It is quite obvious that the high protectionist is being kept in the background, but it is equally obvious that he is with us yet, and that his hand still guides the fiscal policy of the present Administration, as it has guided the policies of every Administration for the last forty years.

Much is being made of the fact that the 7½ per cent duties imposed in 1915 are now being taken off. Much is also being made of the fact that all the benefits of the reciprocity agreement of 1911 have been granted, but nothing is said of duties which still remain at 30 per cent and 35 per cent, and which bear heavily upon many of the necessaries of life. Nothing is said of those duties except another of the annual promises of tariff revision, and although we are given to understand that the revision will be along the line of moderate protection, there is nothing to indicate that the coming revision—if it ever does come—will be downward.

Now, what are we to understand by moderate protection? That expression has been oft repeated by members of the Government and their supporters. It is a very indefinite term, I have no doubt purposely indefinite, intended to assuage the fears of the consumer that further burdens may be added to the things he must buy; he is given the cold comfort that those burdens, whatever they may be, will be moderate and on the other hand, it is intended to inform the protected interests that their welfare will be looked after and moderate protection granted them; moderate protection which means "such as we have had since 1867", which runs all the way from 15 per cent to 50 per cent.

Time was, and not so very long ago, when the tariff as it exists in this country was called a high tariff or high protection. That was when our industries were in their swaddling clothes; when they were infant industries. In this connection, it is well to note that an industry which has been in the infant class for forty years and has not yet learned to stand on its own feet, should be given some more heroic treatment than to be fed on pap. Those industries considered the protection afforded them years ago as high protection. Politicians refer to it as high protection; the people regard it as high protection. Now that they have grown great and prosperous, it is only a moderate dose and we are given plainly to understand that the same policy of protection is to be adopted by this Administration in the future as they have followed in the past.

Now, it is well to have the issue plainly before us. This House has a right to know, and the country should be told in plain language, the issue that is before us and the issue that must be decided upon by the country at no distant date. It is the question of continuing the policy of protection, call it "Moderate" or "High", as against the policy of reducing our tariff taxation until the point is reached where the protective principle may be said to be eliminated and the tariff designed for the production of revenue.

The Minister of Marine says that the question is quite clear. Moderate protection versus free trade; if by free trade he means the entire elimination of all tariffs so that no revenue will be collected in that way, then he is quite wrong in his statement of the case. The question of the future will be a tariff designed to produce revenue and not hamper trade, as against a tariff designed to protect our giant infant industries and enable them to continue to fatten and prosper at the expense of the Canadian people. Protection is to be the policy of the present Administration and you may call it moderate which means all the protection you can get away with and impose on a patient and long-suffering people.

This, as I understand it, is the issue before the Canadian people at this time. It is not, as hon. gentlemen opposite would have us believe a moderate tariff versus no tariff at all. I am somewhat amazed to find how very moderate indeed hon. gentlemen have become in respect to their profession of belief in the tariff. They have no doubt been keeping their ear to the ground and have discovered a strong definite public feeling in the country demanding lower tariff duties. That may explain why they fairly tumble over one another in their haste to explain all that they stand for now, or ever did stand for, or ever will stand for, is a moderate tariff. They would appear to be very moderate indeed in everything except their language of denunciation of the farmers and labourers of this country.

It has always been the policy of those who wanted to secure tariff favours to obscure and camouflage the issue if possible. This policy has been consistently followed in the past and in this debate we see the beginning of another campaign of the same kind, but if we are ever to arrive at any definite solution of this question, there is nothing to be gained by evading the real issue. We must face it squarely and decide it in the light of conditions that obtain in this country at the present time.

Many hon. members have wandered all over the continent of Europe and America for facts and figures and conditions that would substantiate their contention. That, of course, may all be very instructive and interesting, and it is quite true that there may be much to learn from the experience of other nations and yet it is quite obvious that deductions drawn from those statistics and conditions that obtain elsewhere may be very misleading. In fact several different and opposing deductions may sometimes be drawn from the same figures. To illustrate what I mean, let me refer to the speech made in this debate by the hon. member for Fort William. He was quoting figures to show the wonderful development of the United States during the last forty years. He told us how production had increased enormously along certain lines. He was quoting the figures of the development of certain industries in the United States in an endeavour to show how the fiscal policy of that country had developed production in United States industries and agriculture. The remarks to which I particularly want to refer will be found on page 2632 of unrevised Hansard. I will not make a long quotation, but will simply direct the attention of the House to these figures—the increase in the production of certain articles in the United States from 1880 to 1917:

—increase of lead, from 100,000 tons to 600,000 tons; of copper, from 27,000 tons to 840,000 tons; of cement, from 2,000,000 barrels to 91,000,000 barrels. The production of corn increased from 1,700,000,000 bushels in 1880 to 3,000,000,000 bushels in 1917; of cotton, from 6,000,000 bales to 11,000,000 bales; cotton manufactures, from $192,000,000 in 1880 to $701,000,000 in 1914; production of phosphate rock, from 200,000 tons to 2,500,000 tons; of zinc, from 23,000 tons to 584,000 tons. The export of manufactured cotton amounted from $10,000,000 in 1880 to $136,000,000 in 1917. The production of wheat nearly doubled in the same period.

Now, that, I take it, is a fair indication of the development which would be produced by a protective tariff policy, and the conclusion the hon. member wished to draw from these figures was that that policy was a good thing for the United States because it produced that kind of development. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the increase in the production of manufactured articles, such as cement, cotton goods exported, and so forth, was anywhere from ten times to—in the case of cement—forty times what it was in 1880, whereas the increase in corn and wheat was not quite double. Now that is just exactly the kind of development that would be produced by a protective tariff. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman. But I would just like to draw this other conclusion from his own figures, that that is not an all-round well balanced development of the various activities on the other side of the line; and I submit that that one-sided development is a main reason for the present very high price of commodities—in other words, the high cost of living.

And the same condition obtains in this country. Canada is of such vast extent and possesses such immense agricultural possibilities that we have as yet hardly touched the fringe of those possibilities; and in addition we have incalculable natural resources in our mines, forests and fisheries. Looking at the statement made by the Minister of Finance in his Budget speech, we find certain figures of the values of our manufactured articles and of the products of our farms, forests, fisheries and mines. In that connection I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that those figures demonstrate that the products of our manufactories exceed the combined products of our farms, mines, forests and fisheries. That, I submit, is the kind of development that has been encouraged by the protective tariff principle, and in my opinion it is not a well balanced development of our national activities. To be building up large enterprises in a country like this at the expense largely of the consuming public and to the discouragement to a large extent of our basic industry, agriculture, is not conducive to our national welfare.

Now, my opinion is not a mere theory, it is borne out by the facts. The idea of a protective tariff is not to produce revenue but to protect industry and to build up large industrial establishments; and that is just exactly what it has been doing. It has made certain industries profitable largely at the expense of certain other industries, with the result that both labour and capital have been drawn away from those industries which cannot be protected by tariff and have been attracted to those industries

which are protected and are thereby profited. Our census figures bear this out and show that for the last forty years, particularly in the greater part of Eastern Canada, there has been a steady flow of our rural population into the large urban centres. The reason is that the farmers cannot compete with those engaged in other industries for the labour that they require, and they cannot use capital to the same advantage.

In order to further bear out that assertion I would like to place before this House a few figures in relation to the dairy farming business in Ontario to show the rewards offered to the dairy farmers of this province during the last few years of high prices. I have here the report of a survey made in the county of Oxford by the Ontario Department of Agriculture under the superintendence of Professor Leitch, Professor of Farm Management of the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph. For the year beginning March 1, 1917, and ending February 28, 1918, a survey was made of 437 farms in the county of Oxford, the object being to cover the whole financial operations for the year:

(1) To determine the true financial condition of the dairy farming business.

(2) To determine the cost of production of milk.

(3) To discover the features of the business that have the greatest effect in raising or lowering farm profits.

(4) To give suggestions for the most profitable organization of the dairy farming business, based on the conditions found on the farms which showed the greatest financial returns.

These are some of the findings:

The cost of producing milk in the county of Oxford during that year—

And let me remind the House that this county is perhaps the banner dairy county of the province.

The cost of producing milk is a subject over which there is a lot of different opinions even amongst producers. As a matter of fact there has never been until the present any organized effort to find the exact cost of the product on a variety of farms. The information collected from the farmers in this survey gave the looked-for opportunity for an investigation into the cost of milk produced during each month of the year. These farms were devoted to the production of milk as their main business, therefore, each farm was treated as a manufacturing unit for producing milk. The cost of production, therefore, was made up on each farm of the following items: current expenses (labour, repairs, seed, feed bought, taxes, etc.), depreciation on buildings and machinery, interest on investment at seven per cent and $500 for the labour of each farmer himself.

That was the labour income allowed to each farmer in counting up the cost of producing his milk during that year.

[Mr. Kennedy.]

From this total was deducted the amount received for crops, hogs, poultry and other miscellaneous sales. The difference was the cost of producing the milk sold. Of course, in many instances there were considerable profits from the sales of hogs, etc., but the effect was to reduce the cost of milk produced.

This is what they found:—

The farms which were not strictly dairy farms had slightly smaller labour incomes than the dairy farms. Therefore their milk cost them a little more to produce. We are safe in assuming therefore that the cost of producing milk in Oxford county during the year ending February 28, 1918, was $2.20 per hundred pounds. This just equalled the selling price which averaged $2.19½ per quintal.

During 1917-1918, a year of high prices for dairy products, the farmers in the banner dairy county of Ontario were producing milk practically at cost, only being allowed in figuring that cost a labour income of $500 a year.

A little later on a similar survey was carried on at the other end of the province, in the county of Dundas, another excellent dairying county. I would like to ask the House to notice the rewards that were being offered to the dairy farmers that year on 278 farms. The average labour income for the whole year for the farmer himself and his wife and young children was $903, and out of that reward for his labour he had to live and to finance any improvements necessary to his farming operations. The cost of producing milk during that year on 194 farms was $2.30 per hundred pounds, and the farmers who sent their milk to the cheese factories received $1.85 per hundred pounds. The farmers, however, who sold their milk to the condensers or shipped it to Montreal received $2.44 for the milk, and it cost them in the neighbourhood of $2.30 per hundred pounds to produce it. In this case $500 was the labour income allowed each farmer for his own labour and that of his wife and young children. I might remind hon. members that those farmers did not work six or eight hours a day but closer to twelve and fourteen hours a day. And their wives also play a very important part in carrying on the work of these dairy farms.

A later survey was made in the county of Oxford in the year ending February 28, 1919. I will just read a couple of the conclusions reached by Professor Leitch:—

Despite the increased prices of farm products during the last few years, six per cent of the farms in the surveyed area of Oxford county had labour incomes of less than nothing for the year ending February 28, 1919.

Another of his conclusions was " that the average cost of production of milk on 139

Oxford county farms during the year ending February 28, 1919, was $2.64 per hundredweight, and that during the same period and on the same farms the average selling price was $2.36 per hundredweight," 28 cents less than the cost of production. These are the financial rewards offered in these times of high prices to the dairy farmers of the province of Ontario. We are urged to increase production, the production of our farms particularly; yet we are discouraged by the fact that we cannot go into the labour market and compete with other enterprises in this country which can offer to labour a far higher wage than we can pay or obtain for ourselves.

I have simply placed these figures before the House in order that hon. gentlemen who are not well acquainted with farming conditions in this country—and I am speaking now only of Ontario; I am not speaking of farming conditions in the West—may have an opportunity to compare the financial rewards being offered at this time of high prices to the dairy farmers of Ontario as compared with those offered to other enterprises and other industries in this country. I ask hon. members to decide whether a policy which encourages industry largely at the expense of agriculture and which produces this one-sided, ill-balanced development is a proper policy to be longer continued in this country.

Many figures have been given to the House to show the magnitude of our agricultural products. These figures are given in values and are liable to be deceptive. I should like to refer particularly to the cheese industry during the last few years. The amount of cheese exported in 1916 was, in round numbers, 168,000,000 pounds. In 1917 it had increased to 180,000,000 pounds. In 1918 it dropped off to 169,000,000 pounds, and in 1919 it dropped down further to 152,000,000 pounds, a decrease in these last three years of 28,000,000 pounds, or 16 per cent. Now, the cheese industry in this country is a very important industry so far as Ontario is concerned, yet during the last few years it has been declining very rapidly and I think that the figures which I have just quoted show why that condition has existed. I may say that this decrease coincides largely with the period of price fixing in respect to cheese.

I have noticed that officials of this Government have gone over the country claiming that the price of last year for cheese, 25 cents, was a profitable price for the producers and that the producers knew it. Well, the producers knew perfectly well that it was not a profitable price. They know what they are making and they know fairly well when they are making a profit and when they are not. The figures of the survey in the county of Dundas, where the farmers were selling their milk at $1.85 per hundred pounds, when it cost them $2.30 to produce it, are a very effective answer to that contention. That is one of the things which is producing unrest and discontent in this country. Moreover, it is producing a feeling of discouragement among the farmers of Ontario, who feel that they are not being treated fairly. It has been said that this particular group in this House are agitators and have been agitating—this was applied particularly to the United Farmers of Ontario—and stirring up discontent and unrest throughout the country. I would like to remind hon. gentlemen that this discontent and unrest existed long before our organization was brought into existence. Our farmers' organizations were not formed primarily for political purposes; but the people, being discontented, used this organization to show their discontent and we are here largely as a result of that discontent and not as its cause.

The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) also mentioned the fact that in the agricultural estimates $5,000,000 was being granted to agriculture and he said that this was a direct aid to the farmers of this country. He likened it to the bounties which have been paid on iron and steel. I would not have thought so much of his statement that this $5,000,000 was direct aid to the farmers if he had not likened it to the bounties on iron and steel. In that comparison he is absolutely unfair and absolutely wrong, because this $5,000,000 is not paid to the farmers. We are not paid a bounty on our wheat, on our milk, on our butter or on our cheese. This $5,000,000 is not paid to the farmers; it is expended in educational and investigational work. Although the farmers do appreciate it and do receive some benefit from it, let me remind hon. gentlemen that we cannot be altogether selfish in the matter of the benefits which we reap from it because we cannot use all the wheat, all the butter, all the cheese and all the milk that we produce. If there is an added production on the farms of this country as a result of the expenditure of that $5,000,000, that added production adds to the wealth of every other class in the country.

Now in respect to the Budget speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, I wish to say

that it embodies in itself a very serious criticism of the course followed by the present Administrator during the last few years. It calls upon the country to exercise thrift and economy and yet it indicates clearly that the Government has not been practising thrift and economy.

When war broke out in 1914, it should not have required any very far-sighted statesman to foresee that the cost of the war would be enormous and that it must eventually be met by the people through taxation. It would have been the part of wisdom to have immediately made some provision for paying part of the cost of the war out of the revenues of the country. When the people were keyed up by their patriotic fervour, they would have welcomed taxes which they will find burdensome in times of peace and which may be very burdensome if times of depression come. Moreover, unprecedented amounts of money were flowing into the country and boosting industry and business in every direction. This would have been a proper time for the Government to increase the revenues with a view to applying part of them to defraying part of the cost of the war. This course was not followed, however. The cost of the war was met by borrowing, and notwithstanding the fact that our revenues have increased enormously, the fact remains that until now, over one and one-half years after the armistice was signed, no serious attempt has been made to defray the cost of the war by means of taxation.

There are some features of the Budget which I desire to commend. First, there is the frankness and lucidity with which the minister has placed the actual financial condition of this country before the people. It is a good thing to trust the people. In a democratic country, it is a good thing for the Government to take the people into their confidence, and I can assure the minister that the people of Canada will appreciate and respond to his frankness.

Then there is the increase in direct taxation. This is something which the people can understand. They know that there is an immense debt to be paid, and if the charges on that account are levied equitably, the people are willing to pay. I would like to commend the minister for thus extending the principle of direct taxation. The tax on luxuries is a good thing, in so far as it is a tax on real luxuries. In this respect, I feel that the proposals embodied in the Budget are open to a good deal of criticism and revision, both in their incidence and operation, but that can be done in committee.

I would also criticise that feature of the Budget which makes it evident that the future policy of this Administration is to be the same old principle of protection which has been embodied in their fiscal policy of the past. I have already spent some time on the subject and will not refer to it again beyond saying that the fiscal policy of the past forty years has not encouraged a well-balanced, all-round development in the various enterprises in which our people are engaged. It has encouraged industry at the expense of agriculture, and it is not a policy which should be followed longer in a country which has vast undeveloped natural resources and whose agriculture possibilities are still to a large extent waiting to be developed.

Mr. HERMAS DESLAURIERS (St. Mary's) (translation): Mr. Speaker, replying to the insinuations made by the hon. member for Algoma East (Mr. Nicholson) and which were quite out of place, my honourable friend from Timiskaming (Mr. McDonald) charged the Government with having done positively nothing in behalf of the workingmen. I concur in that opinion entirely. One need not be possessed, at this time, of a very great talent for analysis to find in the Budget brought down by the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) the exact continuation of the class policy adopted by the Government.

This Budget is unfair and vaxatious, even, to that portion of the community who have undergone, alone I might say, all the sacrifices imposed by the present Administration, and if public rumour is to be taken heed of, that moderate tariff and protection policy as applied by the Government is a dish which has lost all zest for the people.

To advocate intense protection in behalf of trade and commerce by overloading the workingmen with taxes and letting them fall victims to the ravenous appetites of the profiteers will not make for stabilization of labour. To claim that it will is to make a mistake which seems to me deliberate; it is nothing but a false apprehension on the part of the hon. Minister of Finance; it is a sure way of increasing the latent and real misery which already exists in the ranks of the public. Is it just that the millionaire born of speculations connected with the recent war and who keeps on replenishing his purse thanks to the protection policy of the Government; is it

just that the members of the present ministry should pay for their breakfast the same tax as he who is paid only $15 or $20 a week, or as the soldier who was disabled on the battlefields? Is it just that the childless moneyed man should be taxed once only when the workingman with twelve children is taxed twelvefold? Is it just that the people should pay more, merely for clothing, than the Government gets, in the form of a tax out of the large revenues, when the textile industries admit publicly that they realize profits of 200 per cent and when they have but a ridiculously low tax to pay?

The Government may take the 7½ per cent war tax off the implements of husbandry, they may promise to have the tariff revised by such commissions as they usually appoint and this may mean an electoral boon and promote a greater agricultural production which will enable profiteers in this industry to operate on a larger scale and, in fine, to multiply their profits, but this will not hinder the workingmen in the cities from continuing to pay for the necessaries of life a higher and higher price.

One was justified in believing that, during the reconstruction period, as the Government is pleased to call it, the classes of the community who had been aggrieved by the scourge of war, such as the workingmen in the cities and the soldiers to whose lot the sacrifices fell and who were almost completely disorganized, would be benefited by the Governments "win the war" policy, instead of the profiteers and the speculators who had nothing to suffer but the multiplication of their dollars. On the contrary, the poor is taxed for ever. If, tired out by hard work during the great summer heat, he wishes to drink a glass of beer on his way back from the factory, his thirst is taxed; if, when at home, at night, he wishes to mitigate the drudgery of his daily task and to rest from his daily toil by means of a little mechanical music for want of money to secure something better, "let the workman be the goat," he is heavily taxed. He cannot even take a little smoke without paying a tax on his matches; if he wishes to sleep he must pay the taxes intended for the protection of the textile industries; in a word, he is affected from top to toe and from all sides by all the taxes as he would have been under the salt-tax system in France at the time of the French revolution when a tax was imposed even on the salt of the consumer who could be put in jail if caught in possession of a pinch of salt unauthorized by Parliament.

We had reason to think that the Minister of Labour, seeing that his electors were being treated unjustly, would assume concerning the guidance of this country the important and vital rank assigned to him by the present circumstances.

Fallacy! in the person of the hon. Minister of Labour we have but a distinguished lecturer using magic-lantern slides, who is not responsible nor accountable to the people and whose part is restricted to the hoaxing of workingmen by the means of labour congresses at which nothing is acted upon, of industrial conferences over which he presides and whose only use is to put a heavy drain on the Treasury to generously reward so-called knights and leaders of industry and labour called together that they might puff his showy exhibitions.

The present Government despatched Mr. Draper to Versailles that he might try or make a pretence of trying to do something official for the ever-enduring shorn one. The Government will undoubtedly endeavour to glory in their having countenanced clause 427, paragraph 4, of the Peace Treaty of 1919, concerning the eight hour day or the forty-eight hour week. However, they were not the initiators of that polciy, for as early as 1578, under the reign of Philip II of Spain, it was applied to miners. Later on, in 1797, the physician of the king of Prussia, Hulefant, suggested that the working laws in industries should be divided into three parts so as to enable workers to take wholesome food, to have sanitary homes and to wear proper raiments.

In France, in 1832, in the United States, in 1884, in New Zealand and everywhere since then, even in Canada, such a reform has been advocated and brought about through the perfecting of industrial machinery, and it will become more pressing as machinery is further improved.

However, we must realize that a labour policy should not be confined to words, but should also take the form of deeds.

Not even the shadow of a thought for the welfare of workingmen is to be found in the Budget; nothing was suggested by the Minister of Labour to help them and to facilitate the enforcement of an eight-hour day which means but ruin for Canada, if the department do not set up a general organization of workers based upon physiological, psychological, technical, administrative, local, national or international researches, not individual, but co-ordinate. Why should we not establish as soon as

possible, as was done for the investigating of other problems, an international institute of labour where such matters would be considered and scientists, manufacturers and workingmen could work together? Nothing is done because there is not a true desire of promoting the welfare of every class of the community.

Canada has paid dearly for listening to the unionist verbiage, but to-day she knows that, according to that verbiage, the convening of labour congresses, of industrial conferences is as meaningless as the establishment of boards of food or trade commissioners as far as the lowering of the cost of living is concerned. It is nothing but a mystification and a camouflage in order to shield friends. How long will the people still put up with deception? That I do not know, but I am sure that though they may be deceived once, they cannot be humbugged all the time.

The present social upheaval and the public disparagement of the authorities show that the outside policy of the Government is being well understood, and that should the Government, as guardians of the destiny of the people, still persist in causing instead of preventing distress, the time is not far away when another class already conspicuous, which the hon. member from Algoma East warmly commended, and which is unwilling to consider the interests of the whole community, will think of taking a stand to serve its own cause.

Had the Minister of Labour been equal to the circumstances, would we have witnessed so many people without a shelter, having no homes, while the Government was keeping in the loom a housing scheme for the workers, authorizing an expenditure of twenty millions, but upon conditions which prevented anything being done. As the result of such incompetency or unconcern, we have seen this year a great number of families crowding themselves in tenements which recall the slums of London where there are no morals, chastity is derided, children are robbed of their virginity before becoming of marriageable age to fall later on a prey for houses of ill-fame. Such a disorder is most serious and the responsibility rests upon the shoulders of those who are the guardians of the destinies of the nation and who by a fallacious policy devised to bring up such a result permit the degradation of the home and the disintegration of families.

The Government are in a large measure responsible for these conditions and knowing their existence, they have no right to ignore these evils which, for the sake of the

race and community, should not be tolerated. Social conscience cries loudly to them that they have no right to enact class legislation and thus pile up riches while the evils resulting from the dislocation of industry go unmolested.

In consequence of the Government's war policy how many invalids, how many aged people, how many widows and orphans have well-nigh been reduced to poverty; how many have in fact tasted the very dregs of hardship and suffering? Still the Budget makes no provision for such as these. Instead the ministry is itself opening the way to this economic hell; and every day we see all these poor people falling further and further into the depths and, in an effort to stay their doom, hanging on to insufficient salaries.

The chief cause of the suffering in our cities is imputable solely to the Department of Labour, which refuses to enact the legislation necessary to prevent our present-day disorders through fear of displeasing the high protectionists. I am speaking of forced idleness.

This idleness is caused by irregular work, mainly due to lack of organization, to business depression or to seasonal fluctuations. If we had a competent Department of Labour these problems could easily be solved by following the example of other countries. Couldn't we set up a well organized central labour exchange in our principal cities and enact a law forbidding the employer from hiring workmen at the factory gate and obliging them to apply to the labour exchange? There the worker would have to give his name and his trade; work would be found for each in turn and the wages paid would conform to the scale established by the labour unions. In this way we would be rid of the sight of hundreds and hundreds of workers anxiously waiting every morning at the factory gate for employment which never comes; these poor men waste weeks and weeks in these vain attempts to find work, while their families are suffering the direst poverty.

An equitable distribution of Government contract, during periods of stagnation, would also help to overcome this problem of idleness. Old people and children below eighteen years of age should have to work only during a limited number of hours. Every year the Budget should contain an appropriation for widows so as to oblige them to bring up their children properly and relieve them of the necessity of spending long hours in the workshop to earn a pitiful salary. In this way all our labour would

be absorbed and economic distress forestalled. But the Department of Labour asks for none of these measures. We still have in our cities numerous cases of "sweating"—and I could give details—where grown people receive $6 and $7 a week for working ten hours a day. Such a state of things should never be allowed to exist under a democratic Government. The State should establish a fixed minimum wage and visit severe punishment on all employers who disobeyed the law in this respect.

Another method of overcoming this problem of forced idleness would be insurance such as they have in several cities of Germany where it is coupled with medical attention in return for a reasonable contribution which the employer deducts from the workers' pay envelope. In several countries, especially in Belgium, Norway, Denmark and Holland, the Gand system is followed and seems to give satisfaction; under this system the public authorities, on the recommendation of the Department of Labour, vote certain subsidies to the labour unions as a reward for services rendered the State; this ensures comfort for the workers and prevents just so much hardship.

In a great many industries no thought is given to the workers' health; the sanitary conditions are frightful; the workers are exposed to all sorts of poisons and infections; another fruitful cause of idleness and of hardship. Employers should be obliged to insure their employees against disease contracted in the workshop just as they insure them against accidents. I understand that it is difficult for the hon. Minister of Labour, a Senator for life, and possessed of independent means, to realize what great evils result from economic insecurity; hence his indifference and his grandstand play of improving the lot of the workingman; but he is unfaithful to his moral duty when he fails to obtain from the Government preventive and curative measures for the alleviation of economic distress; conscience, in the name of humanity and of our social welfare, commands him to do so.

Were it not for that, parents could not possibly be called upon to discharge their duties towards their children, from the viewpoint of education, and hygiene, which are essential factors in the upbuilding of a nation sound in body and mind "mens sana in corpore sano."

Mr. Speaker, it is truly regrettable to see the Government steering their course towards a revival, under new appellations, of differences—that ought to be forever obliterated and which responsible government, be it said to its eternal credit, had demolished. Do they mean to resuscitate the old state of things under a new shape? What purpose do they pretend to serve in so doing? I say most emphatically that those who are trying to revive the conflicts of the past, and to create antagonism between capital and labour, or vice versa, are egregiously mistaken or seek to deceive their fellow countrymen.

It may be a fruitful theme for barren and sometimes criminal appeals to prejudices, but it behooves us to defeat such movements through a fair policy towards every group of the community. In these times of stress, while Europe is setting such sad examples, we ought to close our ranks from the highest to the lowest steps of the scale of society. There should be only Canadians—good Canadians—elder brothers, younger brothers in the great family which is called the fatherland.

Were I allowed to put on record my views in this connection, and to suggest a motto to my fellow countrymen, in the name of the country, I would say: Cultivate your mind, improve yourselves, stick together, carry on together.

Mr. P. A. SEGUIN (L'Assomption-Montcalm) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, let me, at the very outset, tell you that I shall not trespass upon the patience of the House at this late hour. However, I wish before the closing of the debate, to say a few words about the Budget we are now dealing with.

From their very coming into power the Government seems to have had no other concern but squandering in risky undertakings, millions upon millions, and, with a view to making up deficits, they are straining every nerve in levying taxes upon the people.

Under cover of a win-the-war policy and its imperative exigencies the Government has been indulging in the most extravagant and unwarranted expenditures, from the standpoint of administration. Having acquired the deeply-seated habit of throwing away broadcast the public moneys, under the plea of their win-the-war policy, they have in the long run lost the sense of their responsibilities and probably in order to gratify the cravings of their favourites, they have launched into scandalous undertakings, such as the taking over of the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk railways, and as a consequence of their reckless policy, this country is now facing a gigantic debt of three billion dollars.

And how could the enormous character of that debt be explained, otherwise than by the reckless financing of the Government, not only from the very inception of the war, but from their coming into power in 1911.

It is too late now to recall the scandalous character of the expenditures which was so conspicuous in the pre-war times, it would carry us too far back; but from 1914 and even 1917, the country has witnessed an orgy of expenditures, and the carousal is not yet seemingly at an end. When the war was on, did not friends and followers of the Government, as General Smart and Colonel Pratt, alarmed over this reckless administration, declare to us that favouritism and injustice, with their headquarters at Argyle House in England, were presiding over the direction of our army? And in this country, how much money has been squandered, and how many millions scattered broadcast among Government favourites and profiteers of their ilk.

It may be acknowledged that the hon. Minister of Finance is a man of high intellectual culture and of broad learning, but one could not, forsooth, deliver him a certificate as a first-class economist and friend of the people; because the method resorted to by him in order to restore public confidence and bring about the welfare of the country is doomed to dismal failure when, without any concern for the well-being of the country in general, he is bending all his efforts towards levying imposts on the people, and sinking the money thus raised into a bottomless pit.

I quite realize that the Minister of Finance of a country, the public exchequer of which has been plundered for many years is performing a thankless task; but that cannot warrant his levying taxes on such necessaries of life, as are to be found in the resolution now before us.

Does the hon. minister mean that he is taxing luxuries in imposing a 10 per cent duty on a pair of shoes worth nine dollars or on a five dollar hat?

For my part I consider this tax upon articles of first necessity and which could not be had any more cheaply. And how many other articles altogether essential have there not been wantonly taxed? Is not the tax on patent medicines itself a most onerous burden upon a class of people who should in justice call for more protection at the hands of the rulers?

But how carefully the big profiteer of late has been guarded from disgorging. He was even allowed to shelter a part of his millions from the income tax by subscribing to the tax-free national loans.

I fully realize that, in order to face the critical situation in which the finances of country are, a remedy had to be found; but I regret that the hon. the Minister of Finance, instead of tackling the great capitalists, especially those who made of the war an opportunity for amassing colossal fortunes, should put the burden of taxation upon the consumer and the mass of the people.

Instead of squeezing the small purses as he does in this Budget, why has the Minister of Finance not put under contribution those who have made such a boon of the dire events of the last years? Instead of bleeding the poor people white, why has he not sought to balance his finances by resolutely adopting a regime of economy, by judiciously doing away with a lot of useless expenditure in the different branches of the administration?

Is it not, for instance, an immorality, if I may use the term, to find in the Estimates for this year, a sum of $12,498,506 to be voted for militia, when $3,903,000 only are provided for agricultural purposes, and when it is found every day that the requests made in favour of the agricultural class are treated with the utmost neglect by the Government in spite of the good will of the Minister of Agriculture.

Why should we be asked to vote such a fabulous sum for military purposes after having made the unheard of sacrifices which the Government imposed upon us, for the very purpose of destroying militarism and securing to the world a lasting peace?

I want to put upon record my most earnest protest against the guilty neglect with which the Government meets the interests of agriculture all over the country and more particularly in the province of Quebec, and this in order to waste countless sums of public money upon military matters.

I protest with all the energy that is in me against the project of developing in this country an imperial navy, by accepting from England the gift of war vessels. Were it not for fear of scandalizing certain wild Imperialists, I would add that this gift of war vessels does in no way allure me—"Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes."

After our having offered our last dollar and our last man as our contribution to the war, why is our Government so indiff-

erent in asking for our share of the indemnity to be paid by Germany?

I do not want to prolong this debate, and I hasten to conclude by saying that if the Government be truly concerned as to the economic and national future of Canada, they must henceforth take the means of giving the people all facilities for co-operating in the resumption of our normal life; and with that purpose in view, they must lighten the people's burden and give the farmers the possibility of procuring as cheaply as possible the tools with which to increase production, an advantage which can be afforded by lowering the tariff.

And when production increases, the cost of living will come down, greatly to the benefit of the consumer. The lowering of the tariff upon the implements of production in the industries born of the natural resources of the country, will bring better days for Canada and make life easier for the people.

And may we return to our national traditions of concord and harmony, by putting an end to appeals to race and creed hatred, which a sect without shame and patriotism takes pleasure in fomenting in our country with the assent of this Government.

Under such conditions only, shall our dear Canada become happy and prosperous, as in the time when its destinies were governed by the illustrious man and the ardent patriot the memory of whom is ever alive, Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

As long as nothing is done for the people, the people will do nothing for the Government. They have been too often deceived to have any faith to-day in the words of those who govern. Henceforth acts only will count; acts, not words, are now in order. And the action must be helpful and constructive because our people have already suffered too much. It is useless to forestall what that imaginary commission on the tariff, which the Government promised more than a year ago, can do. People must have their turn and they will get it, if the amendment submitted by the hon. members for Shelburne and Queen's is adopted. For my part I give it all my support.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Fielding which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Andrews,
Archambault,
Baldwin,
Béland,
Boivin,
Bourassa,
Boyer,
Brouillard,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Chisholm,
Clark (Red Deer),
Copp,
Crerar,
d'Anjou,
Déchêne,
Deilsle,
Demers,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Devlin,
Duff,
DuTremblay,
Ethier,
Euler,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Fontaine,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gauthier,
Gauvreau,
Gervais,
Gladu,
Gould,
Halbert,
Hunt,
Jacobs,
Johnston,
Kay,
Kennedy (Essex, N.),
Kennedy (Glengarry and Stormont),
King,
Knox,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Leger,
Lemieux,
Lesage,
Mackie (Edmonton),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McGibbon (Argenteuil),
McDonald,
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Molloy,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Power,
Prevost,
Proulx,
Reid (Mackenzie),
Rinfret,
Robb,
Ross,
Savard,
Seguin,
Stein,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tobin,
Trahan,
Truax,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Vien,
White (Victoria),
Wright.—94.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Allan,
Anderson,
Argue,
Armstrong (York),
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Ballantyne,
Ball,
Best,
Blair,
Blake,
Bolton,
Bonnell,
Borden (Sir Robert),
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boys,
Brien,
Bristol,
Burnham,
Burrell,
Butts,
Calder,
Casselman,
Chaplin,
Charlton,
Charters,
Clark (Bruce),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Cowan,
Crothers,
Crowe,
Cruise,
Currie,
Davidson,
Davis,
Doherty,
Douglas (Strathcona),
Douglas (Cape Breton S. and Richmond),
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Elkin,
Finley,
Foster (Sir George),
Foster (York),
Fraser,
Fripp,
Fulton,
Glass,
Green,
Griesbach,

Guthrie,	Paul,
Halladay,	Peck,
Harold,	Porter,
Harrison,	Redman,
Hartt,	Reid (Grenville),
Hay,	Richardson,
Henders,	Rowell,
Hughes (Sir Sam),	Scott,
Keefer,	Sexsmith,
Lalor,	Shaw,
Lang,	Sheard,
Loggie,	Sifton,
Long,	Simpson,
Mackie (Renfrew),	Smith,
Maclean (York),	Spinney,
McCurdy,	Stacey,
McGibbon (Muskoka),	Steele,
McGregor,	Stevens,
McIntosh,	Stewart (Hamilton),
McIsaac,	Stewart (Lanark),
McLeod,	Sutherland,
McQuarrie,	Thompson (Weyburn),
Martin,	Thompson (Hastings,)
Meighen,	Thomson (Yukon),
Merner,	Tolmie,
Mewburn,	Tremain,
Middlebro,	Tudhope,
Morphy,	Tweedie,
Mowat,	Whidden,
Munson,	White (Sir Thomas),
Myers,	Wigmore,
Nicholson, (Queens, P.E.I.),	Wilson (Wentworth),
Nicholson (Algoma),	Wilson (Sask.).—120.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I was paired with the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards.) Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the amendment.

Mr. PEDLOW: I was paired with the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken.) Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Mr. Speaker, under a misapprehension in regard to the order in which the vote was taken I voted for the amendment. Had it not been for that wrong impression I would have voted with the Government.

PAIRS:

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

McLean, H. H.,	Murphy,
Maclean, A. K.,	Sinclair (P.E.I.),
Hocken,	Pedlow,
Manion,	Sinclair (Antigonish),
Cronyn,	Denis,
Edwards,	Buchanan,
Wallace.	Maharg.

Main motion (Sir Henry Drayton) agreed to and the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Rt. Hon. SIR ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, while it might seem somewhat a work of supererogation at this stage to adjourn, nevertheless the House would probably support a motion that the Committee rise and report progress. I therefore make that motion.

Motion agreed to and progress reported.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 148 (from the Senate) for the relief of Lockhart Pierce Sutton—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

On motion of Sir Robert Borden the House adjourned at 6.32 a.m.

INDEX

FOURTH SESSION — THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1920.

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r.=first, second, or third reading. Admn.=Administration; Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Div.=Division. Dept.=Department. Govt.=Government. M.=Motion. Ques.=Question. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abey, Mr. H. R. ques. 1000

Acadia Refining Company, 3226

Acton Vale post office, ques. 1899

Adams, Mr. Thomas, ques. 1002, 3551

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 11, 47, 87, 114, 161, 181, 231.

Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Admiralty. *See* Naval Service

Admiralty Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2842; 2r., 3086; com., 3086; 3r., 3086

Adulteration of Food. *See* Food and Drugs Bill

Aerial Navigation. *See also* British North America Act
Air Service, 4553
Material, purchase of for, ques. 1359
Tax, suggested, 3592

Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code

Agricultural Gazette, 1085

Agricultural Machinery Bill (Standardization of Parts), 1r., 2079

Agriculture. *See debates under* Canadian Wheat Board; Commercial Feeding Stuffs
Co-operation with the provinces, 603
Dairying industry. *See that title*
Department, Estimates, 2382
Experimental farms. *See that title*
Farm labour, ques. 800, 1011, 1220, 1227
Government, and, 610
Improvement in, 677
International Institute of, 2411
Potatoes, exportation, ques. 1360
Statement and review by Minister, 2366

Agriculture and Colonization, Com., 306, 540

Alberta Penitentiary, ques. 2777, 3855

Alcohol. *See also* Inland Revenue; Opium and Drugs; Proprietary; Prohibition; Special War Revenue
Industrial, 70, 324

Aliens, 150, 155, 229. *See also* Dominion Franchise; Education; Immigration; Naturalization
Detention camps, in, ques. 314
Enemy, naturalization, ques. 992
Immigrants and Canadian Citizenship, M (Mr. Steele), 812

Allan, Mr. G. W. (South Winnipeg)
Returns to House, 1295

Allies. *See also* League of Nations
Peace Conference at Ostend, 2476, 2574

Alpine Club, 3288

Alves, Mr., death of, ques. 1463

Amery, Colonel, and Speaker's Chair, 3224

Ames, Sir Herbert B. (St. Antoine)
League of Nations—review and summary, 3961. League of Nations a reality—partisanship in international relationships deprecated—history and description of League—meetings—specific tasks and achievements—permanent institutions designed and prepared for—transit—armaments—mandates and minorities—registration of treaties—emergent measures—duties as financial director—first assembly, November, 1920—the Secretariat an international civil service—Canada's opportunity. Questions answered; *for details see* League of Nations
Return of to House, 3623

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Brant Military Hospital, ques. 2519
Federal Bureau of Education, 1370
Income tax, errors in returns, 3302
Opium and Drug Bill, 1636-7, 1644-5, 1746
Parliamentary Restaurant—messengers, 3098
Sugar, price of, 1896

Andrews, Mr. George W. (Centre Winnipeg)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 171. Free trade, 171; returned soldiers; true party discipline, 173; going over to cross benches, 174
Budget, 3012. Members' indemnity, 3012; pensions for soldiers and their dependents—war profits, 3013; conscription of financial and managerial ability; Mr. Meighen on Britain and British policy—trust the people, 3015
Canadian Wheat Board, ques. 2182
Canteen profits, ques. 800
Hudson Bay Company lands, ques. 1897
League of Nations and United States, ques. 1118
Oleomargarine, 1869
Pensions, 433, 511
Returned soldiers, provision for, M. for special com. 511
Soldier Settlement, 2135-6
Universal military training, 945

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1622-3; 2r., com., 1839; 3r., 1840

Animals, Feeding of. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Annuities. *See* Government Annuities

Anticosti, North Point light, ques. 1361

Antigonish and **North Sydney,** Public works, ques. 543, ques. 1004

Appeals. *See* Supreme Court Act

Apple Barrels. *See* Inspection and Sale

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 36 (for 1920-1, for $62,900,-986.09), 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 756
2. Bill No. 67 (for 1920-21, for $2,083,-333.33). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 1289
3. Bill No. 166 (for 1919-20, for $3,175,-199.81; and for 1920-1, for $64,984,-319.42 interim). Res., 3215, 3217; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3218
4. Bill No. 221 (for 1919-20, for $15,875,-999.03; and for 1920-21, for $321,980,-760.61). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4587

"Arabic," SS. Loss of Govt. vouchers in, ques., 3489

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 292. Address seconded in English, not in French—proposed general election; reply to Mr. Meighen, 292; reply to Mr. Hocken, 293; dissolution of Parliament, historical review, 294
Auditor General's report, 4276
Bankruptcy Bill, 4263
Budget, 2925. Farmers' delegation on conscription, 2925; increase of public debt, 2926; "advances unaccounted for," 2927; income tax, exemption on account of children, 2928; cost of living—Board of Commerce—profiteers, 2929; Dominion Textile Company—purchases in connection with advances to Greece and Roumania, members of Parliament interested, 2930; new taxes, proposed taxation of war wealth, 2932; food gamblers, 2933; banks and credits for speculation; tariff commission and revision, personal position, 2934; exchange rate and soldiers' pay—withholding of information on public affairs by Gov., 2936
Canteen profits, 709
Chambly fort, 3769
Daylight saving, 1574
Desjardins, "Ti-Noir," ques. 315
Dominion Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2216, 2221, 2243
Liquor on polling day, 1108
Polling divisions, 1517
Proclamation—language of publication, 1834, 2292
Explosive works at Beloeil, 2247-48
Freight car situation, ques. 319; ques. 997
French wine imports, ques, 1627
Gambling, 3428
Grand Trunk shareholders, 3426-27
Greece and Roumania, ques. 415; ques. 2414
Habeas Corpus, 3296
House of Commons
Debates—translation of French speeches, 697, 4587
Income tax
Exemptions on account of children, 2928, 3297-8
Forms in French, 1084, 1573
Inquiry for returns, 618, 4258
International Labour Conference, ques. 803

Archambault, Mr. Joseph—*Con.*
Kingston harbour works, 458
Kinmel Camp riots, 709
Judges' salaries, 3227
Letter of French Canadian at war front, 284
Militia, 3660-3
Naturalization, Alsace-Lorraine, 3921
Navy League of Canada, ques. 802
Opium and Drug Bill, 1749, 1759
Peace Treaty, Bulgaria, 489
Printing Bureau, Sunday work, 4020
Purchasing Commission—Public Accounts Com., 1474, 4580-3
Racial and religious rights, 489
Roumania, ques. 2413, ques. 3488
Russia, trade with, 4322
St. Johns election, 2239
St. Lawrence channel, 230, 856
Shipbuilding, 640
Contracts, ques. 314, 917
Steel plates for, ques. 706
Soldiers
Cash gratuities, 1084
Payments to in sterling, ques. 2008
Steel and shipping merger, 1953
United States railways and Canadian freight, 1789
Victory loans, ques. 803
Commissions, ques. 320
Committee, ques. 2008
Vimy battlefield, ques. 1358
Washington, Canadian Minister at, 2474

Archibald, Col. Grassie, ques. 2007

Argue, Mr. Ira E. (Swift Current)
Eight-hour day, 449
Experimental Farms, 2389, 3159

Armenians,
League of Nations and, 855, 1465, 3979

Armstrong, Mr. John A. M. (North York)
Franchise Bill, 1067

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Budget Speech, copies of, 2626
Car shortage, 884
Daylight saving, 1084
Ethyl alcohol, 3497
Franchise Bill
Advance and proxy voting, 1164
Voters' lists, 2419-20
Grand Trunk strike and pensions, 1129
Illustration farms, 2384
International Parliamentary Conference, ques. 2721

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E.—*Con.*
Mines Department, 3803
National defence, 4305
Naval Service, additional appropriation, 4305-10
Newspaper postage, 3349, 3755-8
Oil—Hudson Bay—Great Slave Lake, 3811-2
Royal Commission on Natural Resources, ques. 4502
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 3476
Collection, progress of, 3480-1, 3600
Furniture—auctions, 3575
Jewellery, 3579
Musical instruments, 3595
Proprietary medicines, 3600-4
Steel and Shipping merger, 1956
British Empire Steel Corporation, ques. 2777
Vessel Rates
Board of Railway Commissioners, control by, ques. 2414, 2777
Inland and coastwise (Railway Act Amdt. Bill), 160, 1707-27, ques. 2772
Ocean; res., 2013

Armstrong, Mr., Director of Coal Operations. *See under* Coal Operations

Army. *See also* Soldiers
Court martial procedure, ques. 1359
Surplus stores, ques. 1229
War Boots and Shoes, ques. 506

Arsenals. *See* Dominion arsenals; Militia

Arthabaska-Victoriaville, branch line, ques. 4502

Arthur Young Company, 3742. *See also* Civil Service; Griffenhagen
Wolff, Mr. L. R., ques. 1624

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Alves, Mr., death of, ques. 1463.
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2231-56
Peace and good order, 1106-8
Voters' list, 2421, 3892
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3936-40
Point of order—militia—relevancy, 3663
War trophies, 4557

Asbestos, 4513. *See*
Asbestos postmaster, ques. 320

Asiatics in Canada. *See* Chinese; Japanese; Naturalization; Orientals; Franchise Bill

Assiniboia
By-election. 56, 126, 137, 168, 3473. *See also* Recall
Expenses of Candidates, 1172, 1174-84
Grasshopper plague, 128
Sessional indemnities for unrepresented years, 129

Atlantic Sugar Refinery Company, 3226

Auditor General's Report, 458, 4276
Fourth volume, 2179, 2390
Publication in French, ques. 1627

Austrian and German Imports, ques. 2416, ques., 3359

Automobiles, 119, 2823, 2815. *See also* Special War Revenue Act
Imports and excise, ques. 591
Manufacturing plants in Canada, ques. 1201
Smuggled, ques. 807; ques. 1001
Taxes on, 2487

Autonomy of Canada. *See* Canada's National Status; **Bulgarian Treaty; League of** Nations; Peace Treaty

Bacon Industry. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Badges, Naval Service, 437. *See also* Naval Service

Bagot County
Electoral list, ques. 2011
Postal inspection, ques. 2721

Baie de Chaleur Harbours, 2185

Baker, Late Lieut. Col. G. H., M.P.,
Memorial to, 181, 2776, 3557,

Baldwin, Mr. Willis K. (Stanstead)
Budget, 2539. Luxury taxes, 2539; parties and reciprocity, 2540; Liberal party's tariff policy, 2540; immigration and national development, 2541; railways; West Indies, and Confederation, 2543
Food and Drugs Bill, 1262
Opium and Drug Bill, 1755
Scientific Research, 2174
Special War Revenue Bill, 3463
Retailer, effect upon, 3474
Sale (1 per cent) tax, 3467
Stamp taxes, collection of, 1262, 1755

Ball, Mr. Robert J. (Southeast Grey)
Burbidge-Messines, ques. 2721

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service)
Budget, 2533. Business profits war tax—tariff and cost of living, 2534; Liberal party tariff policy, 2535; free trade and the farmers, 2539
Buoy Service, 2116
Canada Shipping Act Amdt (Masters and Mates) 406-7, 563, 573-4, 980-3, 1610-2
Canada Shipping Act Amdt (Pilotage) 1839, 1967
Canada Shipping Act Amdt (Steamboat Inspection) 1050-2, 1762, 1776, 2125
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See also under this title* Shipbuilding
Business statement, 950
Operation, 641, 645
Information concerning withheld-policy justified, 1650, 1659-61, 1667, 1681
Steamers
"Canadian Inventor," delay in sailing, 3226, 3360
"Canadian Recruit" wreck of, 649
"Canadian Sealer," 649
"Canadian Spinner," 649
Canadian National Railway, ships and, 904
Cape Race, 2117
Export trade, larger desired, 621
Fish inspection, 1052-4, 4585-6
Fisheries, 3521-3
Overseers and guardians, 3523
Protection and patrol, 3524
Treaty with United States, 1290
Government policy, expected announcement, 583
Government steamers
Buying for, 1610
Wages, 1598, 1600, 1609-11
Halifax marine agency, 2110
Icebreakers, 1598-1612, 2103-7
"J. D. Hazen," 1599, 1602
"Montcalm," 1606-7
St. Lawrence, new vessel for, 1620-1
Uniforms of men, 1603-4
Fair wage contracts, 1608-9
Jellicoe, Admiral, report of, 344.
Australia and New Zealand, 1160
India, 1290
Printing, 386
Lighthouse Service
British Columbia patrol boats, 1616
Grand Etang, 2114
Lighthouse Board, 2117-8
Salaries, 2110-4
Liquor Shipments, Ontario-Michigan border, 2108

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C.—*Con.*
Little Sands, 4580
Live stock shipments inspection, 1615
Lunenburg—registrar, 2108-10
Magdalen Islands, 649, 651, 1601
Relief ships to, 1742
Marine Dept. and members of Parliament, 2121
Marine Dept., services restored to, 3507
Naval College graduates, 4562
Naval Defence of the Empire
Statement on motion for Supply, 3498 Dominion Ministers' memorandum—Lord Jellicoe, 3499. Government's official statement on naval affairs—acceptance of Admiralty's offer of ships—Naval Service Act, 1910, 3500; "Niobe" and "Rainbow"—war, recruiting and casualties—Naval college—distinguished officers, 3502; reorganization—details of ships from Admiralty—Naval estimates, 3503; efficiency of Service—fisheries protection—Navy Leagues, 3504; submarines to be sold—other Overseas Dominions and Great Britain, expenditures, 3505; service on pre-war lines, 3507. *See also under this title* Naval Service
Naval Service. *See also, under this title,* Naval Defence
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000—4291-4302, 4314, 4398-4402, 4408-9
Civil Service insurance and, 1779
Correspondence and negotiations, 4408, 4413
Ministerial statement, 707-8
Pre-war lines, 4391
Naval Service Badge, 439-45
Naval Service Dept.
Estimates—agreement as to debate on, 441-2
Salaries, 4409-11
Navigation
Aid and protection, 2115
Schools of, 1612-3
Pardee, Mr. and taxation—Montreal address, 2742
Pictou Harbour Bill, 2184-90; 3491-94
Pilots. *See also under this head,* Canada Shipping Act
Pensions, 4579-80
St. John, 2119-22
Quebec grain elevators, 657
Race tracks, influence of, 3428
Registration of shipping, 1614
St. John harbour, 2119, 3492-3
St. Lawrence channel, ice conditions, 230, 856-8

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence dredging, 1616-20
Shipbuilding, 618, 641, 651, 662-9
Canadian-built ships, quality of, 625
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 622, 659
Cattle shippers, and, 911
Contracts, 662-9, 892, 907-910, 916
Georgian Bay Canal, and, 915
Government ownership, 903, 908
Government programme finished, 905-7
Prices, 895, 900-2. *See also under this title,* Contracts
Profiteering, denied, 901
Profits—financial statement, 902-3
Ship plates, 623
Ships at Quebec, 916
Supply—vote of $20,000,000, 618, 892
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3994, 4001, 4013-14, 4145-51, 4157-68
Unforeseen expenses, 1616
Wharves, 2122
Winter fishing, 1609
Wrecks—investigation, 1612

Bank Act Amdt. Bill (Interest rate), 1r., 992

Banking and Commerce, Com., 306

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bills.
1. 1r., 920 (Mr. Jacobs)
2. 1r., 2246; 2r., com., 3255; 3r., 3265
Senate amdt. 4263
Trustees, ques. 2414

Banks, Chartered, ques., 591. *See also* Special War Revenue; Finance
Interest allowed to Government by, ques. 673
Moneys received from, 1001
Shipbuilding and, 4008
Wheat crop and, 4351

Barley. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Barron, Capt. John A., 857

Batiscan Bridge, ques. 317, ques. 1230

Battlefields Memorials
Com. on, 1460, 1738, 2078, 2177
Quebec, fortifications of, 421

Baugh, E. L. and **Tapley, W. H.,** 2015

Bawdy Houses. *See* Criminal Code

Begin, Cardinal, insult to, 1574

Béland, Hon. Henri S. (Beauce)
Air Service, 4555-6
Ames, Sir Herbert and League of Nations, 3623
Budget, date of, 2247
Butter and cheese, grading, 603
Canada and the Empire, 503
Canada Year Book, 1879
Canadian National Railways
Operation and withholding of information, 1656, 3086
Canadian Trade, extension of, 1883-5
Car shortage, 885
Civil Service
Classification, 4172. *See also, under this title,* House of Commons
Holidays, 4061, 4261
Retirement, 2179, 4464-5
Conservation Commission, 3286
Demobilization, 4552
Federal Bureau of Education, 1372
Franchise Bill
Proclamation—language of publication, 1834-6, 2272
Voters' lists, posting of, 3910
Franking privilege, 3763-7
Grosse Isle, 3555
House of Commons
Members, attendance of, 445-9
Staff, classification, 949, 1037-9, 4504, 4563-7
Imperial ex-Service men immigration of, 387
Income tax
Canadian Pacific Railway and, 3306
Dividends, when liable, 3305
Indemnity of members, 3242-3
Indemnity of Members and salaries of Ministers; votes of Messrs. Lanctot and Proulx, 4455
Indians, tuberculosis amongst, 3276
Inquiries for returns, 4258
International Financial Conference, 1465
International Labour Conference, 3359
League of Nations
Belgium, Spain, Greece, Brazil, 3978
Canada's status and relations, 352-3, 481-3
Canadian representative in Assembly, 567, 1046
Commercial treaties, 3973
Next assembly of League, 3977
Saar Basin, 3974
United States, 3977
Mint, the, 616
Moving Pictures of Canada, 1882-3
National parks—big game, 3285

Béland, Hon. Henri S.—*Con*
Naval Service
Estimates, agreement as to, debate on, 4411
Estimates and expenditure, 3508-10
Opium and Drug Bill, 1630-6, 1646-8, 1706, 1752-3
Parliament Buildings, 7
Parliamentary restaurant, 3094-5
Peace Treaty
Belgium, 481
Ratification, 477
Pensions and Re-establishment, 615
Com. on
Recommendations, legislation concerning, 4504
Report not printed in French, 2016
Resignation of Mr. Peck, 2082
Prime Minister, health of, 114
Proprietary medicines, 3603
Purchasing Board, 1468, 1471
Rural mail carriers, 4524
St. Lawrence dredging, 1617-8
Serbia, reported credit to, 567
Soldier Settlement, 2130
Special War Revenue Bill, 3327-8, 3343
Spirits and medicated wines, 3793
Sporting goods, 3571
Universal military training, 945
Washington, Canadian representative at, 1742, 2473-4

Belgium, advances to, ques. 318. *See also* League of Nations; Peace Treaty

Bell Telephone Company, rates appeal, ques. 2009

Beloeil, explosive works at, 2247, 2314

Bersimis and Rimouski service, ques. 1463

Best, Mr. John (Dufferin)
Civil Service
Classification, salary increases in advance of, 551
Senate staff, 4060
Superannuation, 4266-7
Eight-hour day, 374
Franchise Bill
Assiniboia expenses, 1174, 1183
Deposit, 1095
Recall, the, 2028-9
Returning officers, 1525, 1527-8
Voting on certificate, 1099
Indians, education of, 3280
Judges' salaries and pensions, 4417-22
Oleomargarine, 1852-56
Purchasing Board, 1468, 1471
Rural mail, 4529
Special War Revenue Bill, 3330, 3335-6

Biggar, Lieut. Col Oliver Mowat, K.C. 588, ques. 1462, 4264-9, 4516. *See also* Dominion Franchise, Chief Electoral Officer.

Bills, Divorce, remission of charges in, 4321, 4413

Biological Board, ques. 2572

Bird, Mr. Eustace G. ques. 1625

Blair, Mr. W. J. (Battle River)
Screenings, ques. 704

Blake, Mr. Matthew R. (North Winnipeg)
Coal operations director, 3179
Indemnity of Members, 4082
Opium and Drug Bill, 1638-9
Purchasing Commission, 1473-4
Universal military training, 940

Blondin, Hon. P. E., 57, 79, 82, 138, 209
Trip to Europe, ques. 541. *See also* Postmaster General

Board of Commerce, 198, 229, ques. 408, ques. 592, ques. 1740, 1947
Canners, inquiry concerning, 1045
Chairman, Judge Robson, resignation of, 11, 73, 114, 120, 3769, 3863
Correspondence tabled, 85, 4258, 4502-03
M. for papers, 1900
Civil Service Commission, and, 3426
Dairy and pork industry and, 605, 611, 1009, 1017, 1844
Farmers and, 3401
McNichol, Mr. J. L., 994
M. (Mr. Deslauriers) for abolition, 1139
M. for papers, 2015
Murdock, Mr., resignation of, 4170-71, 4466
Letter, text of, 4481
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., resignation of, 1684, 3685
Prosecutions, ques. 996
Report, ques. 2012
Inquiry as to, 3227, 3426, 3427
Presented, 3358
Resignation of members, 4258-59
Robson, Judge. *See title under this,* Chairman
Validity of Act constituting, 3685
Wholesale grocers, dismissal of Mr. Arthur S. Porter, 568

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission.

Board of Translators. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. (French Version)

Boards of Trade Act Amdt Bill. 1r., 2r., 4414; com., 3r., 4460

Boivin, Mr. George Henry (Shefford). *See* Deputy Speaker

Bolshevism, 1495, 3649. *See also* Criminal Code; Immigration; Industrial Unrest.

Bonaventure
Experimental Farms, ques. 414
Pensioners, ques. 993
Postmasters, ques. 507
Public Works engineer, ques. 411
Wharves, ques. 411

Bonaventure and Gaspe
Dairy products and fish, ques. 587

Bonds. *See also* Finance; Loans; Victory Loans
Canadian Government, since beginning of war, ques. 2008

Bonus. *See* Civil Service

Book-making. *See* Criminal Code

Books
Banned, Regina library, 396
Customs duties, 3110
German and Austrian imports, ques. 806

Boots. *See also* Special War Revenue
And shoes, army, ques. 506, ques. 1229
And shoes, prices, 3329-30

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister)
Allies conference at Ostend, 2476, 2574
Bankruptcy Bill, 4097
Bill disposed of—question not to be raised during same session, 3426
Board of Commerce
Correspondence, 3426
Murdock, Mr., resignation of, 4171
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., resignation of, 3685
Report, 3227
Resignation of members, 4258-9
Robson, Judge, Chairman
Correspondence, 3769, 4258, 4502-3,
Budget debate, not limited by amdt., 2518
Budget Speech, inquiry for copies, 2626
Canadian Wheat Board, 3561
Civil Service
Grievances—appeal, 3141-2
Holidays, 4061-2, 4259-62
Senate amdts to Bill, 4259
Coal Operations Director Bill, jurisdiction, 3692
Orders in Council, ratification of, 3362-5

Borden, Right hon. Sir Robert—*Con.*
Coal problem. M. for supply to discuss, 3685-8, 3692
Customs Act (Export regulations) 3620-2, 3690, 3768
Customs and Post Office Departments
Rumoured investigation, 3623, 3941
DeCelles, Mr. A. D., 2968
Departments of Government, reductions of, 4456
Electricity and gas, taxation of, 3106
Fisheries treaties with United States, 3161
French treaty, 4505
Fuel Supply—Special powers for Railway Commission, 4506, 4324-31
United States, attitude of, 4329
See also under this title, Coal
Gauthier, Mr.—complaint of treatment by civil servant, 4097
Grand Trunk Railway Acquisition—Arbitrators, 3490, 3860-1
Health of, absence from Parliament, 9, 18, 31, 38, 49, 51, 114, 199
House of Commons. *See also under this title,* Indemnity
Adjournments
Empire day, 2574-5, 2625-6
King's Birthday, 3080
Business of the House, 3106, 3957
Honour of—statement by Rev. Dr. Speer, 3490, 3558
Members, attendance of, 4457-9
Saturday and morning sittings, preparedness of Government's legislation, attendance of Ministers, 2778-84, 3684
Two o'clock sittings, 3080
Immigration Act, Amdt of, 3426
Indemnity of Members, 3228, 4076
Illness, 4458
Increase proposed, 4379-80
Round robin, alleged, 2967
Indemnity of Members and Salaries of Ministers
General statement on moving 2r. of Bill, 4427-31
In reply, 4454-6
In Com. on Bill, 4456-9
Inquiries for returns, 3226, 3769, 4258
International Joint Commission, 3986
International Labour Conference, 3359
Judges' Salaries and Pensions, 4425-6
Lachine Canal, 3424
League of Nations—Ames, Sir Herbert, return of, 3623
Militia Pension Bill, 3959
Munitions Resources Commission, 2892
Naval Service
Additional appropriation $1,700,000, 4385
Correspondence with Imperial Gov,. 4503

Borden, Right hon. Sir Robert—*Con.*
News Service, 4532-3
Newsprint, 2893, 3227
Parliament, two sessions in one year, 4457
Pecuniary Claims Convention, 3857
Pensions Bill, 3959
Widowed mother, dependent parent, 4050-3
Pensions and Re-establishment
Com. recommendations, special facilities for legislation provided, 3957
M. (Mr. Cronyn) to adopt Com. report, 3954
Fisheries and returned men amdt. (Mr. Peck) 3955
Further legislation, 4504
Post Office and Customs Department
Rumoured investigation by United States firm, 3623, 3491
Prime Minister and portfolio, 4456
Printing Com. report, 4503
Private Bills, special facilities, 3957
Race track betting, 3433
Return of to the House, 2315-16
Salaries Act and House of Commons Act Amdt. (Indemnity and Salaries) 4380
Ships from British Admiralty, correspondence, 4413
Speaker's Chair, 3224-5
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. 3321-2
Speer, Rev. Dr., statement by, 3090, 3558
State Insurance for returned soldiers, 3958
Supplementary Estimates, inquiry as to, 3769
Theriault and St. Quentin, N.B.. 3080
War Memorial, 3228
Washington, Canadian representative at, 2451-4, 4538-43
Correspondence, 3081
West Indies Conference, 3161

Border Chamber of Commerce
Vessel rates—resolution, 1733

Boucher, Mr. Philippe, ques. 2413

Boundary Waters, pollution of, 3552

Bounties Act Administration, 1877

Bourassa, Mr. Joseph B. (Lévis)
Boucher, Mr. Philippe, ques. 2413
Chaudière station, ques. 508
Lévis drill hall caretaker, ques. 1360
Printing Bureau employees, ques. 2005
Quebec harbour steam dredge, ques. 999
St. Romuald postmaster, ques. 2005

Boyce, Mr. George (Carleton)
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3405
Eight-hour day, 376

Boyce, Mr. George—*Con*
Franchise Bill
Debate on, 1837-8
Proclamation, language of publication, 2303-4
Oleomargarine, 608, 1870-1
Rural mail, 4525

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil-Soulanges)
Lighthouse keepers, ques. 1897
Ste. Anne bridge, 3774-5
Ste. Anne de Bellevue hospital, ques. 1115
Soulanges canal road, ques. 999

Boys, Mr. William A. (South Simcoe)
Food and Drugs Bill, 972-8
Grand Trunk strike and pensions, 1130-6
Icebreakers, 2107
Indian Act Amdt. Bill—enfranchisement, 4029-35, 4176

Bran. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Brant Military Hospital, ques. 2519

Bridges, provincial and Dominion authorities, and, 3769

Brien, Mr. John Wesley (South Essex)
Opium and Drug Bill, 1643

Bristol, Mr. Edmund (Toronto Centre)
Shipbuilding, 628
Steel and shiping merger, 1948
Vessel rates, proposed regulation, 1718

British Columbia
Lighthouse service, 1616
Railways. *See* Railway Act Amdt.
Water Powers, ques. 1118

British Columbia Indian Lands Bill, 1r. 386; 2r., com., 787, 950, 3r., 1047, 1152

British Empire Steel Corporation, ques. 2777, 4010. *See also* Steel Industry

British North America Act Amdt. 4379
Aerial navigation, 4169
Motion for papers, 811
Power to amend, 464, 479

British Parliament and Speaker's Chair, 3224

British Preference, ques. 811

Brouillard, Mr. Joseph O. (Drummond and Arthabaska)
Burke, Rev. A. E., ques. 2079
Civil Service Classification, ques. 2181
Parliament Buildings
Commons Chamber floor, ques. 2894

Brouillard, Mr. Joseph O.—*Con.*
Parliament Buildings—*Con.*
Cost of heating plant, ques. 2896
Scaffolding, ques. 3079
Tower, ques. 2894
Roy, Mr. Gustave, ques. 1899
Victoriaville-Arthabaska branch line, ques. 4502

Buchanan, Mr. William A. (Lethbridge)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 121. Proposed general election and western representation, 121; personal attitude and Union Government—public unrest, freedom the cure, 122; profiteering—tariff—income tax, 123; national railways—Peace Treaty, 124
Budget, 2762. Tributes to Mr. Rinfret and Minister of Finance—paying war expenses by taxation, 2763; economy—tariff and cost of living, 2765; tariff and development of resources—favours tariff reduction—trade with trans-pacific countries, 2765
Coal Operations Director Bill, 3373-5
Farm labour for spring work, ques. 800
Flour mills, small, ques. 799
Franchise Bill, 1588
Income and business profits taxes, ques. 806
Industrial disputes, 1979
Industrial Survey by Mr. Ponton, ques. 341
Irrigation, 3695-9
Natural resources development, 1032
Newspaper postage rate, 3353
One Big Union, ques. 409
Pensions and Re-establishment, 536
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 395
Rural mail route, 506
Seed Grain advances, ques. 321, ques. 674
Soldiers' settlement, 3223

Buckwheat. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Budget. *See also* Ways and Means
Debate on, 2495, 2520, 2575, 2626, 2670, 2723, 2786, 2843, 2896, 2969
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) neg., resolution agreed to, 3077-8
Arrangements for, and announcement, 2247, 2318, 2576, 2840, 3026, 3045
Date of, inquiry, 1047, 2126, 2247, 2778
Speech, 2476
Announcement as to date of, 2247
Inquiry for copies, 2626

Budget Resolutions, 2492. *See also* Ways and Means

Buffalo, Wainwright herd, 3283

Bulgaria. *See also* Peace Treaty; Peace Treaty Bill
Peace Treaty, 9, ques. 316, 463
Resolution and statement by Minister, 346; concurrence of Senate in, 1054

Buoys. *See* Marine

Burbidge-Messines, ques. 2721

Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
Admiralty Act Amdt. 3086
Apple barrels—Nova Scotia, 2018
Bankruptcy Bill, reprinting, 3265
Bills—Com.—reading of section by Chairman, 584
British Columbia Indians, 788-95
Business Profits Tax, public utilities, 3232-5
Cabinet changes, 447
Canadian National Railways
Construction and organization, ques. 510
Damage claims, delays, 886-7
Deficit, 886
Operation, suggested improvements, 888
Canadian Northern Railway
Port Arthur terminals, ques. 2012
Capital punishment, 308
Civil Service
Classification—Arthur Young Co. 549
Holidays, 4262
Insurance, 1779
Naturalized British subjects, 510
Retirement, 3826-9, 4460
Coal Operations Director Bill, 3371
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3163
Criminal Code Amdt. (French version) 3082-5
Dominion arsenals, 3717, 3721-2
Eight-hour day, 452-8
Electricity and gas competition and taxation, 3106, 3110, 3113-7
Enterprise Foundry Company, ques. 2415
Export regulations, 3621
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 2000-1, 3874
Aliens, certificate, 2078, 2082, 2217
Canada Temperance Act 3865-6
Debate arrangements for, 1838, 2001
Disqualification of voters
Charitable aid, those receiving, 1814-9
"Election papers," 2023
Indians, 2055-6
Interpretation, 1986-8, 1989-91, 1994
Notices, 777
Oaths, administration of, 779
Proclamation, language of publication, 1829-31, 2273-7, 2281-2, 2291, 2305-6, 2308

Bureau, Mr. Jacques—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Returning officers, 1577-84, 1591-3
Public officials, 1790
Voters' lists,
Copies, procuring of, 2320
Provincial, adoption of, 2347, 2357-66, 3895
Franking privilege, 3763
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1491-3, 1505
Habeas Corpus. *See under this title,* Labrie
Honey adulteration, 2315
House of Commons. *See also under this title,* Indemnity
King's Birthday adjournment, 3080
Lobbies, admission of strangers to, 1629
Saturday and morning sittings, 2783
Serjeant-at-arms department, 3094
Staff, classification, 4504, 4563-4
Two o'clock sittings, 3080
Housing expenditure, 3545-8
Icebreakers, 1598
Ile Verte, 2111
Income tax
Absentees, 3303
Indemnity of members, 3242-3
Part payment with return, 3253
Residence or investment outside Canada, 3250
Indemnity of members, 3096, 3853, 4073, 4450
Income tax and, 3242-3
Indian Affairs Dept., 3266-7
Indians
Destitute, relief for, 3275-6
Education of, 3278
Inspection and Sale Act Amdt.—Fruit, 2018
Penalties, 2019-21
Sections repealed, 2016
Judges' salaries, 3851-3
Labrie Brothers, case of, 3296, 3847-50, 3560
League of Nations, 349
Loan Companies Act Amdt., 1776-8
Maple products, 796
Naval Service Dept.
Estimates—agreement as to debate—misunderstanding — compromise suggested, 4412
Opium and Drug Bill, 1621-2, 1630-3, 1636-8, 1703
Parliament Buildings construction, 1419-33
Parliamentary restaurant, 3095-6
Official list, 2842-3
Parliamentary translators, 3093
Petroleum and Naphtha Act Amdt. 1762

Bureau, Mr. Jacques—*Con.*
Pictou harbour, 2188-9, 3491
Purchasing Commission, 1478, 4583
Questions, inquiry as to, 2126
Questions passed as orders for returns, 1743
Race track betting, 3431-2
Railway Act Amdt. (Jurisdiction), 2413
Registered postal rate, 3732-3
Ross Rifle factory, ques. 1898; ques. 2721, 3722
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3204, 4575
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3989, 4003
Soldier Settlement, 1685, 1702
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. 3337-8
Acetylene gas, 3796
Automobiles, 3597-9, 3793
Bank overdrafts, 3624, 3797-9
"Consumer" how defined, 3794
Debate on Bill, arrangements for, 3455
Refunds, 3629-31
Sales taxes, 3616
Sporting goods, 3571-2
Stamp taxes, 3627
Speer, Rev. Dr., statement by, 3491, 3558
Steamboat Inspection, 1762-3
Stigma on members—personal denial, 547
Supply, interim vote, 754-5
Supreme Court Act Amdt. 2004
Technical education, 1761
Toronto letter carriers, 3424-25
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 585
Yukon Placer Mining Act, 3106-8

Bureau of Statistics, *See* Statistics

Burke, Rev. A. E., ques., 2079

Burlington, Military Hospital, ques. 2519

Burnham, Mr. John Hampden (West Peterborough)
Adress in reply to Governor General's Speech, 66. Quebec and its "hour"—feeling developed by the war, 67; treatment of returned soldiers—cost of living, 68; farmers and class movement—exchange rate and trade—industrial alcohol, the new motive power, 70; individual liberty—prohibition—drop race and party cries, 71
Agriculture, problems of, 2400
Alien immigrants, 826
Budget, 2611. War policy and peace policy—Liberal party and Farmers' party, 2611; land taxation and security of employment—unrest and how to be quieted, 2612; group government—soldiers and their dependents—the profit system of trade, 2613; the People's party, 2614

Burnham, Mr. John Hampden—*Con.*
Business profits tax—public utilities, 3235
Campaign Funds, 1182,
Res. prohibiting, 1216, 1224; withdrawn 1228;
Civil Service
Classification, 546
Reduction of pay, 3135-8
Retirement, 3830
Superannuation, ques. 920
Coal operations director, 3178, 3372
Currie, General Sir Arthur, 3652
Demonstration farms, 2391
Eight-hour day, 334-7 454-8
Contractual rights, 373-81
Farm labour, 1220
Farmers' organization, 1219
Farmers' Party and the Dept. of Agriculture estimates, 2399-2400
Federal Bureau of Education, 1389-90
Franchise Bill
Advance and proxy voting, 1162
Aliens, 733, 2211
Contributions, 1182
Disqualification of candidates, 1089
Enumerators, 3900
Notices, 778
Proceeding by information, 776
Proclamation—language of publication, 2286-7
Provincial lists, 3888, 3897
Recall, the, 2040
Fuel situation, 3178
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1487
Strike of 1910, 1540, 1565
Honour of members—point of order, 1186
Income tax
Charities, 3245-6
Exemptions on account of children, 3300
Indemnity of members, 4069-81
Indians—enfranchisement, 4033
Industrial disputes, 2250
Labour—life not arithmetic, basis of reward, 389
League of Nations
Canada's status, 349, 353
Enforcement of decisions, 3975
Militia—cadet service, 3705
Naval service, 3516
Badges, 446
Old-age pensions, 3830
Oleomargarine, 608
Parliament Buildings, 1420
Peterborough, Gov employees in, ques. 542
Postmaster, ques. 342
Prices of fuel and other necessaries; res. to fix time for full discussion, 321, 333
Prohibition, 1218, 1228

Burnham, Mr. John Hampden—*Con.*
Race track betting, 3427
Returned soldiers, provision for; m. for special Com., 514
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 389
Shipbuilding, 639
Special War Revenue Act Amdt Bill, 3326
Proprietary medicines, 3794
Trent Canal wharves, ques. 586
Wheat, new variety, 1013
Y. M. C. A., 1219

Burns, P. Company, 582

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue)
Address in Reply to Governor General's Speech, 273. Parliament Building—congratulations to mover and seconder, 273; Addresses of Mr. Mackenzie King and Mr. Murphy, 274; absence of Ministers from the House; Mr. Mackenzie King's record—Soldiers' Settlement, 275; Farmers' party—proposed general election, 276; protection and wheat growers, 277; tariff free list, 278; England and tariff, 279; representation of the West, 281
Civil Service, reorganization, 3738-9
Conner, James, dismissal of, 418, 421
Customs Act Amdt Bill (Firearms) 617, 1048
Customs and Excise
Collections, 3859
Estimates, 3858-9
Entomology branch, 2402
French treaty, 4505
Hewitt, the late Dr. Gordon, 2402
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. 3494-8, 3815-21, 4263
Acetic acid, 3497
Alcohol tax, 3496
Methylated spirits, 3497
Resolutions, 3494
Spirits, 3815-8
Evaporation, 3815
Illicit distillation, 3817
Illicit sales, 3498
Malt used to make vinegar, 3818
Warehoused two years, 3816
Wood alcohol, 3820
Tobacco, 3498, 3815, 3818-9
Mines Department—explosives, 3804
Peat, 3807-8
Petroleum and Naphtha Act Amdt. 1762, 1916
Post Office Act Amdt. 3347-58, 4263
Franking, 3356-8
Free matter, 3761-8

Burrell, Hon. Martin—*Con.*
Post Office Act Amdt.—*Con.*
Newspaper postage, 3347-56, 3753, 3757-61
Zone system, 3351
Postage stamps for inland revenue, 3737
Registration fee, 3347, 3732-44
Express companies and, 3744
Statutes, proposed revision, 3821

Business Profits Tax 2489. *See also* Budget; Revenue Bills; Taxation

Business Profits War Tax Act amdt Bill, res., 3111; 1r., 3117; 2r., com., 3229; 3r., 3237

Butter.. *See* Dairy; Oleomargarine
Cold storage, in, ques. 543, ques. 807
Oleomargarine and, food values, ques. 2720

Buttons, Soldiers', unauthorized wearing of, 4020

Butts, Mr. Robert H. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Franchise Bill
Contributions, 1197
Conveyances, 787
Provincial voters' lists, 2326-31
Hudson Bay Railway, 4243
Indemnity of members, 4089
Inverness coal, 4241
Masters and mates, 575
Newfoundland, 4242
Trade, and the Sydneys, 876
Prohibition, 102
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3198-9
Shipbuilding, 646
Iron industry and, 900

By-Elections.. *See* House of Commons

Cabana, Mr., K.C., 3227

Cabinet Organization and Representation, 32, 40-1, 138
Blondin, Hon, Mr., 57. *See also that title.*
Changes, 447
New Brunswick, 110

Cadet Corps. *See* Militia

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Appeal from ruling of Chair, 1071; withdrawn, 1072
Auditor General's report, 2179
Bonds, tax exempt, 3338-9
British Columbia Indians, 950-4
Canada Grain Act, 3823
Canadian National Railways; deficit and rates — construction — colonization — townsites — Mackenzie and Mann — contracts for management—equipment —finance—insurance of property, 4181-94

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Coal purchases, 2380, 4251
Deficit, maintenance, 890-1
Estimates, discussion of, 4249, 4257
Extensions, 3380-1
Information, withholding of objected to, 1655, 1669
Insurance, 4257
Ties, 4250-1
Car shortage, 883, 886
Transcontinental, ques. 999
Civil Service, 3140, 3146-7
Bonus, slide masters, 1279.
Holidays, 4061
Colonization, 2399, 4182
Dredging, 1619
Excise tax (10 per cent) 3467
Filing cases, 3155
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1935-43
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 1071-2
Election expenses, 1932-3
Qualification of electors, 2243
Government annuities, 462-3
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition Bill, 1308, 1486, 1503
Arbitrators, 1047
Branch lines, 1314-7
Hanna, Mr. D. B., suit for libel, 2379
Housing, 3545-52
Soldiers, and, 3545-6
Indians
Enfranchisement, 4038-9
Lands, 3274
Kapuskasing and Spirit Lake, 2398-2401
Militia, 3974-80
Oleomargarine, 959
Ottawa River conservation, 3779
Peat, ques. 671
Penitentiaries, purchasing agent, 3840
Post Office Department, 3740-1
Question—complaint of unsatisfactory answer, 1047
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3203
Royal Military College, 3153
Scottish Canadian Insurance Corporation, 584
Shipbuilding, 645, 3992, 4004, 4010-16
Special War Revenue Act Amdt.
Changes, when effective, 3338
Clothes, made to order, 4290
Statistical department, 3296
Steel and shipping merger, 1956-7, 4010
Timiskaming Lake, wharves, 2187-8, 3493
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 585
Yukon Placer Mining, 3109

Calder, Hon. James A. (Minister of Immigration and Colonization)
Canadian National Railways and Canadian Government Merchant Marine—withholding of information justified, 1671-4, 1683
Civil Service Retirement, 2178-9, 3824-40, 4062-8, 4460-6
Grievances and appeal, 4460
Conner, Mr. James, 419
Distressed Canadians abroad, 4559
Exhibition Commissioner, 4558-9
Franchise Bill
Advance Polls, 1938-40
Ballot boxes, expense of returning, 1927
Provincial lists, 3889
Voters' lists, 2423, 2434-7
Voting notwithstanding disqualification, 1825
Immigrants, landing of at Montreal and Quebec, 3226-8
Immigration and Colonization Department, 4556-9
Imperial ex-Service men coming to Canada, 387
Income tax—charities, 3248
Mennonites, 2179, 2248
Militia, permanent force, 3210
Pensions Bill
Approved by Com. 4041
Canadian in French forces as reservist, 4048
Pensioner resident outside of Canada, 4045-6
Returned soldiers' insurance, 4054-6
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4012
Soldiers' dependents in Britain, 4556

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 118. Union Government, 118; Production and Protection, 119; Farmers and Customs tariff—Board of Commerce, 120; Victoria and Carleton by-election, 121;
Budget, 2823. Ford car prices, 2823; Mr. Meighen on the tariff—the farmers' tariff policy, 2826; Mr. Fielding's amendment, 2827; the new taxes—export duty on newsprint, 2827; United States' manufacturers and Canadian prices, 2828; agricultural implements, prices, 2829; direct taxation, 2830; Victory bonds, 2831; St. John and Quebec Railway, 2832; new party, its name and policy, 2834; potato growing, 2835; farmers and prices, 2837

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W.—*Con*
Campaign funds, 1222
Canadian National Railways
Damage claims, 4230
Demurrage—"bunched" cars, 4229-30
Maine Central connection, 3376
Rates, 1445
Westfield Beach, ques, 508, 4230
Canadian Pacific Railway, taxation, ques. 1360
Carleton and Victoria election, 121, 1223
Farm labour, 1220
Ford car, 119, 2823
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1933-5
Ballot and counterfoil, 1105
Election expenses, 1931
Election papers, 1928
Indians, 2055
Hours to be open, 1920-3
Residence, 1159
Voters' lists—delay, 3903
Grand Trunk Acquisition Bill, 1305, 1445, Stock, ques. 590, 753, ques. 1362
House of Commons, discussions, difficulty in hearing, 4055
Pensions and Re-establishment, 434, 3942, 4049
Potatoes exported, ques. 1360
Returned soldiers, 515
Pensions, 516
University students, 519
St. John and Quebec Railway, ques. 1036
Soldier settlement, 516, 2136-7, 2150, 3218
Special War Revenue—boots, 3563-5, 3585

Campaign Funds. *See also* Dominion Franchise Bill, contributions
Res. (Mr. Burnham) to prohibit, 1182

Campbell, Mr. J. A. (Nelson)
Budget, 3045. Direct taxes approved—luxury taxes, fees, 3045; canoes—difficulty of collecting tax—tariff, 3046; tariff situation in England—trade policy for Canada, 3047; farming not to be handicapped, 3048; mining machinery should be free of duty—Prairie provinces and their natural resources, 3049
Canadian motor car plants, ques. 1201
Canadian National Railways
Townsites—equipment, 4191
Western branch lines, 4232
Canoes, tax on, 3588
Economic Development Commission, ques. 1896
Franchise Bill—telegraph, communications by, 1068

Campbell, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Hudson Bay Railway, ques. 806, 4231-3
Completion, Res. in favour of, 2014
Natural resources prairie provinces, ques. 995, 1047, ques. 1461
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3195-6
Special War Revenue—furs, 3792
Trent Canal, ques. 1359
Welland canal, ques. 1358

Campbellton-Cross Point, ques. 411, ques. 1789, ques. 2415
Bridge and ferry, ques. 342, ques. 3490
Steamer service, ques. 588

Canada and United States. *See* that title under League of Nations; Washington, Canadian representative,

Canada Gazette, ques. 2179

Canada Grain Act Amdt Bill, Res. 3684, 3822; 1r., 3824; 2r., com., 3r., 4459

Canada Highways Act, ques. 1119
Ontario, 1046
Operation of, ques. 802
Payments under, ques. 806

Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bills:
1. Masters and Mates. Res., 406; 562; 569; 1r., 576; 2r., com., 979; 3r., 1047
2. Pilotage. Res. 1405, 1839; 1r., 1839; 2r., com., 1967; 3r., 1968
3. Sick and Distressed Mariners. Res., 1628, 2251; 2260; 1r., 2267; 2r., 3099; com., 3103; 3r., 3105, Sen. amdts. 4056
4. Steamboat Inspection. Res. 855, 1050; 1r., 1052; 2r., com., 1762; 3r., 1776

Canada Steamships, Limited. *See* Debate on Railway Act Amdt
Hanna, Mr. D. B. and, 1742, 1789

Canada Temperance Act, ques. 807. *See also that title under* Dominion Franchise
Expenses under, 4559

Canada Year Book, 1879

Canada's National Status, 91, 156, 465. *See also* League of Nations; Peace; Washington, Canadian Representative at
Empire, and, 359

Canadian Council of Agriculture. *See also* Farmers.
Platform, 125, 2954
Recall, 2052
Tariff, 2907
Vessel rates, resolution, 1717

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See* Soldiers; War

Canadian Explosives Company, 2247-8

Canadian Forestry Association, 3285

Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 622, ques. 921, ques. 921, ques. 996. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Shipbuilding; Vessels.
- Annual report, 2311
- Answers to questions, 1649
- Business statement 903, ques. 921, 950, 1650, 1677, 1681
- Captains, ques. 1624
- Civil Service Insurance—Naval Service, and, 1779-80
- Coal, ques. 1115, ques. 1623
- Crews, 641
- Earnings, ques., 1359. *See, under this title,* Business
- Freight rates, ques. 2009
- Inland navigation and, ques., 2572
- Insurance on vessels, ques. 1511, ques. 2011
- Loading and unloading, ques. 1623
- Operation, 641-5
  - Freights, 646
- Shareholders, directors, investment, ques. 2011
- Vessels
  - "Canadian Inventor," 3226, 3359
  - "Canadian Recruit," 648, ques. 1199
  - "Canadian Sealer," 649
- Withholding of information debated, 1649

Canadian Government Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Manufacturers' Association
- Appeal to Supreme Court, M. (Mr. Devlin) for papers, 321
- Vessel rates, communication on, 1728

Canadian Mission in London, ques. 410

Canadian National Railways. *See also* Grand Trunk; Canadian Northern
- Brudenheim branch, 4250
- Canadian currency and United States lines, ques. 341
- Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See* that title.
- "Canadian Government Railways," defined, 4219
- Canadian National Railway Company, 345
- Car haulage cost, ques. 2313, ques. 2413
- Car shortage—Transcontinental—ques. 999
- Cars, 4184
- Chaudiere station, ques. 508
- Coal purchases, 2380
  - Contracts—details, 4251-6

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
- Colonization, 4182, 4197
- Community centres, 4198
- Construction betterments, 4181-2
- Construction and organization, ques. 510
- Damage claims, delays, 887
- Deficits, 4181, 4201, 4203
- Demurrage, "bunched" cars, 4229
- Duplication, 4196
- Earnings, 4185
- Eastern branch lines, 4247. *See also that title under* Reid, Hon. J. D.
- Electric systems, ques. 1510
- Engine repairs, ques. 3079
- Equipment, 4185, 4191
  - District east of Edmonton, 4250
- Express companies and, ques. 801
- Finance, 4186
- Fire insurance, ques. 1623
- Grand Trunk Railway, 11, 37, 92, 866, 4579,
  - Montreal, improved entrance, ques. 413
- Hudson Bay Railway, 4231. *See also that title.*
- Incorporation, ques. 2012
- Information, withholding of, debated, 1649, 4195
- Insurance, 4257
- Intercolonial Railway
  - Moncton office, 4206, 4220, 4248
  - Pensions, ques. 313, ques. 509, ques. 589
  - Rivière Ouelle service, ques. 997-8
- Inverness Railway, 4236-49
- Mackenzie, Sir William and, ques. 1628
- Mackenzie and Mann, 4184, 4191
- Management and directorate, 4183, 4189, 4190, 4194
- Ministerial statement by Hon. J. D. Reid 859. Passengers and freight, 860; operating costs, 861; labour conditions, 861; betterments, 861; construction programme, 1920, 863; rolling stock, 863; rates, 864; Grand Trunk, 866; Hudson Bay Railway, 867; Operating costs—details, 867-9
- National Transcontinental, 4199
  - Car shortage, ques. 999
  - Champlain market site, motion, 2015
  - Rentals, ques. 1461
- Official and private cars, ques. 409, 4220, 4247
- Operation—goods imported from United States, ques. 998
- Orangedale-Cheticamp, 4263
- Political patronage, 4194, 4221
- Prince Edward Island Railway, 891, 4210, 4245

Canadian National Railways—Con.
Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic, consideration of acquirement of, ques. 507
Rates, 4181, 4187, 4203, 4207
Riviere du Loup workshops, ques. 315
Roadbed, 124
Service, 100
Standard time, ques. 588
Steamships and, 897, 904, 915
Claimed to be necessary, 653, 658. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Ties—list of contracts, 4250-1
Toronto Eastern, ques. 1004
Townsites and subsidiaries, 4183, 4191. *See also* Cahill, Mr. F. S.; Hanna, Mr. D. B.
Victoria—Arthabaska, ques. 4502
Western branch lines, 4231. *See also that title under* Reid, Hon. J. D., Canadian National
List of, 4232
Westfield Beach, ques. 508, 4230
Westmount-St. Henri gatekeepers, ques. 998

Canadian National Railways Bill. 1r. 2842; 2r., 3085; com. 3375-9; 3r., 3395

Canadian News Service at Washington or New York, ques. 414

Canadian Northern Railway Company
Bonds guaranteed by province of Alberta, ques. 2180
Liabilities, ques. 2011
Neuville station, ques. 2721
North Bay, right of way through, ques. 3619
Port Arthur terminals, ques. 2012
Private cars
Mackenzie, Sir William, ques. 2572
Mann, Sir Donald, ques. 2183
Quebec lands, ques. 1626, ques. 2008
Report, 2311
Securities, ques. 2006
Toronto Eastern; Toronto Suburban, ques. 2080

Canadian Northern Town Properties Company, 2379

Canadian Pacific Railway Company
Burbidge-Messines station, ques. 2721
Freight tariffs, ques. 2010
Taxation
Business profits, ques. 1360
Special taxes, ques. 1360

Canadian Press Limited, 4532

Canadian Railway War Board, ques. 508

Canadian Reconstruction Association, 178, 677

Canadian Representative at Washington. *See* Washington

Canadian Wheat Board, 156, ques. 799, ques. 801, ques. 2182, 3402. *See also* Commercial Feeding Stuffs, Winnipeg Grain Exchange; Wheat; Canada Grain Act.
Continuation of, ques. 3294
Protest against reappointment of, 3561
Young, Mr. F., ques. 2313

Canadian Wheat Board Bill. Res. 3863, 4098, 4323; 1r., 4136; 2r., 4341; com., 4343; 3r., 4358
Cars, 4357
Imports and exports, control of, 4352
Losses, possible, 4325
Mill feeds, 4343, 4353. *See also* Commercial Feeding
Oats and barley, 4357
Personnel of Board, 4343

Canadianizing Foreigners. *See* Alien Immigrants.

Canadians in Imperial Service, 857

Canals
Lachine, 3423, 3561
Highway, 3778
Trent, ques. 1359
Welland
Highway, ques. 1200
Work on, ques. 1358

Canners. *See* Board of Commerce

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Appeal from ruling of the Chair, 3664
Canadian Aviation Corps, ques. 1359
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, ques. 921; ques. 921
Loading and unloading, ques. 1623
Civil Service
Bonus, 1284,
Holidays, 4057-8
House of Commons staff, 1042
Retirement, 4063-5
Senate staff, 4058
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. (U.S. Soldiers) 1233
Education, two languages, 287
Food and Drugs Bill, 1257-9, 1266-8
Franchise Bill, 773
Aliens—certificate, 2070, 2083-90, 2232-4
Bribery, etc., 1156-7
Canada Temperance Act, 2053
Contributions, 781-2

Cannon, Mr. Lucien—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Disqualification
Charitable aid, those receiving, 1816-7
Criminals, 1820
Election officers, 1075-8
False statement, made to affect election, 1067
Indians, 2055-6, 2087-8
Misfeasance, etc.—penalty, 1074-5
Non-electors and non-residents, 784
Point of order—school system, 2283
Proclamation, language of publication, 2287-9, 2306
Returning officers, disqualification of, 1073-4
Public officials, 1795-8, 1804-6
Telegraph, communications by, 1068
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1238, 1244-5, 1250-3, 1493-1500, 1505
Strike of 1910, 1549
Hurons of Lorette, 1152, 2014
Indemnity of members, 4080
Indian Reserves, ques. 802
Industrial Disputes Bill—objection to 3r., 2200
Intercolonial, Rivière Ouelle Service, ques. 597
International boundary surveys, 3294
Levis drill hall, 3727
Maple products—"sucre de fresne," 1255
Militia
Active militia, allowances, 3663-7
Annual drill, 3678-82
Natural resources of western provinces, 3293
Parliament Buildings—French reporters' room, 1425-9
Peace treaties and League of Nations, 347-66
Pictou harbour, 2186
Points of order
Franchise Bill, 2283
Militia estimates, 3667
Relevancy, Cockshutt, Mr., remarks of, 3672
Portland, shipments by, 653-5
Post Office Department, 3740
Purchasing Commission, 1474-5, 1484-5
Rural mail carriers, 1283-4
St. John river water-powers, 3291
San Remo Conference, 1465
Shipbuilding, 642
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4016-7
Supply, interim vote, understanding concerning, 754-6
War equipment—guns, 3662-4
Wharves, 2123

Canso, Marine Hospital proposed, 2255

Canteen. *See* War

Cape Race, 2117

Capilano Bridge, 3778

Capital and Labour. *See also* Popular Unrest; Labour.
Readjustment of relations, 373

Capital Punishment. *See* Criminal Code

Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, 4217

Cardin, Mr. P. J. A. (Richelieu)
SS. "Three Rivers," ques. 1897
Sorel Government shipyard, ques. 2180

Carleton-Victoria
Election, 1223
Visit of Ministers to, ques. 409

Car Shortage. *See* Railways

Carvell, Hon. F. B.
Letter from—loading out of Fort William elevators, 565

Carvill, Mr. George, ques. 586, 4219, 4224

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 71. Economy—anti-democratic policies, 72; prices, cost of living. Board of Commerce—production, 73; tariff—resignations from the Government, 74; proposed general election, 75; peace and work—the Liberal party, 76
Aliens in detention camps, ques. 314
Bankruptcy Bill, trustees, ques. 2414
Biggar, Mr. O. M., K.C., ques. 1462
Bilingual stamps, ques. 314
Board of Commerce, ques. 592, ques. 1740
Canners, 1045
Motion for papers, 2013-5
Price Brothers, 1789
Report, date of, ques. 2012
Budget, 2808. Grain Growers and Canadian manufacturers, 2809; the Government and Socialism—Liberal party's fiscal policy—new taxes, 2809; income tax—financial conditions, 2810; business profits tax—moving pictures—tariff, 2811; Board of Commerce, 2812; war profits—national unity, 2813
Business profits war tax, ques. 314, ques. 2012
Canadian National Railways, 877
Car haulage cost, ques. 2313
Canadian Northern, ques. 2413

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Incorporation, ques. 2012
Withholding of information, 1675
Canadian Northern Railway
Car haulage cost, ques. 2313, ques. 2413
Canadian Wheat Board, 4129
Carleton-Victoria, visit of ministers to, ques. 409
"Champlain," the, ques. 314, ques. 672, ques. 921, ques. 1121
Charlevoix-Montmorency
Bridges and highways, 3778
Customs officers, ques. 415, ques. 588
Lighthouse keepers, ques. 319
Pensioners, ques. 994, ques. 1358
Postmasters and mail carriers, ques. 320
Public works, ques. 590, ques. 592
Railway facilities and projects, 878
Wharf repairs, ques. 589
Criminal trials, correspondence, 2014
Franchise Bill, returning officers, 1591
French language, publications in, ques. 541
House of Commons calendar, 2005
French letters, replies in English to, 1045
French origin, Canadian of, ques. 1357
French speeches in House, translation of, 702
General election, cost of, ques. 587
Grand Trunk Railway Company, ques. 996
Lack of information complained of, 1450
Hydro-Electric, Ontario, 4172
Income tax
Earned and unearned incomes, 3309-10
Indemnity of members, 3310
Jellicoe, Lord, visit of, ques. 314
Labrie brothers, case of; also Mantezono, 3560
Lotbinière and Megantic Railway, ques. 590
Mackenzie, Sir William and Canadian National, ques. 1628, 2572
McNichol, Mr. J. L., ques. 994
Mann, Sir Donald, ques. 2183
Members' stenographers, salary of, ques. 2311
Montmorency public works, ques. 592
Naval Service, 4402
Ballantyne, Hon. Mr., reference to leader of Opposition, 4411
Newspapers, payments to, ques. 1114
Newsprint, ques. 994, ques. 588, ques. 589, ques. 2720
Export, ques. 1358, ques. 1114
Parliament Buildings, 1428-32
Parliamentary Secretaries, ques. 1036
Paroled prisoners, ques. 2005
Quebec and Saguenay Railway, ques. 506, ques. 672, ques. 1120

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F.—*Con.*
Quebec and Saguenay Railway—*Con.*
Freight rates, ques. 589
St. Irenée, 3423
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix, ques. 673
Rivière du Gouffre, ques. 1121
Russia, military expedition to, ques. 995
St. James by-election, 707
St. Joachim postmaster, ques. 1121
Ste. Anne de Beaupre wharf, ques. 506
Shipbuilding, 651
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill 3334
Tapley, W. H., and Baugh, E. L., 2015

Casselman, Mr. Orren D. (Dundas)
Budget, 2879. Repetitions in debate condemned—proposed general election, 2879; Government keeps its pre-election promises, 2880; Civil Service reform—mail carriers—Union Government and the farmers, 2881; Farmers' party platform, 2882; Opposition fiscal policy—tax on unimproved land—Union Government's successful policy and administration, 2883
Experimental farms, motion to adjourn debate, 1017

Cattle Embargo, ques. 340

Cattle Shippers and Government Vessels, 911

Caughnawaga, 3266

Censorship, 4556
Press, ques. 541
Regina library searched for banned books, 396

Census, the last, ques. 2009

Census and Election, 122

Cent Coin, ques. 2007

Central Vermont Railway, ques. 1035. *See also* Grand Trunk

Certificates of Service. *See* Canada Shipping Act (Masters and Mates)

Chabot, Mr. J. L. (Ottawa)
Mackenzie Avenue, Ottawa, ques. 999

Chair, Speaker's 3224-5

Chairman of Committees. *See* Deputy Speaker

Chambly Fort, 3769

Champlain Market Site, 2015

Champlain, Steamer. *See that title under* Vessels

Chaplin, Mr. James D. (Lincoln)
Budget, 2814. Messrs. W. C. Kennedy, McCoig and Pardee, and Canadian industries, 2814; Ford car prices, 2815; Farmers' platform, 2816; manufacturers and duties on animals, grain, coal, etc., 2817; boot and shoe industry—canning industry—"no trusts in free-trade England," 2818; present condition of British trade, 2819; iron and steel industry of Great Britain, 2820; United States and tinplate—"who pays the duty"? 2821; local conditions in Lincoln, 2822; freight rates as a form of protection, 2823
Food and Drugs Bill, 963
Income tax
Absentees, 3303
Shares of no par value, 3239
Newspaper postage, 3751-5
Welland canal employees, 3138-9

Charlevoix-Montmorency
Customs collections, ques. 588
Customs officers, ques. 415
Lighthouse keepers, ques. 319
Pensioners, ques. 994, ques. 1358
Postmasters and mail carriers, ques. 320
Public works, ques. 590, ques. 592
Wharf repairs, ques. 589

Chartered Banks. *See* Banks

Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Alien immigrants, 818
Departmental printing plants, ques. 1738

Cheese. *See* Dairy

Cheese Factories. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Cheques and Promissory Notes, taxes on, 2487

Cheticamp, life saving station, 2115

Chicoutimi, defaulters, ques. 409.

Child Labour, 368

Children and Income Tax, 2928, 3297

Chinese in Canada, ques. 805.

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W. (Inverness)
Buoy service, 2116
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Captains, ques. 1624
Withholding of information, 1653
Canadian National Railways, 4236
Orangedale-Cheticamp line, 4239
Canadian Wheat Board, ques. 801

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W.—*Con.*
Federal Emergency fund, ques. 998, ques. 1199
Grand Etang, 2114, 3779-80
Icebreakers, 1610
Illustration farms, 2390
Inverness railway, ques. 319, 4236
Lighthouses
Lighthouse Board, 2117-8
Lightkeepers' salaries, 2114
Margaree island, telephones, 2124
Marine department, 2121
Marine hospitals, 3554
Militia, headquarters staff, ques., 1511
Port Hood, 3159
Registration of shipping, 1614
Soldier Settlement, aid to fishermen, 1691
Wrecks, investigation, 1612

Chisholm, Col. H. A., ques. 3359

Chopped Feeds. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Choquette, Ex-Senator P. A., ques. 2572

Cimon, Mr., and Military Service Act, ques. 1461, ques. 1462

Cinematographic Films, tax on, ques. 3489. *See also* Moving pictures.

Civil Service. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdts. *For departments see their titles*
Additions to, 2642, 2675, 2941, 3005, 3145, 3408
Analysts and inspectors under Food and Drugs Act, 964
Appointments—soldiers serving in Bermuda, ques. 1461
Bonus, 1269, 3228
Cheques, preparation of, 1280, 1285
Lightkeepers, 2110
Regulations, 1274
Salaries and, ques. 2079, ques. 2311
Telegraph operators, 2182
Classification, ques. 84, ques. 505, 675, ques. 997, 1292, ques. 1624, 3769. *For classification of the several depts. see their titles*
Arthur Young Co. 592, ques. 1511
Effective from 1st April, 1919, 345, ques. 674
Experts and, ques. 2413
Inside service, 4019, 4172
Motions for papers:
Ethier, Mr., 592
Fripp, Mr., 544,
Secretary to executive, ques. 2181
Vote to pay increased salaries, 4546
Commission, ques. 997, 4563-7. For classification of the departments, see their

Civil Service—*Con.*
Commission—*Con.*
titles. *See also* debates under Board of Commerce
Appointments by, ques. 311, ques. 320
Board of Commerce, and, 3426
Board of hearing, 3424
Cole, Mr. W. B., ques. 2898
Dominion land surveyors, ques. 1115, ques. 2006
Health Department and, 3543
House of Commons officials and, 4504
Positions, manner of filling, ques. 2006-7
Promotions and, ques. 2007
Putman, Mr., ques. 2414
Returned soldiers, ques. 2006-7
Returning officers—suggested appointment of by, 1803, 1808-9
Staff, ques. 1121, ques. 2414
Unrest due to, 4060
Dismissals and appointments, ques. 320
Appeals in case of proposed. *See debates under* Civil Service Retirement.
Efficiency through reduction of, 2662
Grievances, 3141
Griffenhagen and associates, investigation by, 3861, ques. 4521
Holidays, 4056, 4259
Inside service, ques. 510
Insurance. *See* Civil Service Insurance Bill
Members of, with war record, 3129
Reform, 42
Reorganization, 3735, 3738-43, ques. 3861. *See also under this title,* Classification.
Retirement fund, rate of interest, 459
Returned soldiers and, 19
Suggested disqualification as election officers, 1075
Superannuation, 391-4, ques. 920, 4266. *See debates under* Civil Service Retirement; Judges' Act
Pensions, and, 391
Peterborough employees, ques. 542
Taxation of income. *See debates on* Ottawa Agreement Bill
Technical officers, how to retain, 692
Temporary employees, ques. 415

Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 1r., 1112; 2r., com., 3128; 3r., 3161. Senate amendments, 4056, 4259, 4416.

Civil Service Insurance Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 949; 1054; 1r., 1229; 2r., com., 1779; 3r., 1781

Civil Service Retirement. Bill. 1r., 2178-9; 2r., 3824; com. 3840; 4062; 4460; 3r., 4466
Appeal, 4460

Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act Amdt. Bill (Rate of interest); Res. 459; 1r., 460; 2r., com., 3r., 581

Clark, Mr. Hugh (Parliamentary Secretary for the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment)
Franchise Bill, advance polls, 3876
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3939

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 161. League of Nations—economy and prices, 161; the Farmers' party, 162; classes and politics, 163; debate on the Address and debate on the Budget, 164; protection, profiteering and wages—rate of exchange and trade, 165; inflation and extravagance, 166; direct taxation, 167; Assiniboia by-election, 168; proposed general election—census of 1920 and redistribution, 169; unrest and disquiet, 170; what did men fight for? 171
Bureaucracy, 405
Budget, 2670. Return to the House of Sir Robert Borden, 2670; Mr. Fielding's amdt., tariff revision and stability of tariff, 2671, 2681-2; export trade and exports of agricultural products, 2673; Great Britain and free trade 2673; increasing income or lower expenditure—advances unaccounted for 2674; numerous Civil Service appointments—shipping subsidies—the new taxes. 2675, "a new species in the fiscal zoological garden," 2677; limits to teaching practice of individual economy, 2678; new taxes increase cost of living—income tax 2679; New Zealand and income tax, 2681; Progressive party and free trade, 2682; "army of emancipation" 2683; luxury taxes, 2684-5
Coal Operations Director Bill, 3372-4
Daylight saving, 3449
Export trade, means to promote, 626
Federal Bureau of Education, 1393
Fiscal policy of the Government, 583
Franchise Bill, 748
Aliens—certificate, 2208, 2223
Recall, the, 2033-4, 2045, 2052
Returning officers, 1800-1, 1806
Government annuities, 405
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1437-43, 1448, 1453

Clark, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
House of Commons—acoustics and audibility of debates, 345, 1417, 2317, 2081-2, 3952
Housing programme, ques. 707
Income tax, 3120, 3124
Charities, 3312
Exemptions on account of children, 3300
Incomes over $100,000, ques. 3490
Indemnity of members and salaries of Ministers, 4435
Judges' salaries and pensions, 4425-6
McKenzie, Mr., and Liberal leadership, 898
Militia—active militia, allowances, 3666-7
Naval service, 4395-9
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4381, 4389-90
Oleomargarine, 1785-6, 1848-53, 1855
Parliament Buildings, 1417, 1422-4, 1433
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3952
Committee—resignation of Mr. Peck, 2081-2
Public finance, economy in, 628
Point of order—Franchise Bill, 2223
Political prisoners, 1790
Race track betting, 3428-9
Saturday and morning sittings, 2783
Shipbuilding, 625, 647
Government programme ended, 905
Government vs. private ownership, 905
Profiteering, 898, 901
Subsidies, 899
Soldier Settlement, 2138
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Amendment, "Sales taxes," 3318, 3321-4
Changes proposed by Finance Minister, 3434, 3438, 3443
Collection, machinery for, 3325-7
Methods of—refunds, 3334, 3434-51
Progress of—retailers not collecting, 3479-80
Debate of Bill, arrangements for, 3454-5
Drayton, Sir Henry, reply to, 3448
Edwards, Mr., reply to, 3438
New taxes not "excise," 3316-8, 3321-4
Permanency of taxes, 3479
Returned soldier, exemption of—amdt (Mr. Lemieux) 3448
Steel and Shipping merger, 1948-54

Clements, Mr. H. S. (Comox-Alberni)
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 3876
Recall, the, 2042
Skeena and Comox-Alberni, 3868
Voters' lists, 2434
Fraudulent naturalization papers, ques. 4096
Opium and Drug Bill, 1755

Clements Mr. H. S.—*Con.*
Soldier Settlement, aid to fishermen, 1692
Vessel rates—shortage of ships, 1717-8

Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. *See that title under* Dominion Franchise Bill

Coal. *See also* Director of Coal Operations. *See also* Industrial Disputes
Edmonton Board of Trade resolution, 322
Inverness railway and, 4236, 4241
Prices, 321
Purchases by Government Merchant Marine, ques. 1115, ques. 1623
Supply of—M. (Mr. Lemieux) to adjourn House to discuss, 3685
See also Railways, Car shortage

Coal Operations, Director of
Orders-in-Council, ratification of, 3360
Orders of laid on table, 3225

Coal Operations Director Bill; 1r., 3106; 2r., 3175; com., 3185; com., 3360; 3r., 3690

Coasting Vessels. *See* Railway Commission; Railway Act Amdt

Cocagne, N. B. 3159

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F. (Brantford)
Address in reply to Governor General's speech, 96. Parliament Buildings—Peace Treaty and League of Nations, 96; Christian Church and the Forward movement, 98; popular unrest; record of Union Government, 99; trade, Canadian National railways, 100; labour situation; farmers' movement, 101 prohibition, 102; Quebec and the trade question—general election, 100, 104
Budget, 2840. Congratulations to Minister of Finance, 2843; the new taxes, 2843; income tax—deficit on National Railways—West Indies, 2844; Mr. Devlin and outrages on negroes in United States, 2845; trade conditions, 2846; Canadian surplus, British deficit; Britian's national balance sheet; Canadian Merchant Marine—Mr. Fielding's policy when Minister of Finance, 2848; comments on other speeches, 2849; tariff—parable of the farmers—United Farmers' platform, 2851; protection for farm products, 2852; "implement of production," 2853, income tax defaulters, 2854; farmer candidates in Brant—the labour man, 2855; Canada and United States, competition in manufacturing, 2857

Cockshutt Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways, Rates, 1453
Currency, coinage, 400
Eight-hour day, 377
Firearms, licenses, 3413
Franchise Bill
"Ecclesiastics," 1076-7
Polls—pencil, 1102
Franking privilege, 3765
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1451-4
House of Commons staff, 4547
Income tax
Accounting period, 3308
Charities, 3311
Dividends, when liable, 3304-6
Indemnity of members, 3311
Indians, Six Nations, 3278
League of Nations
Ames, Sir Herbert, statement by, 3979
Canada and the Empire, 491
Militia—Active militia—allowances, 3672-3
Newspaper postage, 3759
Oleomargarine, 1782, 1787
Opium and Drug Bill, 1750
Parliament Buildings, 1430
Peace treaty—Bulgaria, 490
Pensions, 429-35
Purchasing Board, 1479-82
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 3323, 3342-4
Automobiles, 3598
Boats, canoes, etc., 3591
Candy—maple products, 3593
Collection—method of, 3469
Food, 3617
Licenses, 3606-7
Manufacturers' agents, 3609
Overdrafts, 3798
Sales tax, 3794
Goods contracted for, not delivered, 3614
Stock transfers, 3800
War trophies, 4557

Coinage. *See* Currency.

Cold Storage, 2407-09
Butter in, ques. 543, ques. 807

Cole, Mr. W. B., ques. 2893

Collingwood, Marine hospital, 2255-56

Commerce, International Parliamentary conference on, ques. 2721

Commercial Feeding Stuffs Bills:
1. 1r., 617; withdrawn, 1290-1
2. Res. 2184; 3161; 1r., 3174; 2r., 3395; 3405; com., 3405; 3r., 3409

Commission of Conservation, 3286
Consulting Engineer, ques. 1002
Deputy Chairman, ques. 2573
Town Planning Adviser, ques. 1002

Compulsory Voting, 1062-4

Concurrence in supply, 3217, 4586

Connaught Rifle Range, 3728

Conner, James, dismissal of, 415

Conscription, 59. *See also* Military Service

Cooper, Col. John A., ques. 308, ques. 414

Cooper, Mr. Richard C. (Vancouver South)
Pensioner resident outside of Canada, 4052
Returned soldiers, provision for—motion for special com., 513
Soldier's buttons, unauthorized wearing of, 4020

Co-operation, 109

Copp, Mr. Arthur B. (Westmorland)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 195. Sir Thomas White as champion of the Government—proposed general election, 195; the farmers' movement — lower tariff — public revenue and private profits, 197; Franchise Act—Board of Commerce, 198; Union Government—illness and absence of Prime Minister, 199
Bankruptcy Bill, 3256-60
Board of Commerce, Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4479
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, information withheld, 1661
Canadian National Railways, 4195-6
Goods for use of, imported from United States, ques. 998
Extensions, 3390-2
Information wanted, 3392
Intercolonial—equipment deteriorated—scenery and opportunities for viewing it—train connections—need for local headquarters — political influence — superannuation allowances—Mr. George Carvill, former ticket agent, 4219-4228
Carvill, Mr. George, ques. 586, 4219
Cereal shipments, ques. 1626
Civil Service
Bonus, 1280
Putman, Mr., ques. 2414
Customs, rentals paid, 3858-9
Drill halls, 3148
Experimental farms—buildings, 3157-8, 3160
Flour, Canadian Shipments, ques. 1788

Copp, Mr. Arthur B.—*Con.*
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1937-9
Assistant Chief Electoral Officer, 1514-5
Candidate's consent, 1095
"Ecclesiastics," 1077
Oath by elector, 1102
Personation, etc., 1159
Polls, hours to be open, 1921-3
Provincial lists, 3893
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to 3r., 4366
Returning officers, 1576-81
Voting, manner of, 1104
Government steamers, wages, 1599-1600
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1506
Icebreakers, 2105-7
Maple products, 1255
Parliament Buildings, ques. 705
Furniture, 1421, 1427-8, 1434
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3956
Pensioners resident outside of Canada, 4048-9
Widowed mothers, 429
Post Office buildings, 3160
Re-establishment
Fishermen and loans, 4048
Students, 4048
Sackville public building, 3150, 3158
St. John district pension office, 1742
St. John harbour—pilots, 2119-21
St. John river wharves, 2122-3
Scammel, Mr. J. K., 3784-5
Shipbuilding, 643, 660
Material, importation, ques. 1114
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4013
Special War Revenue Bill, 3329-30
Bank overdrafts, 3799
Sales tax, 3615
Tender and contract, 3160
West Indies, trade with, 1884

Copper, 4513

Copyright Bill, 1r., 751-2

Corn. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Cost of Living. *See* High Cost. *See also debates under* Address; Budget: Board of Commerce

Coughlan Shipbuilding Company, 3360, ques. 3620

Courts, appeals from. *See* Supreme Court Act

Courts Martial, ques. 1359

Cowan, Mr. Walter D. (Regina)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 224. Union Government an honest government—democracy and democratic measures, 225; tariff, balance of trade, 226; tariff and prices—income tax, 227; tax on unimproved lands—war-time elections Act, 228; naturalization of aliens—Board of Commerce, 229
Canadian Northern Railway
Willow Bunch, Wood Mountain—western extensions, 3379-82
Coal operations, director, 3178, 3191
Experimental farms, 2390
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2085
Voters' lists, 2433
Provincial, adoption of, 2337-8, 2340-1
Indemnity of members, 4094
Last Mountain river dam, 3788-9
Natural resources development, 1021
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 390, 394, 3198
Scientific research, 2167
Superannuation of public employees, 394

Crerar, Hon. T. A. (Marquette)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 143. New Parliament building, 143; parliamentary government — League of Nations and Canada's status, 144; monetary exchange and trade, 145; natural resources and production — tariff — wheat production, 147; pulpwood—the "Agrarian" movement—by-elections, 148; luxury and income taxes, 149; immigration, 150; franchise and citizenship, 151; proposed general election, 152
Agriculture—federal and provincial control, avoidance of duplication, 2386-7
Bridges and the provinces, 3777-9
Budget, date of, 2126
Budget, 2896. Criticisms of Progressive group, 2896; government control in wheat not desirable—operations of farmers' business organizations—Timiskaming by-election and One Big Union, 2897; expenditure should be reduced—new taxes, 2898; business profits and income taxes—the tariff, 2899; the Government and protective tariff, 2900—Great Britain's fiscal policy—Britain and Germany, 2901; British trade and foreign investments—tinplate industry, 2902; British industrial and social conditions, 2903;

Crerar, Hon. T. A.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
agriculture in Canada and Great Britain—inquiries into industries, 2905; result of the war, Britain and other countries compared, 2906; Canadian Council of Agriculture tariff policy, 2907; British tariff policy would apply advantageously in Canada—agriculture under disadvantages—textile industry, 2908; business combines and the tariff, 2909; Mr. Fielding's amendment, 2910
Canadian Wheat Board, 4119, 4348-54
Cold storage, 2407-9
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3166, 3400
Dairy industry, 2405
Dominion arsenals, 3719
Fox farming, 2410
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2217, 2223
House of Commons
Audibility of debates, 2126, 2314
Two o'clock suggested as hour for meeting, 2781
Income tax—errors in returns, 3315-6
Indemnity of members and salaries of Ministers, 4434
Judges' salaries, 3853
League of Nations, 4319-20
Militia—active militia—allowances, 3660, 3671-2
Mineral deposits
Leases, etc., 3808-13
Tax on unused, 3810
Naval Service, additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4319
Retirement of members of public service, 3834
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3206-7
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3995
Special War Revenue Act Amdt., 3332-3
Bank overdrafts, 3799-3800
Collection, method of, 3483
Amdt.—taxes to be collected at source, 3484-7

Cressé, Mr. L. G. A., K.C., ques. 4502

Criminal Cases, appeals in. *See* Criminal Code

Criminal Code Amendment Bills:
1. Capital punishment. 1r., 308
2. French version. 1r., 2571; 2r., com., 3081; ref. to Spl. Com. 3106; 3r., 3488
3. Firearms; Use of Documents not sworn to; sexual offences; gambling; attempted rape; unlawful use of uniform; differences on appeal; Quebec

Criminal Code—*Con.*
change of venue; 1r., 2840; 2r., com., 3410; 3r., 3427; Sen. amdts., 4414
For details of debate see Doherty, Rt. Hon. C. J.

Criminals, alleged, removal from one province to another.
See Criminal Code

Cronyn, Mr. Hume (London)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech (Mover) 11. Parliament Buildings—Union Government—League of Nations, 12; thrift—public finance, 13; tariff commission — immigration — scientific research, 14; representation and government — re-establishment, 15; capital and labour—after-war condition, 16; race and religion—Canada, 17; Earl Grey's farewell message, 18
Income tax
Charities, 3311-4
Patriotic funds, 3244
Pensions Bill, 4043, 4050
Drafting in accordance with decisions of Com., 4041
Pensioner resident outside of Canada, 4044
Widowed mother, dependent parent, 4043
Pensions and Re-establishment Com.
Peck, Mr., resignation of, 2081
Report; M. to adopt, 3922. History of pensions increase, 3923; changes and present state, 3927; insurance, 3928; war service gratuities—Re-establishment, 3930; work of Com. 3931; in reply—unanswered letter, explanation, 3957
Printing additional copies, 4321
Pensions, widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power), 428
Returned soldiers' insurance, 4054
Scientific Research—Com., Special, report of, 2154
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 585

Crothers, Hon. T. W. (West Elgin)
Civil Service
Retirement of members, 4063-6
Superannuation, 391-2, 4268
Coal Operations Director Bill, 3368, 3375
Food and Drugs Bill, 959-60
Franchise Bill
Chief Electoral Officer—Biggar, Mr. O. M., appointment of, 4268-70
Returning officers, 1535, 1577-86
Voting notwithstanding disqualification, 1824-5

Crothers, Hon. T. W.—*Con.*
Grand Trunk strike of 1910 and pensions, 1126, 1349-51, 1541
Income tax
Charities, 3247-8
Suggestions, 3122, 3126
Industrial disputes, 2192-6
Judges' salaries and pensions, 4334-8, 4420-3
Opium and Drug Bill, 1641, 1646-8
Postmasters' salaries, 4526
Race track betting, 3427
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 391, 394

Crowe, Mr. S. J. (Burrard)
German and Austrian books, ques. 806
Shipping—sick and distressed mariners, 3104

Currency. *See also* Finance
Canadian, in United States, ques. 341
Copper—new one cent coins, 402, ques. 2067
Dominion notes and gold, ques. 588
Inflation, 107
Token money, 401
United States silver coins, 402

Currency Act Amdt. Bill (Coinage). Res. 399;1r., 402; 2r., com., 460; 3r., 462

Currie, General Sir Arthur, 3641, 3648, 3652-6, 3706, 3708

Currie, Mr. John A. (North Simcoe)
Balance of trade, 4329
Budget, 3053. Reduced tariff protection, 3053; Liberal-Conservatives and the Budget—how to secure greater markets—"jug-handled" free trade, 3054; home market for beef—effect of cotton duty in United States—Canadian conditions before protection—3055; danger of increasing purchases from United States—indirect and direct taxation—luxury tax and key industries, 3056; free trade agitation sectional—protection needed for glass, chinaware, silk spinning—tinplate—Canada's opportunity and how to meet it, 3057; resources, population, wise and paternal government—injurious effect of free trade agitation, 3058; Liberals and manufacturers—luxury tax opposed—socialists influence, 3059; free trade and public revenues—Adam Smith on sales tax, 3060—"Who pays the duty?"—a free trade Budget. 3061; "going to the country"—Mr. Fielding's amdt. 3062; national policy approved—not pledged

Currie, Mr. John A.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
to support present policy further than next session, 3063
Canadian National Railways
Canadian Pacific Railway, and, 3384
Deficit—rates, 3382-3
Extensions, 3383
Political patronage, 4222-3
Coal operations, director, 3175-6
Franchise Bill
Chief Electoral Officer, 1071-3
Disqualification of candidates, 1086
Naturalization—amdt. (Mr. Euler) to 3r., 4368-72
Polling divisions, 1520
Returning officers, 1530
Voters' lists, provincial, 2355-63
Franking privilege, 3356-8, 3762-7
Fuel Supply
Demurrage charges, 4328
Special powers for Railway Commission, 4327
Grain transportation charges, 2634
Grand Trunk strike and pensions, 1122, 1131, 1138, 4511
M. to restore pension status, 1122
House of Commons Staff, classification, 1041-4
Income tax
Deficits and losses, 3241
Patriotic and charitable funds, 3245-8
Stock dividends, 3238
Surplus revenues, 3252
Inland revenue, spirits, 3816
Luxury taxes—United States, in, 2528
National defence, 4303-5
Newspaper postage rate, 3351
Catalogues and parcels, 3356
Newspapers and propaganda, 4378
Parliament Buildings, 1420
Pensions Committee
Report, printing, 4321
Resignation of member of, 1085
Printing, Joint Com. on, 4257-8, 4321-2, 4503-6
Quebec's ancient fortifications, 425-6
Sick and distressed mariners, 2256
Soldier settlement—fishermen, 3220
Steel and shipping merger, 1960
Toronto
Letter carriers, 345
Militia property, 3728-31
Wealth, taxation of, 2527
Workmen's compensation Act and seamen, 2263

Customs. *See also* Customs Tariff
Automobiles, smuggled, ques. 807

Customs—*Con.*
Brokers, 3716
Department
Employees, ques. 317
Rumoured investigation by U.S. firm, 3491, 3623
Salaries, 3858
Duties, basis of estimates, ques. 1788
Entries and exchange rates, 109
Franco-Canadian tariff Convention, ques. 3684
French Treaty. *See that title*
Imports for 1919, ques. 2182
Textile imports, duties on, ques. 1899
War duty, removal of, 2489, 3110

Customs Act Amendment Bills
1. Importation of Firearms. Res. 616; 1r., 617; 2r., com., 3r., 1048
2. Export Regulations. Res. 3620; 1r., 3623; 2r., Ref. to Special Com. 3690; Report of Com. that Bill be not further proceeded with, 4504

Customs Tariff Act, 1907. Amdt. Bill. Res. 3110; 1r., 3111; 2r., com. 3174, 3r., 3229

Dager, Herman J., ques. 2182

Dairying Industry, 2403. *See also* Board of Commerce; Commercial Feeding Stuffs; Oleomargarine
Butter, prices, ques. 807
Feed, 605
Grading Export Butter and Cheese
Res. (Mr. Edwards) moved, 592; withdrawn, 614
Production records of cows, 1014
Products, quality of, improvement in, 599-607
United States market, advertising in, 601

Daly Building, Ottawa, ques. 1200

d'Anjou, Mr. Joseph E. S. E. (Rimouski)
Active militia—allowances, 3659
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 81. Tariff, duty on Government to formulate a policy, 81; Quebec representation in the Cabinet—Hon. Br. Blondin—French language—Quebec province and the Government, 82; Franchise, 83; popular unrest—Printing Bureau dismissals and Civil Service classification, 84; proposed general election, 85;
Board of Commerce, prices, 1151
Budget, 2568. Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) approved—defence of the farmers, 2568; public debt, 2569; economy and encouragement of agriculture, 2569; production and consumption — railway policy, 2570; Union Government and election, 2571;
Experimental farms, 1016, 2384
Franchise Bill—Proclamation, language of publication, 2309
French speeches, translation of, 699
Militia headquarters officers and service at the front, ques. 506
Naval Service, additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4400
Universal military training, 942

d'Anjou, Mr. Joseph E. S. E.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*

Daughters of Canada, 244, 396

Davidson, Mr. A. L. (Digby and Annapolis)
Dominion Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1936
Returning officers, 1523-4, 1580, 1588
Voters' lists, provincial, 2327-38
Naval Service Dept. estimates—agreement as to debate, 4409, 4412

Davis, Mr. Fred Langdon (Neepawa)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 106. New Parliament Building—taxation, increased, needed, 106; Civil Service and returned soldiers—inflation of currency—public revenues and expenditure, 107; Parliamentary control and its methods, 108; customs duties and exchange rates—profits, prices and co-operation, 109
Budget, 3023. New taxes and the business outlook—public finances, 3023; reduction of expenditure—Committee on estimates, 3024; Government should watch mergers—Budget supported—controversy on protection or free trade, Germany and Great Britain as examples—taxes probably to be revised, 3026
Coins, Canadian and American, 461-2
Franchise Bill
Ballot boxes, expenses of returning, 1927
Contributions, 1186
Misfeasance—penalty, 1075
Non-electors and non-residents, 786
Oath, administration of, 779
Polls, hours to be open, 1926
Proclamation, language of publication, 1834
Recall, the, 2035
Soldier land settlement, 2148
Special War Revenue Act Amdt Bill
Collection, method of, 3477
Ethyl alcohol, 3603-4

Daylight Saving, 1084, 1574

Debates. *See* House of Commons

Debt, National, ques. 309, 2478

DeCelles, Mr., 114, 210
Superannuation, 2968, ques. 3489

Déchène, Mr. Aimé Miville (Montgomery)
Budget, 2946. The new taxes, 2946; manufacturers and their products, 2947; rural population and its problems—new ideas in farming—votes for experimental farms and for Department of Agriculture generally, 2948; demonstration farms and local demonstrators in Quebec—well-being of the farmer the country's safest asset, 2951
Butter and cheese grading, 599
Canadian National Railways
Electric systems, ques. 1510
Express companies and, ques. 801
Civil Service
Bonus, 7191
Classification, ques. 1624
Quarantine station operators, 1281
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3169-70
Food and Drugs Bill, 1258, 1262
Franchise Bill, fees—statement to be in box, 1927
French speeches in House, translation of, 703
Government employees at Sorel, ques. 1199
Government steamers, 1604-6
Grosse Isle, public works, ques. 343, ques. 344
Maple products, 1255, 1258
Naval Service, 4406
Public loan, ques. 810
St. Lawrence dredge, 1616-20
St. Regis Indians, ques. 799
Toronto Eastern Railway, Toronto Suburban Railway, ques. 1004, ques. 2080

Defaulters. *See* Military Service

Delinquents. *See* Juvenile Delinquents

Delisle, Mr. Michel Siméon (Portneuf)
Icebreakers, St. Lawrence channel, ques. 317

Demers, Mr. M. J. (St. Johns and Iberville)
Bank interest, 992
Blue books, language in which published, ques. 992, ques. 1004
Budget, 2708. Balance of trade, 2708; cost of living—economy, 2709; protection and its effects, 2710; development of natural industries, 2711

Demers, Mr. M. J.—*Con.*
Bulgarian Peace treaty, ques. 316
Canadian Expeditionary Force, numbers, ques. 315
Commission of Conservation
Engineer, ques. 1002
Town Planning Adviser, ques. 1002
Farmers' Account book, French edition, ques. 315
Franchise Bill
Polling divisions, 1517, 1520
Polls, hours to be open, 1920
Registrars, 720
League of Nations, Canada's contribution, ques. 316
Mines department, ques. 672
Naval Service, 4401-2
Newsprint Controller, ques. 315
Ottawa new public building, ques. 1002
Quebec city mail deliveries, ques. 591
Rural mail carriers, ques. 591
Smith, Mr. J. E., ques. 2722
Vancouver dry dock, ques. 316

Demobilization, 19, 53, 4550, 4556, 4585. *See also* War Bonds; Reconstruction; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Demobilization Appropriation Bill. Res. 4137. (*See* War Bonds, Over-subscriptions.)

Demobilization Vote—Housing and, 3545

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Budget, 3043. Late sittings of the House—congratulations to Minister of Finance—tobacco duties, 3043; national emergency and the Budget—revenue and expenditure, 3044
Business of the House, state of, 3216
Canadian National Railways—stations, 891
Criminal Code Amdt. (French version) 3083-4
Dairy industry, 2403
Exhibition Commissioner, 4558-9
Fertilizer, freight rates on, 2407
Food and Drugs Bill, 960
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1940-3, 3875
Ballots and ballot boxes, 1097, 1104
Deposit, 1093-5
Disqualification
Candidates, of, 1088-9
Electors of—charitable support, those receiving, 1812-7, 1997
1812-7, 1997
Interpretation, 1987
"Candidate," 1985
"During an election," 1985-6

Denis, Mr. John J.—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Nomination,
Place of, 1092-3
Postponement of, 1096
Polling divisions, 1516-9
Reading of clauses in Com., 1919
Returning officers, 1528-30, 1574-5, 1585-8
Public officials, 1802-4, 1809
Votes for informal candidate, 1096
Voting on certificate, 1099-1100
Women voters, 2418-9
Married, names how listed, 1827, 3869
General election, deposits lost, ques. 922
Grand Trunk Railway Acquisition Bill, 1303, 1317, 1357, 1435, 1442-3, 1449-50
Strike of 1910 and pensions, 1553
Gold shipment to New York, 181
Icebreakers, 1602
Income tax
Additional information, demand for, 3302
Checking returns, 3128
Multiplicity of laws, 3315
Overpayment, 3254
Those who did not make reports, 3118-21
Interim Supply Bill, 3216
Judges' salaries, 3851
Moving pictures, 3627
National defence, 4302
Naval Service, 4300-5
One-cent coin, ques. 2007
Parliament buildings, 1423, 1427
Railways—public ownership rates, 1442, 1449
Royal Military College, 3152-3
Scientific Research, 2162
Session of Parliament, time of, 3217
Shipbuilding, contracts, 894
Statutes, suggested revision, 3821
Supply, undue haste complained of, 4562
Supreme Court Act, 2389
Tobacco growing, 2383, 3819-20
West Indies Conference, 3860
Yukon, 3281-2

Departments of Government, reduction of, 4456

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George H. Boivin)
Rulings and Statements of
Adjournment—order to be maintained, 1838
Amdts., one at a time, 1819
Appeal from ruling as Chairman, put by him as Speaker, 3664
Appeal from ruling—statement of appeal questioned, 1327, 3664
Arrangements to facilitate business—Franchise Bill, 3903

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Bills
Amdts. to, order of, 2224-5
Involving charge on public revenue, 1513. *See also, under this title,* Motions
Com.
Clause cannot be re-opened after adoption, 1256
Com. and 3r. at same sitting, 1061
Discussion, subsection by subsection, 1935, 1943
Explanation of Bill only by unanimous consent, 396, 1685
Reading of section by Chairman, 584, 1254, 1919
Section adopted, amendable only on reconsideration, 2365
Sub-clause amended, clause not passed—further discussion, procedure in, 1744
Consolidation of two, 1234
Preamble, proposal to insert, 4155
Special Com., ref. to by House, not by Com. of the Whole, 1639, 2022
Title, discussion of details without motion irrelevant, 4466
3r.,
Immediately after amdt. in, Com. only by consent, 1256
Chair to be addressed, 2030, 2231, 3308, 3550
Debate closed, 1044
Debates—publication of matter not spoken, 447, 4251
Decorum—conversation, 2317-8
Denials, 1184
Documents re-read at same session, 2294
Explanation—section amended, 3391
Granby public building, 3149-50
House of Commons officials, 949
Interim supply vote, explanation—rule 17c, 755
Interruptions, 353, 1131, 1179, 2033, 2528, 2916, 3062, 3500, 4118, 4150
Cahill, Mr.—Sir Henry Drayton, 3339
Member may rise to ask permission to ask question, 2047
Member requested to give way, 3454
Questions, 286-7
Asked by permission, not in question form, 1719
Limited, 2562
May exhaust right to speak, 2568
Language
"Delusional insanity," 2732
"False statements," 3006

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Language—*Con.*
"Knows that the statement he has made is untrue" 3549
"You are trying to fool someone," 3550
Matters sub-judice—Labrie brothers, 3849
Members
Honour of—insinuation, 1186
How to be referred to, 2831
—"the hon delegate" 2032
Interrupted, but address not completed, holds the floor, 3520
Recognition of by the Chair, 2756
Whips' list of names, 3045
Resume seat when Chairman rises, 2042
Right to speak exhausted, 871, 1718, 3086
Motion to adjourn debate negatived, 2951
Speaking, may not interrogate others, 2042
Statement of, to be accepted, 1224, 2291-2, 2334
To keep the floor, must speak, 2242
Motions
Involving charge upon public revenue, 1513, 3587, 4052
Non-debatable—Com. rise, etc., 1044, 1082, 1585, 3617
Seconder not needed, 3587
To be in writing, 1263
Mover to close debate, 333, 419, 553, 1225, 3837, 3403
Indemnity of members—Sir Robert Borden, 4454
Negative motion, 1264, 1915
Nothing before the Chair, 1597
Notice of motion passed over, afterwards called, 703
Point of order
May be discussed, 2032
Right of member to raise, 1183
Previous debate, 1397, 1677-8
Privilege—question not to be raised, 2918
Quorum, count of members, 964
Relevancy, 394, 645, 648, 656-7, 864, 915, 985, 1060, 1313, 1317-8, 1692, 3140, 3401, 3474, 3491, 3545, 3627, 3663, 3667, 3849, 3996
Appeal (Mr. McMaster) from ruling, 1327
Budget resolutions, 3338
Canadian National Railways Bill, 3384-5
Car shortage, 1317
Doherty, Mr., and Irish question, 1496
"Excise" taxes, 3318
Explanation and request for instructions—Special War Revenue Act

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Relevancy—*Con.*
Amdt. Bill, 3455
Franchise Bill, 1064, 1071-3, 1176, 1196, 1197-8, 1932, 1935, 2223-31, 2294, 2327, 2334
Amdt suggested, not moved, 2337-8
Canada Temperance Act, 2053
Documents re-read, 2294
Personalities, 2048-50
Reconsideration of clause, 1997
St. Johns election, 2239
Schedule, discussion of, 1999
School system, 2283
Sermon, 1077
Gould, Mr., election of, 2038
Grand Trunk Railway Acquisition Bill
Section and schedule considered together, 1435
Strike of, 1910, 4511
Judges' salaries and indemnity of members, 3853
Militia estimates, 3656
Appeal (Mr. Cannon), not sustained, 3663-5
Militia—
Cockshutt, Mr., remarks of, 3673
Peck, Mr., remarks of, 3669
Tweedie, Mr., remarks of, 3667-9
Opium and Drug bill, 1746
Post Office, 3742-4, 4531
Reference allowed as for comparison, otherwise out of order, 3492
Unanimous consent to disregard rule, 2105
Ways and means, 915
Repetitions, 2286
Resolution, error in, 3628
Saturday night—time of adjournment, 4320
Six o'clock interrupts debate—procedure, 1034
Special War Revenue—questions, opportunity for, 3631
Suggestions to facilitate debate, Special War Revenue, 3564
Supply—motion for, limits of debate on, 872
Supply—reverting to previous item, 4565
Taxation—request for statement by Minister, 3597
Unanimous consent, 796, 1692, 1999, 2023, 2389, 3315, 3565
Latitude in debate, 2105
Reverting to former clause of bill, 1061
Stacey, Mr., on Indian Act Amdt., 4021
3r., of Bill immediately after amdt. in Com. 1256

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Vote called, debate closed, 2242
Vote in Com., rule as to counting, 3673
Desaulniers, Mr. Arthur L. (Champlain)
Batiscan bridge, ques. 317
Budget, 2623. Protest against existing government, 2623; reconstruction and economy—navy deficits—general election needed, 2624; popular discontent, 2625
Hennick, Daniel D. patents of, ques. 1510
Loans to foreign countries, ques. 318
Mail carriers, ques. 343
Quebec arsenal. ques. 3862
Desjardins, "Ti-Noir," ques. 315
Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Batiscan river, ques. 1230
Board of Commerce, M. for abolition, 1139
Budget, 3072. Workingmen and taxes, 3072; Minister of Labour and labour policy, 3073; present social upheaval—central labour exchange—distribution of Government contracts, 3074; employment insurance and health protection—stick together, 3075
Enemy aliens, naturalization, ques. 992
Montreal wharves, ques, 674
Proportional representation, ques. 803
Destroyers. *See* Naval Service
Detention Camps, ques. 314
Detroit River
Liquor patrol, 2107, 2118
Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Civil Service
Bonus, 1270-3
Classification, 1272
Coal Operations Director, 3177
Food and Drugs Bill, 959, 1259, 1268
Franchise Bill
Corrupt practices, 1161
Disqualification of candidates, 1085-6
Non-electors and non-residents, canvassing, 772, 785
Public officials, 1802
French speeches in House, translation of, 700
Georgian Bay Canal, 914, 3177
German war payments, ques. 310
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1300-1
Honey adulteration, 798
House of Commons staff organization, 567, 753, 1040
Indemnity of members, 4091
Indian lands, 790-1
Inquiry concerning questions, 2416
Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B.—*Con.*
Jellicoe, Admiral Viscount, visit of, ques. 310
Manufacturers, aid to in appeals, 321
Natural resources,—Wright county, 3813
Naval Service, 707-9
Orders in Council, Government by, 2020
Peace treaty, 1060-1
Railway cars—Canada and the United States, 881-2
Returned soldiers, 538
Shipbuilding, 914
Expenditure, how to be met, 917
Special War Revenue
Liquor cabinets, smokers' cabinets and tea wagons, 3793
Tooth washes, 3793-4
West Indies—outrages on blacks in the United States, 2845-6
Director of Coal Operations. *See* Coal Operations
Distressed Canadians, relief of, 4559
Distressed Seamen. *See* Canada Shipping Act
Distribution Office, 1037
Divisions. *See* House of Commons
Divorce, 134
Divorce in Ontario and Prince Edward Island Bill, 1r., 1573
Divorce Cases
Remission of fees, 4321, 4413
Documents, not sworn to. *See* Criminal Code
Doherty, Rt. Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Administration of Justice, 3840-51
Labrie Brothers, case of, 3227, 3295, 3558-60
M. (Mr. Casgrain) for papers, 2014
Admiralty Act Amdt., 2842, 3086
Board of Commerce
Constitutional questions, 3685
Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4476
British North America Act, 4168-70, 4379
Motion for papers, 811-2
Campaign funds, 1227
Canada's national status, 474
Criminal Code Amdt (French Version) 2571-2, 3081-5
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 2840, 3410-3
Affidavit, pretended, 3414-5,
Marriage licenses, 3415
Age of consent, 3415
"Appeal Court" defined, 3410
Arrest on summoning of person outside province, 3417-8

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Courts of appeal—Supreme Court, appeal to, 3422-3
Firearms—weapons, 3410-15
Gambling, 3415-6, 3427
Petty thefts and jury trial, 3421
Quebec, change of venue, 3420-1
Race-track betting, 3427
Re-election by prisoner, 3419-20
Saskatchewan and Alberta, appeals in summary convictions, 3418-9
Senate amendments, 4414—collectors of fares, 4415
Sexual offences, 3416
Uniforms, etc., unlawfully worn, 3417-8
Criminal trials
Motion for papers re, 2015
Eight-hour day, 454
Exchequer Court Act Amdt., 2003, 2201-4
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2064-73, 2233-4
Canada Temperance Act, 2053
"Ecclesiastics," 1076
"Hours of the day," "standard time," 1994
Misfeasance—penalty, 1074-5
Pollbooks to returning officer, 1078-80
Franking privilege, 3762-8
Grand Trunk Railway Acquisition Bill, 1298, 1316-21
Loans—amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 1536
Ratification of agreement, 1323-4
Strike of 1910, 1134, 1542, 1545, 1547-53
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) 1351
Habeas Corpus. *See* under this title Administration of Justice
Internment cases, 4517-8
Irish question, 1496
Judges' salaries, pensions, 3228, 3851, 4331-41, 4417-23
Juvenile Delinquents Act, 2842
League of Nations
Canada and the Empire, 484
Lennox, Mr. Justice, 1232
Military Service Branch, 4516-8
Naturalization
Alien enemy origin, 3920-1
Alsace-Lorraine, 3921
Certificate not issued, 3919
Oaths, administration of, 3919
Naturalization Act Amdt. Bill, 3682, 3915-21, 4416
Revocation of certificate, 3915-9
Newspaper postage rate, 3351
Pecuniary Claims Commission, 3858
Penitentiaries, 3409-10, 3858
Alberta, 3855-7

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Penitentiaries—*Con.*
Dorchester, 3855
Portsmouth, appointments pending, 568
Purchasing agent, 3840, 3854-5
Penitentiary Act Amdt., 2848, 3409-10
Pension as ex-judge, 298-9
Personal position in relation to pension, 4423
Purchasing Commission, 4582-3
Quebec riots of 1918, 1211
St. James by-election, 707, 787
St. Peter river, floods, 859
Shipbuilding, contracts and tenders, 664-6
Stoneham, the late Finlay, 568
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 2003-4, 2315-8, 2389
Supreme Court reports, 3855
Washington, Canadian minister at, 2469-73

Dominion Alliance, 807

Dominion Arsenals, Quebec, 3717, ques. 3862

Dominion Canners, ques. 415. *See also* Board of Commerce

Dominion Franchise Bill, 1r., 338, 2r., 710; 756-775; com., 775, 1061; 1085; 1103, 1152, 1160, 1165, 1175, 1512, 1574, 1790, 1916, 1985, 2023, 2082, 2204, 2267, 2269, 2318, 2417, 3864, 4264; 3r., 4379
Amdts.—recorded divisions;
1. By-elections; 2. Provincial lists;
3. Naturalization; 4. Propaganda;
5. Publicity of contribution, 4360-79
Debate of Bill, arrangements for, 1072, 1166, 1198, 1837, 1944-5, 2417, 2430-2, 3901
Com. on forms, 2001
Non-contentious clauses, 776
Printing, copies of Bill, 704
Statement as to additions, 582
Translation into French, 1061
Sections and subjects discussed:
Accidents and errors—provisions in case of, 1110
Advance polls, 1162, 1933, 1998, 3864, 3873, 4271
List of, 3875
Agents and officers to vote, 1918
Aliens, 340. *See also that title*
Certificate, 2057, 2082, 2204
Amdt. (Mr. Euler) neg. 2224
Amdt. (Mr. Pardee) moved 2225-6, neg. 2242
Amdt. to 3r. (Mr. Euler) 4369; neg. 4373
Armed strangers, 1108
Assistant Chief Electoral Officer, 1513, 4269-70

Dominion Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Ballots, 1097
Counterfoil and, 1103, 1104
Counting before opening of poll, 1101
Forgery or destruction of, 1098
Form of, black border, 1168
Not to be displayed, 1103
Ballot boxes, 1097
Custody of, 1928
Returning, 1927
"Blocking the poll," 1827
Bribery, treating, undue influence, personation, 1156
By-election, simultaneous, 1090-1
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 4359-60 to 3r.
Campaign funds. *See under this title* Contribution
Canada Temperance Act, 1166, 1943, 2052, 3864
Candidates,
Consent, 1095
Withdrawal of, 1096
Canvassing by outsiders, 772, 786
Chief Electoral Officer, 339, 1070, 1075, 4264
Remuneration of—res. 4136
Report as to working of law, 1110
Salary, 1512, 4516
To retain papers, 1111, 1928
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 1069, 1198
Compulsory voting, 1062-4
Contributions, 781, 1169, 1930
Publicity of, amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King), 4272; amdt. (Mr. McMaster), 1171; neg. 1198; amdt. (Mr. Maharg) to 3r., neg., 4373
Conveyance of electors to polls, 786, 1061
Corrupt practices—disqualification, 1160
Counting and reporting vote, 1109
Definitions, 775
Deposit, 1091, 1095
Deputy returning officers, 1074
Disfranchisement, 731, 735, 738, 746, 748, 750, 757, 763, 765, 768
Disqualification—*See also under this head,* corrupt
Candidate, of, 1085, 4271
Electors of, 1996
Charitable aid, those receiving, 1812
Criminals, 1820
Returned soldiers exempted from, 1811, 1820
Voting notwithstanding, 1824
"Ecclesiastics," 1070, 1076
Election clerk, 1073, 1515-6
Election expenses, 1152, 1929. *See also under this title* Contributions

Dominion Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Election expenses—*Con.*
Advertising, 1930
Proposal that Dominion treasury pay, 1197
Publicity of, 747
Return of by agent, 1155
Election officers, 1918
Fees and expenses, 3867, 4270
Taxation of, 1111, 1152
Persons disqualified for, 1075
"Election papers, 1928, 2023
Election return, 1110, 1928
Executory contracts void, 781
Expenses
Accounts, taxation of, 1929
Former general elections, 728
Or wages of voter, payment of forbidden, 1064
Personal, 1991
False, oath—penalty, 781
False statements—made to effect election, 1065
Fees, statement to be placed in box, 1926-7
Forms, 1166, 3868
Hindus who were soldiers, 1812, 1821
Interpretation, 1943
"Advance Poll," 1943
"Candidate," 1943, 1985
"During an election," 1985
"Election officer," 1987
"Elector," 1988
"Hours of the day"—"standard time," 1988, 1994
"List of voters," 1989
"Member," 1989
"Official agent," 1991
"Rural Polling Division," 1991-2
"Urban polling division," 1991
"Voter," 1993
Judges and elections, 721
Jurisdiction, 712, 725, 761
Married women's names—how listed, 1827, 3869, 4272
Misfeasance—penalty, 1074
Names not on list, 1926, 3877
Nomination of Candidates, 1090
"Electors" how defined, 1916
Place of, 1092
Postponement, 1096
Non-electors and non-residents, canvassing, 784-6
Notices, 777, 1169
Oaths, 779-81, 1102
Ontario, election laws amdt act, effect of, 3880-98
Ontario provincial voters' lists, 3880

Dominion Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Orders in Council, repeal of, 776
Orientals, 1811, 1820
Paid propaganda—amdt. (Mr. McMaster) to 3r., 4374
Peace and good order, 1105
Liquor, 1108
Penalties, 1160
Personal registration of voters, rules for, 3901, 3907
Rules, 4272
"Plugging," 2350
Political contributions. *See under this title* Contributions.
Poll books to returning officer, 1078
Polls
Hours to be open, 1919
Pencil provided, 1102
When to be held, 1101
Polling divisions, 1516, 1811, 1995
Polling place—parties present, 1098, 1102
Additional, 1826
Population and status of place, 2320
Present laws, insufficiency of, 710, 724
Printers' name, 779
Proclamation—language of publication, 1918, 2267, 2277, 1828, (Amdt) Mr. Turgeon, 1834
Mailed to postmaster, 1080
Notices, etc., 2319
Provincial lists
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to 3r., 4363; neg. 4366
Jurisdiction, 339, 3889
Qualification of electors, 1811, 4271. *See also under this title* Aliens
Indians, 2055
Recall, the, 2023-5
Amdt. (Mr. Tweedie) 2023-5, neg. 2052
Recount by Judge, 1110
If judge fails to act, 1110
Registrar and enumerator, 1096
Registrars, 720, 728, 3899
Public officers, choice of, as, 722
Registration of voters
Interrogatories, 1167
Removing notices, 779
"Residence," 1159
Returning officer, 720, 759
Civil Service Commission, proposed appointment by, 1809
Duty on receipt of writ, 1516
Further duty of, 1096
Oath of, 1166
Rules for personal registration amdts. 3901
Rural municipalities, 339
Schedules, 1166

Dominion Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Secrecy during poll, 1103
Staff and temporary assistance, 1073
Swearing in of names. *See under this title* Voters' list.
Swearing in voters, 721
Telegraph communications by, 1068, 1198
Time element, the, 728
Voters' lists, 2319
Corrections in, 1103
Married woman's name, 1827
New lists, 1825, 1997
Not necessary, 1826, 4272
Preparation of, 3878, 4271
Provincial, use of, 2417. *See also under this title* Provincial
Voting
By mail, 1163
By proxy, 1162
Manner of, 1103
On certificate, 1098
War-time Elections Act, effect of, 711, 725, 734, 765
Women voters, 2418
Writs, 1073, 1166
Nomination—election—delay, 1092
To be addressed to returning officers, 1515

Dominion Land Surveyors. *See* Land Surveyors

Dominion Lands, acreage unsold in West, ques. 1118

Dominion Lands and Parks, 3283

Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bills
1. Alien Homesteaders. 1r., 704; 2r., 1048, 1233; com., 1233; Consolidated with Bill following
2. Soldiers of Associated Powers. 1r., 1113; 2r., com., 1233; 3r., 1235

Dominion Police. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Dominion Steamers, 1598

Dominion Steel Corporation, 623

Dominion Troops, Services of overseas, Resolution of thanks from British House of Commons, 1159

Dorval Military Property, 3727, 3731

Doughty, Dr., and war trophies, 4557

Douglas, Mr. James M. (Strathcona)
Budget, 2838. Tariff for revenue, 2838; income tax—manufacturers and farmers, and prices, 2839

Douglas, Mr. James M.—*Con.*
Franchise Bill
Counting and reporting vote, 1109
Oath by elector, 1102
Polling divisions, 1517
Polls, hours to be open, 1924
Returning officers, 1584
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1458
Rulings and statements as Chairman
Bills, printed in both languages, 3251
Soldiers Settlement Act—cattle branding, 1698
Special War Revenue Amdt. Bill
Bank overdrafts, 3798
Candy, 3592
Carpets and rugs, 3585
Hats, 3453
Jams and marmalades, 3796
Underwear, 3453-4, 3567

Douglas, Mr. John C. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Coal purchases by Canadian Merchant Marine, ques. 1115

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry (Minister of Finance)
Auditor General's report, 458, 2179, 2390
Belgium, proposed credit, 583
Bonds, tax-exempt, 3339
Budget, inquiry as to, 1047
Budget, the, 2476. Exports and imports (aggregate trade) 2477; national debt, 2478; inflation, 2479; trade with Great Britain and with United States, 2481; revenue and expenditure, 1919-20 and estimated for 1920-1, 2483; Grand Trunk acquisition, 2484; luxury taxes, 2486; motor cars, liquors, sales, stamps, moving pictures, 2487; income tax, 2488; business profits tax—customs war duty removal, 2489; tariff, 2490; resolutions, 2492
Business profits war tax, 3111-7, 3229-37
Public utilities, 3230-7
Canadian National Railways and Canadian Government Merchant Marine—withholding of information justified, 1679-80
Civil Service
Bonus, 1269-71, 1279-89
Slide masters, 1279
Insurance, 1054-6, 1779-81
Retirement fund, 459-60
Currency (coinage) 399, 401
Exchange and, 461
Currency Act Amdt., 460-2
Customs Tariff Act Amdt. Bill, 3110-1, 3174

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry—*Con.*
Demobilization. *See under this title,* War Loans
Gas and electricity, tax, 3111-4
Gold shipment to New York, 181
Government annuities, 402-6, 462-3
Income War Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 3118-28, 3237-55, 3296, 3316, 4288
Absentees, 3303
Accounting period, 3305-8
Additional information, demand for, 3302
Beneficiaries, 3309
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and, 3306
Charities, 3313
Consolidation of laws, 3315
Deficits and losses, 3240-1, 3297
Delinquents, disputable assessments, 3118-27
Distraint of goods, 3304
Dividends, when liable, 3305-6
Earned and unearned incomes, 3309-10
Errors in returns, 3315-6
Estate accumulating in trust, 3243, 3309
Exemptions on account of children, 3297
Five per cent added, 3251-2
Graduated tax, 3126
"Householders," 3249, 3315
Indemnity of members and, 3306, 3310-1
Installments, 3301, 3253
Partnerships, 3252
Part payment with return, 3253
Patriotic and charitable funds, 3244-8, 3309
Penalties, 3303
Pensions, 3253
Refunds, 3301
Residence or investment outside Canada, 3249-51
Retroactive provision, 3304
Returns, 3253-4
Forms, in French, 1085, 1573
Stock dividends, 3238-40
Tax Bills delayed, 3125
Interim Supply Bill, 3215-8
Kingston Harbour works, 459
Loan Companies Act Amdt., 1776-1779
Mint, the, 615-6, 798
Newsprint shortage, 2967-8
Returned soldiers' insurance, Senate amdts., 4466
Returns and questions, 753
Scottish Canadian Insurance Corporation, 583-4
Session of Parliament, time of, 3217
Shipbuilding, cost of—not another popular loan, 917

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry—*Con.*
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3988-4017, 4155-68
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Administration—cards of directions, 3480, 3791
Amdt. (Mr. Crerar). Taxes payable at source, 3483-7
Auctions, 3575
Automobiles, 3597, 3793
Bank overdrafts, 3624-5, 3798-3800
Beer used to make vinegar, 3604
Binder twine, 3623
Boats, canoes, etc., 3588-92
Boots, 3563-3585
Breakfast foods, 3795
Bric-a-brac, 3576
Candy, 3592-4
Caps, 3566, 3790
Carpets and rugs, 3585
Chandeliers, 3578
Changes made in resolutions, 3345
Clark, Mr. M., reply to, 3442-5, 3449
Date of coming into effect, 3607, 3629
Defended—precedent of 1896, 3444
Duties paid before, 3624
List and explanation, 3561-2
Chewing gum, 3594
Clocks and watches, 3574
Clothes, 3564, 4289-90
Collection,
Method of, 3465-8, 3458-9
Progress of—retailers and collections, 3479
"Consumer," how defined, 3795
Containers, 3633-4
Curtains, 3578
Debate of, arrangements for, 3454-6
Dresses, except silk, 3587
Duties paid before changes, 3624
"Excise and sale" and luxury taxes, 3316, 3319-20, 3465-8
Amdt. (Mr. Lemieux), exemption of returned soldiers, 3447
Explanation and answering of questions, 3326-35
Firearms, 3595, 3793
Food, 3616, 3795
Fountain pens, etc., 3577-8, 4289
Furniture, 3575-6
Gas and electric light fixtures, 3597
Glass, cut, 3569
Imports and manufactures, 3566
Instructions issued, 3791, 3480
Jams and marmalades, 3796
Jewellery, 3578-85
Licenses, 3581
Medals, 3585
Wedding rings, 3584, 3797

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry—*Con.*
Special War Revenue Act—*Con.*
Lace, 3792-3
Lace and braid, 3574
Licenses, 3606-8, 4290
Small manufacturers, 3797
Liquor cabinets, smokers' cabinets and tea wagons, 3793
Merchandise not delivered on May 19, 3613
Moving pictures, 3627-8
Musical instruments, 3595-6, 3628-9
Oriental rugs, 3577
Overcoats, 3586
Paragraph by paragraph, consideration, M. 3487-8
Peas (split), etc., 3795
Penalties, 4290
Permanency of taxes, 3479
Plated ware, 3572
Playing cards, 3599-4000
Prices, how arrived at, 3790
Promissory notes, 3624
Proprietary medicines, 3600-6
Purses and pocketbooks, 3568
Real estate sales, 3796
Refunds, 3607-8, 3629-31
Ribbons, 3574
Sales taxes, 3608-17, 3794
Foods, 3616-7
Manufacturers' agents, 3610
Senate amendments, 4505-6
Silk fabrics, 3572-3
Silk kimonas, etc., 3790
Silk waists, 3632
Silks, 3563
Spirits and medicated wines, 3600, 3793
Sporting goods, 3569-72
Stamps, 4290
Stamp taxes, 3627, 3801
Stock transfers, 3625-6, 3800
Stockings, 3567
Tobacco pipes, 4289
Toilet ware, 3576
Tooth washes and powders, 3794
Underwear, 3568
Wedding rings, 3797
Wheat meal, 3796
Supply
Interim vote, 754-6
Taxation of mutual insurance companies, 2080
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 586
Trust Companies, 855
Trust Companies Act Amdt., 1779
Victoria Shipowners (limited) 4584
War loans—oversubscriptions, 4137, 4180-1, 4287-8

Dredging, 3781-90

Drugs. *See* Opium and Drugs; Food and Drugs; Proprietary Medicines

Dry Docks, 4567
Vancouver, B.C., ques. 316, ques. 3620
Victoria, B.C., ques. 3619

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Archibald, Col. Grassie, ques. 2007
"Canada," steamer, ques. 1230
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Ques. 996
Income and expense, 623
Information withheld, policy opposed, 1676, 1681
Canadian navy, ques. 540
"Canadian Recruit," steamer, ques. 312
Cape Race, 2117
Charlottetown fish hatchery, ques. 313
Civil Service
Insurance, 1054-5
Retirement fund, 459-60
Dredging, 3783-4
Extension of trade, 1884
Firearms—licenses—ship-captains, 3411
Fisheries
British Columbia, 3534
Department, estimates, 3521-5
Development of, M. in favour, 839
Food inspectors, 3539-41
Franchise Bill
Advance and proxy voting, 1164, 1933-6, 2001
Peace and good order, 1107
Voters' lists, provincial, 2333-7
Govt. steamers, crews, wages, 2112-3
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, branch lines, 1318-9
Halifax marine agency, 2110
Hanna, Mr. D. B. and Canada Steamships, Limited, 1742
Health Department and Civil Service Commission, 3543
Housing expenditure, 3550
Icebreakers, "Montcalm," 2112
Ice conditions, Atlantic coast, 2105-7
International Fisheries Commission, ques. 311
Liquor shipments and Marine Dept., 2108
Lunenburg, registrar, 2108-10
Margeson, Mr. J. W., ques. 1036
Marine hospitals, 3554
Masters and mates, 569, 984-6
Naval defence
Newfoundland, position of premier of, 3499
Naval service, 3516-20, 4395

Duff, Mr. Wm.—*Con.*
Naval Service..*Con.*
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4401-2, 4291-9
Badges, 437-446
Department
Ballantyne, Hon. Mr., statement as to leader of Opposition, 4412
Salaries, 4409
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., ques. 3618
Oleomargarine, 1865
Pensions Board employees and soldier organizations, ques. 1116
Pictou harbour, 2184-89, 3493
Wharfage dues, 2189
Pilotage, 2120-1
Public buildings—payments, 3724
Roumania, shipments to, ques. 312, ques. 343
St. Lawrence river power development, ques. 1120, ques. 1230
Shipbuilding and Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 632, 641, 646
Expense and income, 904-6
Government ownership, 906
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4001-8, 4148-51, 4159-67
Sick and distressed mariners, 2256-58, 2260
Skeena river hatchery, ques. 412
Soldier settlement, and fishermen, 1690
Special War Revenue Act Amdt Bill, 3466
Bank overdrafts, 3625
Collection, method of, 3478-80
Motor boats, canoes, etc., 3588-90
Musical instruments, 3595
Staff, estimated, 3478
"Stanley," steamer, ques. 312
Steamboat inspection 1051-2, 1763-75
West Indies, 1885

Duncan, Mr. Walter, ques. 1117, ques. 2720

Dupont, Mr. Joseph, ques. 590

Du Tremblay, Mr. P. R. (Laurier-Outremont)
Allies conference at Ostend, 2476
Budget, 3063. New taxes and high cost of living, 3063; income tax—revenue needs as argument for new taxes—tariff commission, 3064; shipbuilding—the German war indemnity, 3065; England after the war—congratulations to Minister of Finance, 3066
Franchise Bill
"Candidate," 1985
Proclamation—two languages, 1082
Newspaper postage, 3760
Ottawa city, agreement with, 988
Parliament buildings, 1427
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4005, 4009
War indemnity—Canada's share, 1084

Economic Conditions of the World
Peace conference declaration, 1888. Prices; peace not yet established; production, increase of needed; consumption, increase of; inflation of currency; profiteering; thrift; credit, difficulties in; co-operation of all classes needed; conclusions, summary of

Economic Development Commission, ques. 1896

Editorial Committee, 4322. *See also* Printing
French member necessary, 4503-5

Edmonton
Alberta penitentiary, 3855, ques. 2777
Post Office, 4518
Deputy postmaster, ques. 1739
Papers, motion for, 1900
Money parcel lost, ques. 412, 923

Edmundston
Post office and customs, ques. 2722

Education. *See also* Technical Education; Schools
Aliens, of, 819, 822
English speech among the foreign-born, 814
Federal Bureau of, 826
M. (Mr. Edwards) in favour of, 1362
Methods of, 820

Edwards, Mr. John Wesley (Frontenac)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 135. Reply to Mr. W. F. Maclean, 135; vacancies and by-elections, 136; Assiniboia by-election—absence of Prime Minister, 137; cabinet representation—Hon. Mr. Blondin, 138; French-Canadians and Hon Mr. Blondin—War-time elections act, 139; Military Voters Act and its effect on election, 140; Opium, Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King and, 141; Hearst papers, 142; Quebec and its "hour," 143
Aliens
Immigrants and Canadian citizenship, 826
"Suckling traitors," 732
Budget, 2723. Tariff inquiry and revision, 2723; Liberal party and tariff, 2724; comparison of party records on the tariff, 2725; tariff amdts. of Mr. McMaster and Mr. Fielding, 2728, 2732; Mr. M. Clark and tariff proposals, 2729; Great Britain and protection—fiscal matters and prices in 1909, 2730; reciprocity, 2731; rural depopulation, 2733; Canadian agriculture and United States markets and competition, 2734; Mr. Crerar and the farmers, 2737;

Edwards, Mr. John Wesley—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Grain Growers' Grain Company, etc., 2738; protection not for a section, but for the country, 2739
Capital punishment, 308
Civil Service
Holidays, 4059
Senate staff, 4059
Clark, Mr. M., record and views on free trade, 2729, 3436-8
Farmers' party, 610
Federal Bureau of Education, 826, 1362, 1384-5, 1396, 1400
Franchise Act, 733
Aliens—certificate, 2231, 2245
Contributions—Assiniboia expenses, 1187
Proclamation, language of publication, 1831-2, 1836, 2280-4, 2288-91, 2295
Recall, the, 2030-4, 2039-42
Assiniboia 1180-1, 1186
Registration—interrogatories, 1168
Returning officers, public officials, 1793
Grading export butter and cheese, 592, 609
Hearst publications, 142, ques. 993, 1290
Income tax
Charities, 3312
Exemptions on account of children, 3297-3300
Inspector at Kingston, ques. 2181
Indemnity of members and salaries of, ministers, 4083
Lighthouses and keepers, 2114
Military training, 3713
Militia
Active militia—allowances, 3671
Cadet service, 3712
Musical instruments, tax on, 3595
Oleomargarine, 597, 612, 1782-7, 1849-73
Pensions and re-establishment, 3941
Pensioner resident outside of Canada, 4047-9
Widowed mother resident outside of Canada, 4047
Portsmouth penitentiary, vacancies in chief positions—Stoneham case, 568
Press gallery reporters, 4503
Race track betting, 3430
Rural mail carriers, 4525
Shipbuilding contracts, 666-7
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4011
Soldier settlement, 1688-89
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 3319, 3339
Changes proposed by Finance Minister, 3436
Stoneham, Finlay, deceased convict, 568
The Menace, ques. 1899
Timiskaming election, 1188

Eggs—imports and exports, ques. 1898

Eight-hour Day, 334, 367, 449
Agriculture and, 374-80, 384, 453
Contractual rights, 372, 373-4
Dominion and provinces, jurisdiction, 450, ques. 509
Minister of Justice, opinion of, 455
International Conference at Washington—draft provisions, 371
League of Nations and, 383
Peace Treaty and, 381
Summary of position in different countries, 382

Electoral Atlas, ques. 317

Electoral Lists,
Bagot county, ques. 2011
By-elections, for, ques. 310. *See also* Dominion Franchise

Election, General
Cost of, ques. 587
Deposits lost, ques. 922
Opposition leader's motion in favour of, 35

Electric Railways. *See* Railway Act, 1919 Amdt. (Provincial Jurisdiction)

Electricity
Competition in sale of—taxation, 3106, 3113
Export of, ques. 1624. *See also* Special War Revenue Act
Inspection, 1887

Elevators. *See also* Grain; Canada Grain Act; Commercial Feeding Stuffs
Dominion Government, ques. 3862-3
Fort William, 565
Screenings, ques. 704, 3401-2
Terminal, 1878

Elgin East vacancy, 1, 11

Elkin, Mr. Stanley E. (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Budget, 2559. Exchange rate, 2560; business profits war tax—natural resources and development, 2560; protective tariff and those who benefit by it, 2561; the organized farmers and their business activities, 2561; farmers are prosperous, 2562; voting strength of country and city, 2563; American factories brought into Canada by protection—reductions in Canadian tariff, 2564; free trade, effect of on transportation and credit, 2567; duty of members of Parliament to lead public opinion, 2568

Emigration,
Canada, from, ques. 1119
Mennonites to United States, 2127, 2179, 2248

Empire, the. *See also* Washington, Canadian Minister at; League of Nations; Peace Treaty
Canada's status in, 359
Independence opposed by Government and Parliament, 365
Imperial War Cabinet, 362

Employment Offices, 4512-3
Order in Council affecting, 3087

Employment Offices Co-ordination Bill, 1r., 2313-14; 2r., 3086; com., 3088; 3r., 3092

Enemy Aliens. *See* Aliens; Naturalization; Dominion Franchise

Enterprise Foundry Company, ques. 2415

Entomology, Branch, 2401

Erieau, 2115

Estimates. *See also* Supply, Com. of
Form of objected to,
Civil Service bonus, 1276
Method of voting, 108, 2778. *See also* King, Hon. Mr.
Supplementary, 1920-21, 1229, 1254, 2412, 4257, 4413
Inquiry as to, 3769
"Examiner of Estimates" 108

Ethier, Mr. Joseph A. C. (Laval-Two Mountains)
Bankruptcy Bill, 4097
Cinematographic films, tax on, ques. 3489
Civil Service
Bonus, 3228
Classification, ques. 505, 552, 592, 675. *See also under this title,* House of Commons
Conscription, ques. 320
Conservation Commission, ques. 2573
House of Commons
French language, rights of, 1040
Organization and classification of staff, 858, 1038
Naval Service—Ballantyne, Hon. Mr., reference to leader of Opposition, 4411
Otter, Sir William Dillon, ques. 673
Post Office and Customs Departments, rumoured investigation, 3623
St. Hermas postal service, ques. 412
Tobacco, duties on, ques. 1114

Ethyl Alcohol. *See* Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Aliens and franchise, 340. *See also under this title,* Franchise; Naturalization
Belgium, proposed credit to, 582
Canadian National Railways, mail contracts and, 4530
Civil Service bonus, 4547
Eight-hour day, 357, 383
Jurisdiction, ques. 509
Franchise Bill, 739
Advance polls, 3876
Aliens, 2057, 2065-6, 2071, 2074-5, 2091-6, 2227-8, 2231-2, 2240-2
Amdt. 2096
Amdt. to 3r., 4367-72
Voters' lists, 2429
Provincial lists, 3895
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1501, 1505
Income tax, 3126
Internment case, 4518
League of Nations, 357
Letter carriers, 4529
Naturalization Act, 3683
Alien, enemy origin, 3920
Certificate not issued, 3919
Imperial citizenship and, ques. 996
Revocation of certificate, 3915-8
Opium and Drug Bill, 1633-4, 1746, 1751-3
Parliament Buildings, 1425-7
Postal employees' salaries, 2670, 3145
Roumania, advance to, ques. 3488
Rural mail carriers, ques. 414, 4523
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4144-7, 4156
Special War Revenue Act Amdt, 3439
Auctions, 3575
Automobiles, 3598
Boats, canoes, etc., 3590-1
Collection, method of, 3439, 3459-62
Furniture, 3574-5
Hats, 3562
Gas and electric light fixtures, 3596
Jewelry, 3579
Luxuries, on retail sale, list of, 3462
Musical instruments, 3628

Europe, distress in, 116, 4545. *See also* League of Nations

"Examiner of Estimates," 108

Exchange, rate of, 69, 112, 126, 145, 157, 165, 178, 190
Gold shipment to New York, 181
United States trade, and, 55

Exchequer Court Act Amdt. Bill, 1r., 2003; 2r. com., 2200; 3r., 2204

Excise
Estimates, 3859

Excise and Sales Tax. *See also* Special War Revenue
Prices, effect on, 3329

Exhibitions, 4558

Exhibition Buildings, use of by Militia, ques. 2009

Experimental Farms. *See also* Agriculture; Commercial Feeding Stuffs, ques. 1360, 2382, 2390, 2412
Achievements of, 1013
New buildings, etc, 3156
Ontario, extension in, M. by Mr. Sutherland, 1005
Swift Current, 4560

Exploration
Stefansson expedition, ques, 704

Explosives, 2248. *See also* Beloeil; Mines

Export Regulations. *See* Customs Act Amdt

Exports. *See also* Trade
Hides to United States, ques. 313
Increase of and means to promote, 621, 626
Wheat to United States, ques. 313
Wheat to Greece, ques. 415

Expropriation. *See* Irrigation Act

External Affairs, Dep, 4534

Extra-Territorial effect of Dominion legislation, 4169

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Budget, 2717. Wish courage to those who have to pay taxes—railway deficits—standing army, 2717; militarism—new taxes—tariff revision, 2718; high cost of living and popular unrest, 2719; national unity, 2720
Cimon, Mr., and Military defaulters, ques. 1462
Civil Service classification, ques. 997
Dominion land surveyors, ques. 1115, ques. 2006
Flax industry, 693
Food—price regulation, 1144, 1151
High cost of living, 1151
St. Camille-Cabano proposed railway, ques. 589

Farm Labour, 1011, 1220, 1227
Spring work, for, ques. 800

Farms, Fertility of. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Farmers' Account Book, ques. 315

Farmers' Movement and party, 102, 127, 153, 186, 196, 282, 1219, 1226, 2057. *See also* Canadian Council of Agriculture
Subsidies and bounties, position on, 899

Federal Bureau of Education. *See* Education

Federal Emergency Fund, ques. 1199; ques. 2182

Fertilizers, 119

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens (Shelburne and Queen's)
Admiralty Act Amdt, 3086
"Allied and Associated Powers," 1234
Bill—printing of in English and French, 1057
Board of Commerce, 1685
Bridges, 3772-9
British Columbia Indians, 952
British North America Act Amdt, 41-69-70
Budget, The, 2495. Congratulations to Minister of Finance in view of difficulties of situation, 2496; loans, stabilizing the market, 2507-2517; borrowing in Canada and its effect, 2490; revenues and expenditure, 2500; net debt, 2501; economy needed, 2502; tariff, free trade or protection 2,503; bounties, 2506; the Farmers' party, 2507; Liberal party and policy, 2508; tariff inquiry, 2509; amdt moved, 2510
Budget, date of, 2247, 2318
Budget debate not limited by amdt, 2518
Business of the House, order of, 2314
Business profits war tax, 3111
Public utilities, 3231-2
Canada and the Empire, 493
Canada and the United States, 496
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Crews, 641
Canadian National Railways
Lockeport proposed extension, 3085, 3376, 4218
Nomenclature and legislation, 3390
Western extensions, 3390
Withholding of information, 1667
Withholding of information, 1667
Canadian representative at Washington. *See, under this title,* Washington
Correspondence, 3081
Canadian Wheat Board, 4358
Capital punishment, 308
Civil Service
Bonus, 1269-72, 1289
Insurance, 1056
Ottawa, taxation, 579
Retirement, 3825-30, 4460-5
Retirement fund, 459-60
Returned soldiers and, 3131

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens—*Con.*
Civil Service—*Con.*
Superannuation
Pensions, inadequacy of based on former values, 391
Principle approved, 392-4
Temporary employment, 3129-33
Coal Operations Director Bill, 3361-3
Concurrence in supply, 4586
Criminal Code Amdt (French version) 3081-84
Currency, coinage, 399
DeCelles, Mr., superannuation of, 2968
Dominion Lands Act Amdt (United States soldiers) 1234
Dredging, 3783
Dry docks, 4570-2
Eight-hour day, 380
Estimates and their discussion, 4586, 4589
Experimental and demonstration farms, 2385-6
Export regulations, 3621
Extra session, 1919, ques. 543
Firearms, licenses, 3410-3
Fish inspection, 1054, 4586
Food and drugs Bill, 956-69, 1257, 1260-2
Franchise Bill, 759
Advance and proxy voting, 1162
Aliens—certificate, 2072-6, 2234-7
Ballot and counterfoil, 1105
By-elections, simultaneous, 1090-1
Amdt. to 3r., 4359
Chief Electoral Officer, 1513, 4136-7
Successor to, 4270
Contributions—expenses—public treasury should pay, 1197
Conveying voters, 1063
Corrupt practices, 1160
Deposit, 1091, 1110
Disqualification of candidate, 1086-8
Election expenses, return, 1155
Election officers, fees, etc., 1111-2
False statement made to affect election, 1067
Nomination of candidates, 1090-2
Proclamation, 1081-2
Provincial lists, 2323, 2352-5, 2419-20
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to 3r., 4365
Nova Scotia lists, 3899-3900
Returning officers, 1515 ,1521-5, 1532-5, 1581
Amdt—public officers, 1521
"Standard time," 1988-9
Franking privilege, 3358
French speeches in House, translation of, 700
Government annuities, 403, 4528

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens—*Con.*
Grand Trunk Railway, 1251, 1296-1303, 1356
Branch lines, 1319-21
Loans—amdt., 1504, 1537
London—Trafalgar Square office, 1251
Ratification of agreement, 1321-4
Stocks, value of, 1562-3, 1567
Halifax, Militia Dept. property, 3724
Hartney, Mr. E. P., 4566
House of Commons
Empire Day adjournment, 2575
Monday for Government business, 1464
Orders of the day—time taken by Minister in reply to question, 3425
Saturday and morning sittings, 2786
Staff, organization and classification of, 1037
Messengers, 3097
Icebreakers — Nova Scotia south shore ports, 1607, 2124
Income tax, 3251
Charities, 3247-9, 3312-3
Deficits and losses, 3241
Dividends, when liable, 3304-6
Part payment with return, 3253
Indemnity of members and salaries of Ministers, 4078
Correction of press report, 4171
Separate bills suggested, 4380, 4454
Inquiry for return, 3226
Inspection and Sale Act Amdt
Nova Scotia fruit growers, 2017, 3109
Jellicoe, Admiral, 386
Judges' salaries and pensions, 4418-23
Doherty, Right Hon. Mr., case of, 4424
League of Nations
Canada's contribution toward expenses, ques. 589, que. 618
Canada's status, 350 353, 366
Labour, 355-6
Peace, maintenance of, 353
Loan Companies Act Amdt, 1778
Lockeport, 3085, 3376, 4218
Lockeport-Froude's Point steamer service, 4514, 4284-5
Lotbiniere and Megantic Railway, 4585
Maple products, 796-7, 1254
Militia, Contingencies, 3714
Mint, the, 616
Naval College graduates, 4562
Naval Service
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4386
Estimates, 4316-20
Newspaper postage, 3761
Nickel coinage, 400
Oil—leases, royalty on, 3809-10
Oleomargarine, ques. 1117, 1787, 1856-74

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens—*Con.*
Opium and Drug Bill, 1750, 1760
Ottawa city, agreement with, 580, 991-2
Parliament Buildings, 1418-23, 1429-32
Furniture and fittings, 3155
Partisanship, extreme, 493
Peace Treaty
Bulgaria, with, 475, 493, 1058-9
Canada's position, 493
France—protection against Germany, 1059
Ratification, 475
Peat, 3807
Penitentiary Act Amdt., 3409-10
Pensions—widowed mother, 4044-6, 4050
Point of order—matter pending before com., 3652
Prime Minister and portfolio, 4456
Privilege—Press report — indemnity of members, 4171
Public accounts, 1839
Public buildings, none new, 3147
Purchasing Board, 1469-78
Registered postal rate, 3733
Registrar of shipping, 2109
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3203, 4575
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3997, 4155-6, 4160-6
Sick and distressed mariners, 2265-6
Soldier Settlement, 1692
Fishermen and, 1690
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 3320
Automobiles, 3599
Boats, canoes, etc., 3589-90
Collection, method of, 3464-6
Containers, 3615
Debate on Bill, arrangements for, 3454-5
Fountain pens, 3577-8
Furniture, 3576
Imposition, mode of, 3340
Jewellery, 3339, 3578-84
Musical instruments, 3596, 3629
Proprietary medicines, 3602
Sporting goods, 3570
Stock transfers, 3626
Sugar embargo, 3226
Supply
Interim vote, 754-6
Terminal elevators, 1878
Trade Commissioners, 1886
War loans
Bonds, amount of, ques. 2008
Validation of over-subscriptions, 4180-1
Victory loans, 2520
Washington, Canadian Minister at
M. in amdt. to Supply, 2442-4, 2453, 3081, 4534-42

Finance. *See also* Budget; Grand Trunk Railway; Highways; Loans; Taxation; Chartered Banks.
Department, employees, ques. 592
Dominion revenues, ques. 1001
Federal emergency fund, ques. 1199; ques. 2182
International Financial Conference, 1465
Obligations and revenues, ques. 998
Tax-free bonds, 192

Firearms. *See* Customs Act; Criminal Code

Fiscal Policy of Government. *See also* Address; Budget
Inquiry, 583

Fiset, Dr. Michel, ques. 317, 2015, 4530

Fish Inspection Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 855, 1052; 1r., 1054; 2r., 1175; Com., 4585; 3r., 4586

Fish Meat used as food for hogs, 3164

Fisheries
Biological Board, ques. 2572
British Columbia fish, quantity, ques. 505
Development. Res. (Mr. Duff) in favour of, 839
Dogfish, 848
Estimates, 3520
Fishermen, education of, 846
Grenfell, Dr., and, 2266
Hatcheries
Charlottetown, ques. 313
Salmon, 848
Skeena river, ques. 412
International Commission, ques. 311
Japanese and, 844
Lobster hatchery employees, ques. 4096
Lobsters, illegal fishing, ques. 410
Officers,
Isle Madame, ques. 3294, 3520
Overseers and guardians, 3522
Pacific Coast, 3521-2
Patrol, 3521, 3523-4
Returned soldiers, and, 531, 885
Peck, Mr., M. Res. 3933. *See also* Soldier Settlement
Treaty with United States 1290, ques. 1002, 1290, 3161
Vessels. *See that title*

Flax. *See also debates on* Scientific Research
Bounty, 1886
Grants, ques. 806
Industry, res. (Mr. Glass), 675
Seed. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Flour. *See also* Wheat
Canadian, shipments of, ques. 1788
Mills, small, ques. 799

Flynn, Capt. Percy, ques. 2415

Fontaine, Mr. Joseph E. (Hull)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 104. Opposition leader and the War—public debt and expenditure, 104; Board of Commerce—Franchise Act—capital and labour, French Canadians, 105, proposed general election, 106
Budget, 2715. Union Government and tariff revision, 2715; war profits—unwarranted expenditures and inadvisable economies, 2716; downward revision of the tariff, 2717
French speeches in House, translation of, 701
Income tax, 3251
Purchasing Board, 1484
Special War Revenue Act Amendment Bill, 3468

Food
Gambling in, 4133
Hoarding of, ques. 807
Inspection. *See* Food and Drugs Bill
Production, compared with United States, 679
Shortage, 385, 1845
World situation, 675

Food and Drugs Bill. 1r., 582; 2r., 955, Com., 955, 1256; 3r., 1465
Amdt. (Mr. Pedlow) to refer back, 1465, neg. 1466
Access, refusal of, 977
Adulterations
Drugs, 957-8
Food, 961
Analyses, 963-4
Chief analyst, 967
Compounds to be marked as such, 960
Inspector, 957
Materials usable for adulteration, 977
Misbranding, 958, 1256
Proceedings—evidence, 962
Expenses, counsel fees, 978
Knowledge, 973
No certiorari, 975
Other remedies, 979
Prosecutions, 1263
Regulations, 958, 967-9
Sales, penalties, 971
Samples and bulk, 961
Seizure, 967
Standard containers, 1258
Voluntary payments, 976

Ford Car, 119, 2815, 2823

Foreign Credits
Belgium, proposed, 582
Serbia, reported, 567

Foreign Relations. *See* League of Nations; Washington, Canadian Minister at

Foreign Trade, 2477, 2481. *See also* Budget

Forestry, 3285

Forests, Waterways and Water Powers. *See also* Dominion Lands and Parks
Com. appointed, 307

Fortier, Mr. H. A. (Labelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 132. Canada under federal compact, 132; Imperialism, 133; Canada's relations with the Empire—divorce—Labour's legitimate claims, 134; proposed general election, 135
Budget, 2889. Congratulations to Minister of Finance—production and thrift—government extravagance—militarism, 2889; soldiers turning to occupations of peace—railway nationalization, 2890; Liberal fiscal policy—general election advocates, 2891
Exchequer Court Act Amdt. 2201-3
Hull and Montreal highway, 1113
Judges' salaries, 4339-40
Printing Bureau linotypes, ques. 670

Fort William elevator, 565, ques. 1358. *See also* Elevators

Forward Movement of Christian churches, 98

Foster, Mr. A. DeWitt, ques., 1201

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George (Minister of Trade and Commerce and Acting Prime Minister February 26-May 12).
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 35. Congratulations to mover and seconder, 35; Opposition leader's criticism, 36; Franchise Bill—Grand Trunk agreement, 37; preparedness of sessional programme—government by Order in Council—absence of Prime Minister, 38; Peace negotiations and treaty, Canadian Ministers needed in Europe, 39; Ministers of the Crown in the Senate—commissions, 40; cabinet responsibility, 41; proposed general election—the Government's work and record—prosecution of the war, 42; Civil Service reform—Health department—scientific research, 43; women's franchise — prohibition — shipbuilding—cost of living, 44; production—War Purchasing Commission, 45; finance—returned soldiers, 46
Amnesty, general, to political prisoners, 1790
Archambault, Mr., questions by, 709
Armenians, 855
Auditor General's report, 2179, 4276
Bill (Mr. Stevens) proposed introduction, 1216
Board of Commerce
Canners, 1046
Correspondence, 3426
Motion for papers, 2013, 3863
O'Connor, Mr., reported resignation of, 1685
Porter, Mr. Arthur, dismissal of, 568
Robson, Judge, resignation of, 114, 1900
Budget, date of, 1465, 2126, 2247, 2318
Budget, 2510. Debt, gross and net, 2511; economy of administration, 2512; Civil Service policy, 2513; no more loans at present, 2513; taxation to meet present needs, methods of taxation, 2514; forethought and afterthought, 2515; Bank of Montreal trading account, 2516; free trade or protection—Liberal party's policy, 2517
Business of the House
Easter adjournment, 752
Empire Day adjournment, 2575
Late sittings, 1894
Legislation foreshadowed, 1789
Monday for Government business, 1464, 1573
Notices of motion standing, 1628, 2013
Order of, 2314
Wednesday evening sittings, 1044-5
Cabinet changes, 386, 447
Canada Grain Act, administration of, 1877, 3822-4
Canada Steamships Limited and Mr. D. B. Hanna, 1789
Canada Year Book, 1879
Canada's national status, 486
Canada's representative at Washington, 449, 1742, 2177, 2460
Canadian Wheat Board, 4323, 4098, 4110-1, 4341-58
Losses, possible, 4348, 4516
Magill, Dr., statement by, 4124-5, 4342-7
Telegram to Mr. Sifton, 4348
Canadians in Imperial Service, 857
Civil Service classification, 675
Correspondence, motion for, 592
Copyright Bill, 752
Daylight saving, 1574

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George—*Con.*
East Elgin vacancy, 11, 1085
Economic conditions of the world—Peace Conference declaration, 1888
Estimates and their discussion, 4588-9
When to be brought down, 567
Explosive works at Beloeil, 2248
Extension of trade, 1880-6
Federal Bureau of Education, 1398
Flax bounty, 1886
Franchise Bill
Disqualification of candidates, 1089
Returning officers, 1531
Statement as to possible additions, 582
French speeches in House, translation of, 700
French treaty, 3425-26, 4274
Gisborne, Mr. F. H., K.C., Parliamentary Counsel, 4587
Grain Exchange, closing of, reimbursement of losses, 4516
Grand Trunk Railway, 11
Correspondence, 1228
Stock, 754
Hearst Publications, 1290
House of Commons.
Acoustic properties of, 1418, 2126
Debates, Translation of French speeches, 4588, 700
Staff, 1037
Hudson Bay Railway, 2014
Hurons of Lorette, 2014
Imperial Conference, 114
Industrial legislation, 1790
Inquiry for returns, 857
International Financial Conference, 1465
Ireland, condition of, 856
Japanese occupation of Vladivostock, 1945
Jellicoe, Admiral, visit of, 11
Joint distribution office, 1037
League of Nations, 567
Armenian mandate, 1465
French occupation of German territory, 1046
Marshall, the late David, M.P., 10
Mennonites, 2127
Ministers and Grand Trunk stock, 590
Ministers' knowledge of their business, 527
Naval service, ministerial statement, 708
Newfoundland, 4276-81
Oral answers to questions, 1623
Parliament buildings, 2, 1418-20, 1432-3
Parliamentary librarian, 114
Partisanship, 485, 488
Peace, 230
Peace Treaty, 485
Pensions and Re-establishment Com.
Resignation of:

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George—*Con.*
Pensions and Re-establishment Com.—*Con.*
Lang, Mr., 1085
Peck, Mr., 2081-2
Pensions, soldiers, taxation of, 1895
Prime Minister
Illness and absence of, 9, 114
Return of, 2126
Printing, Joint Committee on, 4321
Public accounts, 1838
Purchasing Board, 1467-70, 1474-9
Questions not answered, 949
Railways, freight to Canada from United States prepaid, 1893
Returned soldiers, 520. *See also, under this title,* Pensions; Soldiers
Cash gratuities to, 1082-84
Life insurance, 522
Returns, delayed, 459
Russia, 4322
Saar Valley Commission, 344
St. Julien, battle of, 1357
St. Lawrence route, insurance, 4515
San Remo Conference, 1465
Scientific Research, 617, 2176
Serbia, reported credit to, 567
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Dept., 520
Soldier Settlement, 521
Statistical Department, 1880, 3296
Steamship companies, supervision of, 2013
Steamship Services
Cape Breton; Lockeport-Froude's Point; Magdalen Islands; Newfoundland; New Zealand; St. Lawrence, etc.; St. John-Digby; South Africa, etc., 4276-87
Economies in, 4287, 4515
Steel and Shipping merger, 1895, 1955-6
Sugar
Embargo, 3226
Prices, 1896
Supply, Com., of, arrangements for, 1597
Interim vote, 755
Terminal elevators, 1878
Trade Commissioners, 1885-6
Universal military training, 948
Victory loan transactions, 2520
War indemnity, Canada's share, 1084
Washington, Canadian Minister at. *See under this title* Canada's representative at Washington
Water carriage of goods, 1216
West Indies, 1884, 2892-3, 3860

Foster, Mr. Thomas (East York)
Bell Telephone rates appeal, ques. 2009
"Excise and sales" tax, 3451
Returned soldier (amdt. Mr. Lemieux) 3452, 3455, 3458-9

Foster, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Exhibition buildings and militia, ques. 2009
Franchise Bill, 763
Grand Trunk Railway
Head office, ques. 2008
Technical education, ques. 2519
Toronto
Grain elevators, ques. 1897
Harbour improvements, ques. 2181

Fournier, Mr. C. A. (Bellechasse)
Board of Commerce, 3227
Canadian National Railways, official cars, ques. 409
Cattle embargo, ques. 340
Electric power, export, ques. 1624
Food and Drugs Bill, 958, 977, 1260
Hides, exports to United States, ques. 313; ques. 343
Intercolonial Railway, pensions, ques. 313
St. Valier wharf, ques. 1231

France
Advances to, ques. 318
Occupation of German territory by, 1046

Franchise, 25, 28, 36, 37, 53, 114, 151, 155, 283
By-election lists, ques., 310. *See also* Dominion Franchise Bill

Franco-Canadian Customs Tariff Convention, ques. 3684

Franking Privilege. *See* Post Office Act Amdt. Bill

Fraser, Mr. Evan E. (Welland)
Judges' salaries, 4339

Fraudulent Naturalization Papers, ques. 4096

Freight Cars. *See also* Railways
Grain and grain products in, ques. 1035

Freight Rates. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Railways; Railway Act Amdt.

French Language. *See* Language Questions

French Treaty, ques. 1788; 3425-6, 3684, 4274, ques. 4323

Fripp, Mr. A. E. (Ottawa)
Biggar, Mr. O. M., K.C., 4265-6
Canada Highways Act, ques. 802, ques. 1119
Choquette, Ex-Senator P. A., ques. 2572
Civil Service
Classification, M. for papers, 544, 556
Commission, staff, ques. 2414
Printing Bureau, ques. 320, 3742
Taxation of incomes, 579-80
Ottawa city, agreement with, 579

Fruit Packages. *See* Inspection and Sale

Fuel. *See also* Coal
Price, 321

Fulton, Mr. Frederick J. (Cariboo)
British Columbia Indians, 953
Soldier Settlement, 1695
Cattle branding, 1699

Gambling. *See* Criminal Code

Game. *See* National Parks; Northwest Game Act

Gargoyles, 1433, 1493

Gas, taxation of, 3106

Gas and Electricity inspection, 1887

Gascons Wharf, ques. 411

Gaspesia, resources, attractions and need of railway extensions, 4213-7

Gauthier, Mr. L. J. (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 61. Quebec badly treated, waiting for its hour—war and the constitution, 61; Liberals and Union Government policies, 62; public unrest—Prime Minister's health, 63; proposed election, 64; party system and government, 65
Budget, 2605. Tactics of United Farmers, 2605; Liberals and tariff—Wheat Board, 2606; the Government and its record—Canada's production, 2607; currency, credit and gold reserve—profiteers and prices, 2610
Privilege—Complaint of Treatment by civil servant, 4097

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles A. (Témiscouata)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 209. French language—Hon. Mr. Chapais and conscription—Hon. Mr. Blondin, 209; Mr. DeCelles' retirement, Hon. Mr. Sevigny—Canadian National Railway shops at Rivière du Loup—Quebec biding its time, 210
Arthur Young Co., ques. 1511, ques. 1740
Bank Act Amdt., inquiry, 1573
Business of the House—holiday adjournment moved without notice, unanimous consent denied, 2575
Canadian National Railways
Engine repairs, ques. 3079
Cimon, Mr., collections by, ques. 1461
Civil Service, 670
DeCelles, Mr. A. D., 210, 2968; ques. 3489

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles A.—*Con.*
Dominion Canners ques. 415
Dupont, Mr. Joseph, ques. 590
Empire day adjournment, 2626
Franchise Bill
Disqualification — charitable support, those receiving, 1813-5
French translation, 779, 1061
Indian agents, 3276
Intercolonial employees, pensions, ques. 589
Isle Verte, 3160
Lennox, Mr. Justice, 1232
Lightkeepers, 2110
Montmagny colonization lots, ques. 1229
Parliamentary librarian, 114
Pension Commission employees, ques. 2895
Public Works employees, 3142
Questions
Passed as orders for returns, 1743
Portion deleted, 1045
Rivière du Loup workshops, ques. 315, 801
St. Malo shops, ques. 3079, ques. 3618
Saturday and morning sittings, 2626
Sevigny, Hon. Albert, 210
Témiscouata railway, ques. 674

General Election, proposed. *See* Address

Genoa, International Labour Conference, 3359

Geological Survey, 3801, 4513. *See also* Mines

Georgian Bay Canal and Shipbuilding, 915

Germany
Reparation by, ques., 1463, 2574
Allies Conference at Ostend, 2476

Germany and Austria
Books, ques. 806
Imports from, ques. 2416; ques. 3359
Trade with, ques. 801

Gervais, Mr. Theodore (Berthier)
Budget, 2556. Popular unrest, 2556; tariff policy and its effects, 2557; agriculture, its opportunities and needs—manufacturers and high tariff, 2558
Butter and oleomargarine, ques. 2720
Canada Highways Act, payments under, ques. 806
Scrap iron and steel, ques. 1739
Sorel shipyard superintendent, ques. 343
Vandal, Mr. Calixte, ques. 1740

Gisborne, Mr. F. H., K.C., 4587. *See also* Dominion Franchise Bill; Chief Electoral Officer

Glass, Mr. Samuel F. (East Middlesex)
Alien immigrants, 836
Board of Commerce, 1148-9
Export Butter and Cheese, 598-9
Flax industry, 675
Food and Drugs Bill—Toasted corn flakes, 1261
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 3876-7
Deposit, 1095-6
Election accounts, 1112
Nomination, place of, 1092
Proclamation, language of publication, 2275-6
Returning officers, 1595
Oleomargarine, 1868
Opium and Drug Bill, 1639
Post Office Department, 3743
Prices, 1148-9
Soldier Settlement, 2133-5
Special War Revenue
Fountain pens, 3577
Gas and electric light fixtures, 3596

Gold, 3107. (*See also* Currency; Yukon)
Commissioner, 3108
Shipment to New York, 181
Standard—Dominion notes and, ques. 588

Good Roads, 45. *See also* Canada Highways Act

Gophers, 3793

Gordon's Reserve school (Indian) 3269, 3278

Gouffre, Riviere Du, ques. 1121

Gould, Mr. Oliver R. (Assiniboia)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 124. Parliament building—Canadian Council of Agriculture platform, 125; Assiniboia election—trade and rates of exchange, 126; tariff and protection—water fronts and mines as taxable resources, 128; conditions in Assiniboia—grasshopper plague, 128; sessional indemnities for unrepresented years, 129
Budget, 2951. Finance Minister's great task—Mr. M. Clark's address—Mr. Meighen on Britain's policy and condition, 2952; exorbitant protection—Dominion Textile Company, 2953; shoes and protective duties; Farmers' platform, 2954; Western Canada Colonization Association—names applied to Progressive group, 2955; Messrs. Stevens, Mowat and Stacey and protective duties, 2956; faith, hope and charity, 2959; farm implement manufacturers, 2960; apple

Gould, Mr. Oliver R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
prices and protective duty, 2961; lumbering industry and housing problem, 2962; members of the House and special interests, 2964; wages in protected manufactures — proposed railway extension to coal area, 2966
Canadian Wheat Board, 4112-4
Civil Service bonus, 1287
Election for Assiniboia, 1
Franchise Bill
Contributions—Assiniboia expenses, 1172-84
Deposit, 1095
Recall, the, 1181, 2027-30, 2037
Returning officers, 1590-3
Grading export butter and cheese, 607
Grasshopper plague, ques. 705
Indemnity of members, 4449
Indians and wild game, 3280
Parliament Buildings, 1424
Portal immigration hall, ques. 674
Recall. *See under this title,* Franchise
Seed Grain Purchasing Commission, ques. 1117
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4000, 4015-6
Soldier Settlement Act
Cattle branding, 1699
Increase in stock, 1702
Special War Revenue
Airplanes, 3592
Caps, 3566
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 586
Universal military training, 947

Government Annuities, 4528

Government Annuities Act Amdt Bill. Res. 402; 1r., 406; 2r., com., 462; 3r., 463

Government Ownership, 124. *See also debates under* Canadian National; Grand Trunk
Ships, of, 627, 659. *See also under* Shipbuilding

Government Printing Bureau. *See* Printing

Government Steamers. *See also* Vessels
Civil Service insurance for crews, 1779

Grain and Grain Trade. *See also* Agriculture; Canada Grain Act; Canadian Wheat Board; Commercial Feeding Stuffs; Seed Grain
Cereal shipments from Canada, ques. 1626
Dominion Seed Grain Purchasing Commission, ques. 1117
Elevators. *See also that title*
Halifax, ques. 1116
Terminal, Port Arthur and Fort William, 565, ques. 1358
Toronto, ques. 1897

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Flour mills, small, ques. 799
Freight cars, ques. 1035
Grain Exchange, closing of, losses, 4516
Participation certificates, ques. 802
Wheat
Importation in 1912, ques. 590
Shipped by farmers to United States, ques. 802
Spirit River shipments, 566
Winnipeg Grain Exchange, 2005

Granby Public Building, 3149

Grand Etang, 2114, 3779-80

Grand Trunk Railway Company..
Administration of, 4173
Entrance to Montreal, ques. 413
Head office, ques. 2008
London. Trafalgar Square office, 1251
Pensions—and Strike of 1910, 1122
Agreements and letter to Mr. Hays. 4508
Amdt (Mr. Mackenzie King) 1536; neg. 1572
Shareholders, list of, 3426-7, 4258
Stocks, ques. 1361-2, ques. 590, 753
Subsidiary companies, ques. 996

Grand Trunk Railway Acquisition, 11
Arbitrators, 1047, 3860
Taft, Mr., ex-President, 3490
Budget, statement by Minister of Finance, 2484
Correspondence, 1228, 1235
Loan, 4579

Grand Trunk Railway Acquisition Bill. 1r., 1113; 2r., 1235; 1291; 1311; Com. 1311, 1315, 1435, 1486, 1536; 3r., 1572

Grasshopper Plague, 128, ques. 705, 2375

Gratuities to Soldiers
Statement by acting Prime Minister, 1082. *See also* Pensions

Great War Veterans Association, 3669
Soldier Settlement and, 2142

Greece
Advance to, ques. 318
Roumania, and,
Loans, ques. 3488
Purchases by, ques. 2414
Wheat shipments to, ques. 415, ques. 509

Grenfell, Dr., and fishermen, 2266

Grey, Earl, farewell message, 18

Griesbach, Brig.-Gen. William A. (West Edmonton)
Currie, General Sir Arthur, 3653
Enlistments by Provinces, ques. 408
Franchise Bill
Disqualification, charitable aid, those receiving, 1815
Polling divisions, 1516
Returning officers, 1582-4
"Or a returned soldier," 1525
League of Nations, 3976
Militia
Cadet service, 3704
Contingencies, 3716
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3212
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4159
Universal military training, 933

Griffenhagen and Associates, 3623, 4521. *See also* Civil Service
Papers moved for and laid on table, 3863

Grosse Isle, ques. 1003
Buildings, ques. 344
Quarantine, 3151
Wharves, ques. 343

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (Minister of Militia and Defence, and acting Solicitor General)
Bankruptcy Bill, 2246, 3255-65, 4263
Battlefields Memorials, 1460
Demobilization, 4549
Franchise Bill, 338-40, 775-87, 1061-82, 3864-3914; 2r., motion for, 710, 741-2, 773-5
Advance and proxy voting, 1162, 1166, 1933-43, 1997-9, 2002, 3864, 3873
List, 3875-7
Nova Scotia list, 3914
Agents and Officers to vote, 1098, 1918-9, 4271.
Aliens—certificate, 1536, 2057-64, 2214-20, 2226-30. *See also under this title,* Qualifications of Electors.
Armed Strangers, 1108
Assistant Chief Electoral Officer, 1513-5
Ballot
Counterfoil and, 1104-5
Ballots
Counting before opening of poll, 1101
Forgery or destruction of, 1098
To be alike, 1097
Ballot boxes, expenses of returning, 1927-8
Bribery, treating, undue influence, personation, 1156-9
By-elections
Simultaneous 1090-1
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to 3r., 4359

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Campaign funds, Publicity amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to 3r., 4273-4. *See also under this title,* Contributions
Canada Temperance Act, 1166, 2052-4, 3864-6
Candidates,
Consent of, 1095
Disqualification, 4271, 2023
Chief Electoral Officer, 1512-3
Biggar, Mr. O. M., K.C., appointment of, 4264-70
Remuneration, 4136-7
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 1069-73
Compulsory voting, 1062
Contributions, 781-4, 1169-70
Amdt (Mr. McMaster) 1194-5
Conveying voters, 786, 1061-4
Corrupt practices—disqualification, 1160
Counting and reporting vote, 1109
Debate of Bill, arrangements for, 1072, 1837-8, 1944-5 2001-2
Definitions, 775
Deposit, 1092, 1094-6
Return of, 1110
Deputy returning officers, 1074
Lists of, 1097
Disfranchisement, 1160, 1536
Charitable support, those receiving, 1813-20, 1997
Criminals, 1820
Hindus, 1812
Returned soldiers excepted, 1811-2, 1821-3
Disqualification of candidates, 1160, 1085-8
Election clerk, 1073, 1515-6
Election expenses, 1152-5, 1930-3
Accounts, audit of, 1929
Return by agent, 1155-6
Election officers
Disqualified parties, 1075-8
Fees, etc., 3867-8, 4271
Taxation of, 1111-2
Election papers, 1928, 1988, 2023
Election return, 1928
Executory contracts void, 781
False oath, 781
False statement made to affect election, 1065-7
Fees, statement to be placed in box, 1927
Forms, 3868-76
Advance polls, 3873-5
Indians, 2055-7
Interpretation
"Advance poll," 1943
"Candidate," 2943-5, 1985

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Interpretation—*Con.*
Opposition, attitude of, 725
"During an election," 1986-7
"Election officer," 1987-8
"Election Papers," 1988
"Electors," 1917
"Hours of the day"—"Standard time" 1988-9, 1944
"List of voters," 1989
"Members,", 1989
"Personal expenses," 1991
"Rural polling division," 1992-3
"Urban polling division," 1991
Liquor on polling day, 1108-9
Misfeasance, etc.,—penalty, 1074-5
Names not on list, 1926, 4272
Oaths, 3877-8
Naturalization—amdt (Mr. Euler) to 3r., 4369
Nomination, 1916
Candidates, of, 1090-6
Place of, 1092-3
Postponement of, 1096
Non-electors and non-residents canvassing, 784-6
Notices, 777-8, 1169
Oaths, 779-81, 1166
Elector, by, 1102
Ontario voters' list, 3880-98
Amdt proposed, 3896; agreed to, 3898
Paid propaganda, publicity of, Amdt. (Mr. McMaster) to 3r., 4375
Pass on railway, 1065
Payment of voters' expenses, 1064-5
Peace and good order, 1105-8
Poll books, etc., to returning officer, 1078-80
Polling divisions, 1516-20, 1996
Polling stations, additional, 1826-7
Polls
Hours to be open, 1920-6
When to be held, 1101-2
Population and status of place, 2320
Printer's name, 779
Proclamation
Language of publication, 1837, 1918, 2268-73, 2291-2, 2301
Mailed to postmaster, 1080-2
Notices, etc., 2319
Provincial lists, amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to 3r., 4364. *See also under this title* Voters' Lists
Qualification of electors, 4271
Aliens—certificate, 2059, 2076, 2085-8, 2092, 2099-2103, 4271
See also under this title Aliens, Naturalization

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Qualification of electors—*Con.*
Indians, 2055-7
Naturalization, 4271
Recall, the, 2044
Recount by Judge, 1110
"Registrar" and "Enumerator," 1096-7
Registrars, 3899
Duties of, 3909-10
Rural, attendance of, 3908
Registration—interrogatories, 1167
Voters, of, 4272
Removing notices, 779
Repeal, 776
Returning officers
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 1574-6
Further duties of, 1096
Ineligible parties, 1073-4
Poll books, etc., to be sent to, 1828
Public officials, 1791-2, 1809-10
Schedules, 1166-9
Standard Time, 1988
Telegraph, communications by, 1068-9, 1198
Translation into French, 779
Voters' lists, 2319
Addition and elimination of names, 3909-13
Copies, securing of, 2319-20
Married woman's name, 1827-8
New—when unnecessary, 1825-6, 1997, 4272
Possible delay in printing, 3902
Preparation of, 3878-99, 4271
Provincial, 2417-23, 2430-4, 2438-41
Amdt. (Mr. Ross) 2324, 2329-30, 2333-4, 2345-66
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to 3r., 4364
Voting
Language of voter, 1997
Manner of, 1103-5
Notwithstanding disqualification, 1825
On certificate, 1098-1101
Women voters, Quebec, in, 2419
Writ of election, 1166
Writ, nomination, election—delay, 1092
Militia
Active militia—allowances, 3654-74
Air Service, 4553
Annual drill, 3676-81
Cadet service, 3702-4, 3714
Civil pensions, 4553-5
Contingencies, 3714-6
Customs dues, 3716
Demobilization, 4549
Dominion arsenals, 3717-25
Engineer services and works, 3723-5

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Militia—*Con.*
Estimates, 4548-55
Grants to associations, 3725-6
Military properties and maintenance, 3726-7
Dorval, 3731
Toronto, 3729-31
Ministerial statement and summary, 3636-45. Estimates compared by branches with former years, 3636; increase due to higher prices, 3638; permanent force and slowness of recruiting, 3639; returned officers, 3641; volunteer militia, 3642; barracks, rifle ranges, 3643; unity of directing organization, 3644
Ordnance, arms, lands, etc., 3727-32
Permanent force, 4548
Staff, 4548-55
Warlike Stores, 4549
Militia Pension Act, 4020-1
Quebec's ancient fortifications, 424
Returned Soldiers' buttons, unauthorized wearing of, 4020

Guysborough Harbour, 2124

Habeas Corpus
Labrie case, 3227, 3295, 3558, 3840
M. for papers, 2014

Halbert, Mr. Robert H. (North Ontario)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 282. Parliament Building—Farmers' movement not a class movement, 282; popular unrest and its cure, 283; proposed general election—Franchise Act, 283; A United Canada, 284
Budget, 2941. Reply to Mr. Cockshutt, 2941; inheritance and income taxes, 2942; farmers' deputation on conscription—a former Conservative — the farmers and public affairs, 2943; public problems the concern of the ordinary citizen—economic as well as political democracy, 2944; public and press, 2945; profits system should function naturally—food production hampered—decrease of farm population, 2945; drawbacks to manufacturers—tariff tax on the coffin, 2946
Election for North Ontario, 1
Foster, Mr. A. DeWitt, ques. 1201
Franchise Bill
Contributions, 1191
Oath by elector, 1102
Recall, the, 2025
Grading export butter and cheese, 606
Indemnity of members, 4083
Oleomargarine, 1871-2
Soldier Land Settlement, 2147

Halifax
Grain elevator, ques. 1116
Marine agency—telephone, 2110

Halifax and Southwestern Railway, 3085

Halladay, Mr. H. H. (Bow River)
Alien immigrants, 820
Franchise Bill
Polling division, 1518-9
Income tax, charities, 3314
New party movement, 126
Soldier Settlement, 1701

Hanna, Mr. D. B., 622, 642, 1679, 4183. *See also* Canadian National Railway
Canada Steamships Company, and, 1742, 1789
Suit against Mr. Cahill, M.P., 2379

Hanna, town, 2379

Hansard. *See* House of Commons, Debates

Harbours. *See* their titles

Harold, Mr. John (Brant)
Food and Drugs Bill, 971
Indians and Franchise, 2055-7, 4035
Purchasing Board, 1485
Special War Revenue
Binder twine, 3610, 3623
Furs, 3569, 3791-2
Jewellery, 3579-80, 3584
Underwear, 3567

Harris, Mr. Lloyd, 1948

Harrison, Mr. Charles R. (Nipissing)
Budget, 3041. Iron and steel industry, bounties — French River waterway, 3041; Northern Ontario—Timiskaming by-election — Labour and One Big Union—class warfare denounced, 3043; Mr. G. B. Nicholson and organized labour, 3043
Eight-hour day, 382
Franchise Bill
Interpretation, 1991
Polls, hours to be open, 1921
Grand Trunk strike of 1910, and pensions, 1129
North Bay shore protection, 3160

Hartney, Mr. E. P., 4566

Hay, Mr. Thomas (Selkirk)
Campaign funds, 1222
Catalogues, postal rate on, 3744
Civil Service retirement, 3837
Franchise—voters' lists, 2441
House of Commons staff, 4566
Indemnity from Germany, ques. 1463

Health. *See also* Food and Drugs Bill; Honey adulteration; Opium and Drug Bill
Department, 43, 242, 263, 3539

Hearst Publications, 142, ques. 993, 1290

Hearst, Sir William, 3986

Hebertville-St. Joseph D'Alma mail, ques. 1000

Henders, Mr. Richard C. (Macdonald)
Alien immigrants, 835
Budget, 3015. Congratulation to former and present Ministers of Finance — direct taxation approved, 3016; income tax—removal of customs super-tax-postponement of tariff inquiry, 3017; personal position on the tariff, and on proposed taxes, 3019; party records on tariff compared, 3020
Canadian Wheat Board, 4351
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3408
Franchise Bill
Polls, hours to be open, 1923
Voters' lists, 2438
Opium and Drug Bill, 1645
Rural mail, 4529
Special War Revenue
Caps, 3566

Henderson, Mrs. Rose, 2807, 2898, 3039

Hennick, Mr. Daniel D., patents of, ques. 1510

Hewitt, the late Dr. Gordon, 2375-6, 2382, 2402

Hickey's Wharf, ques. 706

Hides, exports to United States, ques. 313, ques. 343

High Cost of Living, 68, 72, 78. *See also* Address; Board of Commerce; Budget; Popular unrest; Prices of necessaries, (Mr. Burnham) 321

Highways.. *See* Canada Highways

Hindus, soldiers. *See* Dominion Franchise

Hinton, Mr. W. P., 1311

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (Toronto West)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 284. Controversy between Mr. Rowell and Mr. Murphy, 284; French language in schools, position of Orange order, 285; opinion of Senator Belcourt, 286; French Canadian aims and ambitions, 287; clerical influence — Senator David's book, 288; Quebec's local autonomy, 289; French Canadians and the war—Orange order's war record, 290; Orangemen and political party; Orangeism a bulwark of the constitution, 291; Orange Sentinel, 292
Alien immigrants, and Canadian citizenship, 821
Budget, 2659. Congratulations to Minister of Finance, 2660; new taxes and the masses, 2660; personal views on tariff changed by conditions — protective tariff necessary, 2661; development of rsources—economy through reducing number of civil servants, 2662; promoting efficiency in Civil Service, 2663;
Canadian Wheat Board, 4113
Civil Service
Commission, employees, ques. 1121
Customs, employees, 317
House of Commons, employees, 1043
Inside, ques. 510
Dager, Herman, J., ques. 2182
Divorce Bills, remission of charges, 4321
Electoral atlas, ques. 317
Empire day adjournment, 2575
Franchise Bill
Polls, hours to be open, 1921-2, 1925
Proclamation, language of publication, 2296-9, 2301-2
Recall, the, 2036-8, 2042-3
Judges' salaries, 4338
Personal position as member, 2043
War profits in Britain, 2631-2

Hogs, raising of. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Homesteading. *See* Dominion Lands Act

Honey Adulteration Bill. 1r., 582; 2r., com., 3r., 798; Senate amdts., 2314, 2412

Horseracing,
Dr. Rutherford's report, 540
Race tracks and betting, 3415, 3427

Horses
Carload rates on, ques. 2010
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3204

Hospitals
Alcohol tax and, 3495
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, ques. 1115
Ships. *See* Canada Shipping Act (Sick and Distressed Mariners)

Houle, Mr. Joseph, ques. 2313

House of Commons. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Adjournment, decorum at, 1838

House of Commons—*Con.*
Adjournment, to discuss matter of public importance. *See the several subjects*
Adjournments
Ascension Day, 2311
Easter, 752
Empire day, 2574-5, 2625-6
King's birthday, 3080
Answers to questions
Complaint (Mr. Sinclair) 1649
Audibility of debates, 345, 388, 394, 405, 461, 2126, 2317, 3521, 4055, 4419
Statements by Mr. Stevens and others, 1416, 4055
Suggested rearrangement of seats, 394, 1417
Business of, 3216
Complaint of delay, 2778, 3506, 3622, 4102, 4274, 4314, 4547, 4586
Legislation pending, 1789, 2723, 2779
Monday — Government business, 1464, 1573
Order of, 3106
Private Bills, special facilities for, 3957
By-elections, 148
Assiniboia, 1, 56, 126, 137, 168, 1172, 1174-84, 3473
Carleton and Victoria, 1223
Kamouraska, 948-9
Ontario North, 1
St. James, 707, 787
Victoria city, 1
Calendar of the House, ques. 2005
Chamber,
Acoustic properties of, 2317-8. *See also under this title,* Audibility
Central floor, ques. 2894
Committees, standing, 9, 304. *For proceedings and reports, see titles of the several Committees*
Debates, official report of
Documents not read, insertion of. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
French reporters, 1425
French speeches, translation of, 552, 697, 4587
Decorum
Conversation, 2317-8
Distribution office, 1037
Divisions
Address—amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) for general election, 303
Appeal from ruling of the Chair, 3664
Budget—amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 3077
Dominion Franchise Bill
By-elections, amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to 3r., 4360
Contributions, publication of, amdt. (Mr. Maharg) to 3r., 4373

House of Commons—*Con.*
Divisions—*Con.*
Dominion Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Naturalization—amdt. (Mr. Euler) to 3r., 4372
Paid propaganda—amdt. (Mr. McMaster) to 3r., 4378
Provincial lists, amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to 3r., 4366
Food and Drugs Bill—amdt. (Mr. Pedlow) to 3r., 1466
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition—strike of 1910;
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) 1572
Appeal from ruling of Chairman, 1327
Indian Act, amdt., six-months' hoist, 4179
Washington, Canadian minister at, 2475
Estimates, method of voting, 30, 108, 567, 2779, 3769, 4586, 4589
Indemnity of Members, 3228, 3853-4
See also Salaries Act and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill
Alleged round robin, 2967
Correction (Mr. Fielding) of press report, 4171-2
Debate on motion for supply, 4069-95
Illness, 4458
Press, attitude of, 4441
Provinces and Dominion compared—statistical table, 4440
Taxation of, 3242
Internal Economy Commission, 9
Lobbies, admission of strangers to, 1629
Members,
Attendance of, 135, 964, 1838, 2782, 2968, 4457. *See also, under this title,* Indemnity
New
Election and introduction
Gould, Mr., 1
Halbert, Mr., 1
McDonald, Mr., 1684, 1787
Rinfret, Mr., 1357
Stein, Mr., 949
Tolmie Hon. Mr., 47
Threatened, 1743, 1841
Parliamentary Restaurant. *See that title*
Post Office
Use of box by Mr. K. H. Palmer, ques. 1001
Press Gallery. *See that title*
Private members' business, state of, 564
Privilege
Cronyn, Mr., resignation of Mr. Peck from Pensions and Re-establishment Com., 2081

House of Commons—*Con.*
Privilege—*Con.*
Edwards, Mr., report in Ottawa Journal and Montreal Gazette, 4503
Fielding, Mr., press report, 4171
Gauthier, Mr.—complaint of treatment by civil servant, 4097
Lavigueur, Mr.—Judge Lennox on non-English speaking witness, 1231
Kay, Mr., reference to by Ottawa Citizen as member for "Mississippi," 2016
Mackie, Mr. H. A., comment on absence from House, 2968-9
Questions, inquiry as to, 949, 2126
Questions passed as orders for returns, status of, 1743
Quorum, attendance of members, 964
Report not printed as ordered, 2016
Returns, asked for, 459, 618, 857, 4258
Senate and,
Joint Committee on unification of certain branches, 402
Joint distribution office, 1536
Sittings, duration of, 1838, 1893, 4432
Morning and Saturday, 2723, 2778, 3684
Two o'clock, 3080
Speaker's Chair, offer of from British Parliament, 3224
Staff
Bonus, 3228
Committees, 1042, 4547
Journals, 1038
Law Branch, 1038
Members' stenographers, ques. 2311
Organization and classification of, ques. 590, 753, 858, 919, 949, 1037, 3092, 4172, 4414, 4459, 4504, 4563
Parliamentary Counsel, 339
Sergeant-at-Arms Department, 3094
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 9
Translators, 552, 2093
Supply, Com. of—Friday rule—statement of Minister permitted by consent, 2366
Unauthorized distribution of documents in house, 1743, 1841
Vacancies, 160
Elgin, East, 1, 11, 1085
Kamouraska, 1
St. James, 1

House of Commons Act Amdt.. *See* Salaries Act

Housing, 3543
Adams, Mr., 3551-2
Demobilization and, 3543
Dominion—provinces agreement, 3548
Farmers and, 3546
Houses built, 3545-7
Programme, ques. 707

Hudson Bay Railway, ques. 806, 867, 2752, 4231, 4243
Manitoba land, ques. 1897
Res. (Mr. Campbell) 2014

Hughes, Lt.-Gen. Sir Sam (Victoria, Ont.)
Baker, late Lieut. Col., memorial to, 2776, 3557
Bolshevism, 3649
Canadian Wheat Board, 4123
Chauveau, Col., and Pinze, Col., 3666
Civil Service
Holidays, 4262
Retirement of members, 4066-9
Currie, Col. John A., M.P., 3655
Currie, General Sir Arthur, 3648, 3655
Dorval military property, 3731
Franchise Bill
Provincial lists, 3897
Registrars and enumerators, 3907
Fuel Supply, 3181
Special powers for Railway Commission, 4326-30
Indemnity of members, 4079
Militarism, 3649
Military training, 3704, 3709
Militia
Active militia—allowances, 3658, 3674
Annual drill, 3678
Barracks, 3648
Cadet service, 3704, 3709
Ministerial statement of Mr. Guthrie, 3648
Officers reverting to rank, 3681
Rifle ranges, 3649-54
Toronto property, 3729-31
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 4021
Speer, Rev. Dr., statement by, 3491

Hull and Montreal Highway, 1113

Hungary, 1059-60, 3983-4

Hunt, Mr. A. B. (Compton)
Military districts in Quebec, ques. 1035

Huron. *See* Indians

Hydro-Electric and Ontario Radial Railways, 3113-4, 4172

Ice-Breakers, 1598-1612, 2103-7
"J. D. Hazen," 1599, 1602
"Montcalm," 1606-7. 2112
St. Lawrence, ques., 317
New vessel for, 1620-1
Uniforms for men, 1603-4
Fair wage contracts, 1608-9

Ile D'Orleans and St. Lawrence River Navigation, 3295

Ile Verte, 2111, 3160

Immigrants
Landing of at Montreal and Quebec, 3226-8

Immigration
Emigration and, ques. 1119
Imperial ex-Service men, 387
In 1919 and 1920, ques. 3862
Medical inspection, 3555
Ontario and, 1012
United States from, ques. 1463

Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, rejected by Senate, 3426

Immigration and Colonization
Department, 4557
Conner, Mr. James, dismissal of, 415
Estimates, 3555

Imperial Conference, 114

Imperial Ex-Service Men, immigration of, 387

Imperial Munitions Board
Ships, ques. 1002

Imperial Press Conference, ques. 410

Imports. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade
Certain countries from, ques. 2182

Income Tax, 2488. *See also* Budget, Ways and Means, Taxation
Inspector at Kingston, ques. 806, ques. 2181
Returns, errors in, 3302
Forms in French, 1084, 1573
Toronto payments, ques. 592

Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. Bill. *See* Revenue Bills. *For details, See* Drayton, Sir Henry

Indemnity of Members. *See* House of Commons

India, Status of under League of Nations, 361

Indian Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 386; 2r., ref. to Special Com., 704; 795; Report, 3617-8; Com., 4021; 3r., 4137, 4173
Amdt. six-months' hoist (Mr. Mackenzie King) 4179

Indian Affairs, Dept. of, 3273
Com. of Supply, in, 3265

Indians, 3265. *See also* British Columbia Indians
Enfranchisement, ques. 807. *See also* Indian Act; Dominion Franchise
Gordon's Reserve, 3628

Indians—*Con.*
Hurons of Lorette, 1152, 2014
Reserves, ques. 802
School buildings, ques. 2894
St. Regis, ques. 799
Sparrow, Dr. C. J., attendance on, ques. 1897
Tuberculosis, 3276

Industrial and Scientific Research, 1886

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1357; 2r., 1900; com., 1901, 1971, 2190; 3r., 2248-51

Industrial Legislation, 1790

Industrial Survey of the Dominion, ques. 341

Infectious Diseases. *See* Canada Shipping Act (Sick and Distressed Mariners)

Inflation, 107. *See also* Currency Act

Information Service, Department of External Affairs, 4543

Inland and Coastwise Shipping Rates, proposed to be under Railway Commission. *See* Railway Act Amdt.

Inland Navigation
Canadian Government Merchant Marine and, ques. 2572
Freight boats, ques. 2572

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. *See* Revenue Bills

Inside Service. *See* Civil Service

Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bill (Fruit Packages). Res. 1573; 1915; 1r., 1916; 2r., 2016; com., 2016; Ref. to Special Com. on Agriculture, 2023; Com., 3109; 3r., 3110

Institute of Agriculture, 2411

Insurance. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; State Insurance for Returned Soldiers; Civil Service
Annuities, and, 403
Fire—mutual companies, taxation, ques. 2012, 2080
St. Lawrence route, 4515

Intercolonial Railway. *See* Canadian National

Interior Department, 3192

Internal Economy Commission, 9

International Financial Conference, 1465

International Fisheries Commission, ques. 311

International Institute of Agriculture, 2411

International Joint Commission, 3986
St. Lawrence river development, ques. 1120, ques. 1230

International Labour Conference, 798, ques. 803, 1790
Canadian representative at, 3359

International Parliamentary Conference on Commerce, ques. 2721

International Waterways, 3985. *See also* International Joint Commission

Internment, 4516

Inverness Railway and Coal Company, ques. 319, 2380, 4236-49

Ireland, condition of, 856

Iron and Steel Industry, 21

Irrigation Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 3358; 2r., com., 3694; 3r., 3702

Isle Madame, fishery officers, ques. 3294

Italy, advances to, ques. 318

Jacobs, Mr. Samuel W. (George Etienne Cartier)
Bankruptcy Bill, 920, 3260-5
Board of Commerce
Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4489-99
Robson, Judge, correspondence, 3769
Budget, 3027. Shipbuilding—advances to Roumania and other countries 3027; Mr. M. Clark and Mr. Fielding, references to Jews—advances unaccounted for, 3028; Canadian Northern Railway and Montreal Tunnel Co., 3029; immigration, 3030; excess profits tax, 3031; promises of members of Union Government as to continuance for war only, 3031; beer tax—East Elgin vacancy, 3032; Mr. Rowell's address, 3033
Business profits war tax, 3111-7
Canadian National Pictorial, 4544
Canadian National Railways
Montreal-Ottawa, 4190
Civil Service
Employees on public works, 3134-5
Retirement of members, 4065-6
Criminal Code Amdt. (French version) 3083

Jacobs, Mr. Samuel—*Con.*
Export regulations, 3622-3
Food and Drugs Bill, 978-9, 1264-5
Franchise Bill, 768
Aliens—certificate, 2069, 2076-8, 2097
Assistant Chief Electoral Officer, 1514
Chief Electoral Officer, 1070, 1512-3
Conveying voters, 1062
Disqualification of candidates, 1087
"Ecclesiastics," 1070, 1075-7
Election officers, parties disqualified, 1075-8
False statement made to affect election, 1065-6
Indians, 2055
Naturalization
Amdt. (Mr. Euler) to 3r., 4370
Proclamation, language of publication, 2306
Returning officers, 1533-4
Telegraph, communications by, 1068-9, 1198
Grand Trunk Railway, 1488-91
Branch lines, 1314
Income tax
Distraint of goods, 3303-4
Not a joke, 3119
Indians, Christian missions amongst, 3268
Internment cases, 4517
Japanese occupation of Vladivostok, 1945
Naturalization, British Government, representations by, 3917
Peace treaty, United States Senate reservations, 1060
Purchasing Board, 1480
Schelking, Baron, ques. 3618
Shipbuilding
Contracts, 908, 919
Returned men employed, 909
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4145-8
Special War Revenue
Beer, 3605
Firearms, 3595
Overcoats, 3586
Stock transfers, 3626
Steel and shipping merger, 1967
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 2318
Typhus epidemic, 4545
Vessel rates—letter from Montreal Corn Exchange, 1727

Japan, 3670-1

Japanese
Canada, in ques. 805
Fisheries, 844
Occupation of Vladivostok, 1945

Jellicoe, Admiral Viscount
Visit of, 11, 92, ques. 310, ques. 314
Papers called for, 321
Report presented, 308, ques. 309, 344, 386
Australia and New Zealand, 1159
India, inquiry, 1290
Printing of, 386
Job Brothers, wharf rent, 2124
Johnson, "Pussyfoot," 786
Johnston, Mr. J. Fred (Last Mountain)
Agricultural problems, 2397
Budget, 2664. Protection does not retain population—no handicap should impede agriculture—appreciation of Minister of Finance, 2664; ex-Minister of Finance and public borrowing—school lands trust fund, 2665—Mr. Elkin and protection, 2665; farmers and payment of taxes, 2666; farmers and American grain markets, 2667; cross-benchers and the Budget, 2668; make the farmers prosperous, 2669
Canadian Northern securities, ques. 2006
Canadian Pacific Railway taxation, ques, 1360
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1940-1
Aliens—certificate, 2099, 2244
Returning Officer, 1583
Gordon's Indian reserve, 3628-71
Immigration and emigration, ques. 1119
Immigration in 1919 and 1920, ques. 3862
Last Mountain river dam, 3788-9
School buildings on Indian reserves, ques. 2894
Soldier Settlement, 2149-50
Special War Revenue Amdt. Bill
Containers, 3633
Wheat meal, 3796
Sugar importations, ques. 2009

Joint Committee on Printing. *See* Printing

Joint Distribution office, 1536

Joint Industrial Councils, 4512

Judges. *See also* Admiralty Act Amdt., Exchequer Court Act Amdt.
Salaries of in province of Quebec, ques. 1035, 3227

Judges' Act Amdt. Bill (Salaries). Res., 4323; 4331; 1r., 4340; 2r., 4341; 4417; com., 4418; 3r., 4426

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amdt. Bill. 1r.,2842

Kamloops, public building, 3156

Kamouraska, vacancy and election, 1, 948-9

Kapuskasing-Spirit Lake, 2398-2401

Kay, Mr. W. Fred (Missisquoi)
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3167-70
Honey adulteration, 2315
Missisquoi Bay—not fishing, 3535
Oleomargarine, 1968-71
Privilege—Ottawa Citizen—not member for "Mississippi," 2016
Rent of Daly Building, Ottawa, ques. 1200
Rural mail, 4525

Keefer, Mr. Francis H. (Parliamentary Secretary for External Affairs)
Franchise Bill, advance polls, 3876
National defence, 4302-3
Natural resources development, 1030
Oleomargarine, 1874
Passports, 4544
Shipbuilding, 634, 4142
Stewart, Mr. W. J., 3985
Vessel rates, proposed regulation, 1733
West Indian trade, 635

Kelley, Rev. P. R., 794

Kemp, Hon. Sir Edward (Toronto East)
Canteen profits, 709

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred (Glengarry and Stormont)
Budget, 3067. Strange features of previous speeches—tariff, "moderate protection," 3068; protective tariff directs capital towards manufacturers rather than to-towards farming, 3069; dairying farm surveys, 3070; cheese product and prices—appropriations for the benefit of agriculture, 3071; features of the budget criticised or commended, 3072
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3406-8
Indemnity of members and salaries of ministers, 4447
Oleomargarine, ques. 1627, 1859
Rural mail carriers, 1283
St. Anne bridge, 3776

Kennedy, Mr. William C. (North Essex)
Budget, 2644. Expenditure and public loans, 2644; banks and their profits—Victory bonds, stabilizing, 2645; collection of taxation, American system—unnecessary expenses, Board of Commerce, Wheat Board, 2646; wheat prices, Canada's credit as affected by Govt. dealings, 2647; subsidies—shipbuilding, 2648; tariff, 2649
Experimental farms, 2384-7
Income tax, Toronto payments, ques. 592
Interest to Govt. by chartered banks, ques. 673

Kennedy, Mr. William C.—*Con.*
Parliament Building, 1426-7
Shipbuilding, 664
Vessel rates, proposed regulation, 1732

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie (Prince, P.E.I.)
See also Leader of the Opposition.
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 23. Mover and seconder—external affairs dwelt upon in Speech from the Throne, 23; Grand Trunk agreement, absence of documents—Opium Convention, food not drugs, 24; Parliamentary government, extension of term of Parliament, 25; Franchise Act, 26; War-time Elections Act, 27; Proposed new Franchise Act—vacancies, 28; Parliament a deliberative assembly—voting of supply, 30; government by Order in Council—Prime Minister's absence, 31; Cabinet changes—commissions and government, 32; cabinet representation and responsibility, 33; need of post-war policy, 34; amdt. in favour of early general election, 35; (neg., 303)
Air Service, 4554-6
Auditor General's report, 458
Bill not distributed—objection to proceeding with, 1057
Board of Commerce
Murdock, Mr., resignation of, 4170-77, 4466, 4460, 4499
O'Connor, Mr., resignation of, 3685
Robson, Judge, resignation of, 4258
British Columbia Indians, 792-3, 950
Budget, inquiry as to, 1465, 2126, 2247
Budget, 2969. Congratulations to Minister of Finance, 2969; no further loans—direct taxes, approved—economy, 2970; Government's promise for period of the war—general election proposed, 2971; war-time spirit and extravagance—advances unaccounted for—contracts without tender, 2972; supervision of Parliament—loans to foreign countries — unnecessary appropriations, 2973; a profiteer's Budget—income tax delinquents—tax on war profits, 2974; war-wealth taxes in Britain, 2975; the community's share in production of wealth—high cost of living, 2977; industry and taxation—taxes on capital, 2979; manufacturers and freedom of production—basic industries, 2980; urban and rural populations, 2981; Liberal platform on agricultural production, 2982; Health Department and tuberculosis, 2983; child life and welfare—National policy,

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
2984; St. John harbour and its trade, 2985; cargoes in as well as cargoes out—all classes to be considered in arranging taxation, 2987; Britain's industries and tariff policy, 2987; England and Germany—Supreme Council of Peace Conference, declaration, 2988; Mr. Fielding's amdt., 2989; Government's promise of tariff revision, 2990; Liberal tariff platform and Mr. Fielding's amdt., 2991; Liberal party's fiscal policy—British preference, 2993; Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Fielding tariff, 2994; common ground for Liberals, Farmers and Labour—need of unity on the part of those who think alike, 2995; two wings of the Government forces, 2996
Business of the House
Complaint of delay, 2778, 3506, 4102, 4274, 4314, 4547, 4586. *See also under this head,* Interim Supply Bill
Defective legislation—complaint of, 2779, 3147
Hasty legislation, 2779
Legislation pending, 1789, 2723, 2779
Long sittings, 1893, 4432
Morning and Saturday sittings, 2778, 3684
Wednesday evening sittings, 1044-5
Canada's national status, 464
Constitution, power to amend, 468
Parliament, authority of, 468, 474
Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Robert Borden, 472
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Business statement, 950
"Canadian Inventor", steamer, 3226, 3359
Canadian National Railways
Grand Trunk loans, 881
Withholding of information, 1656, 1669-70
Canadian Wheat Board, 4102
Cash gratuities to returned soldiers, 1083
Civil Service
Canadian National Railways employees, and, 3140
Classification, 3142-4, 3769, 3985, 4547
Insurance, 1055-6, 1779-80
Retirement of members of, 3836-9, 4063-8, 4461-2
Taxation of salaries, 579-80
Civil Service Bill—Senate amdts., 4059
Coal Operations Director, 3186-91
Jurisdiction, 3691
Orders in Council, ratification of, 3185, 3360-75
Cold storage and fox farming, 2407-9

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Concurrence in Supply, 4586
Contracts signed by Government before submission to House—Ottawa agreement, 1047
Criminal Code Amdt. (French version) 3081
Customs Tariff Act, 3174
Demobilization, 4550-3, 4585
Appropriation for, 1877, 1887
Dominion Franchise Bill
2r., reply to Mr. Guthrie, 723
Advance Polls, 1933-43, 1998-2002, 3874
Agents and officers, 1918
Aliens—certificates, 2075, 2212-7
Ballots
Counting before opening of poll, 1101
Forgery or destruction of, 1098
Bribery, treating, undue influence, personation, 1156-7
By-elections, 1091
Campaign funds, publicity — amdt., 4272-4
Canada Temperance Act, 2054, 3866
Chief Electoral Officer, 4136
Biggar, Mr. O. M., appointment of, 4268
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 1069-72
Contributions, 783-4
Counting and reporting vote, 1109
Corrupt practices, 1160
Debate on, arrangements for, 1072, 1944, 2002
Deposit, 1092, 1095
Return of, 1110
Disqualification of candidates, 1086-8, 4271
Election expenses, 1929-32, 1155
Accounts, audit of, 1929
Return by agent, 1155
Election officers, 1075
Fees, etc., 1112, 3867
Enumerators. *See under this title,* Voters' lists.
False statement made to affect election, 1066
Indians, 1535
Inquiry as to possible additions, 582
Interpretation
"Candidate," 1944
"Rural polling division," 1992
Liquor on polling day, 1108-9
Names not on list, 1926-8,
Oaths, 3877-8
Non-contentious clauses, 775
Oath by elector, 1102
Ontario voters' lists, 3880-98

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Dominion Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Paid publicity—Amdt. (Mr. McMaster) to 3r., 4376
Peace and good order, 1105-7
Polling divisions, returning officer's discretion, 1995-6
Polls
Fourteenth day, 1101
Hours to be open, 1920-2
Preparation of voters' lists, clause not acceptable, 3905-6
Provincial lists, amdt. to 3r., 4361
Recall, the, 2043
Recount by judge, 1110
"Registrar" and "enumerator," 1096-7
Registration—interrogatories, 1167
Telegraph communications by, 1068
Vacancies, 1091
Voters' lists
Addition and elimination of names, 3911-3
Candidates, to, 3908
Preparation of, 3879, 3905-6
Provincial, adoption of, 2355-7, 2365-6, 2421-36
Voting, manner of, 1103
Drill halls, 3147-8
East Elgin vacancy, 11, 1085
Eight-hour day, 373, 451-2
Contractual rights, 373-4
Employment offices, 3087
Minister, powers of, 3091-2
Orders in Council, effect of, 3091
Estimates and their consideration, 30, 567, 859, 918, 2779, 3215-7, 3769, 4586-8
European distress, 4546
Exchequer Court Act, 2201
Export regulations, 3622, 3690
Farm problems—fertilizers, 2405-7
Food and Drugs Bill, 956-61, 971-9, 1257-8
Franchise. *See under this title,* Dominion Franchise
Citizenship, and, 340
Gisborne, Mr. F. H., Parliamentary Counsel, 4587
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 11, 1113 1291, 1313, 1488, 1509-10
Appeal from Chairman's ruling—difference in question as put, 1327
Arbitrators, 3860
Correspondence, 1228, 1235, 1251-3
Ratification of agreement, 1329
Strike of 1910 and pensions, 1136-7, 1329-56, 1537-51, 1557-61, 4507-12
Amdt. to 3r., 1547
Hewitt, the late Dr. Gordon, 2382

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
House of Commons Staff, 3099
Housing, 3543-8
Expenditure for, 3543-4
Houses constructed—rural and urban areas, 3546
Icebreaker and car ferry, 1601, 1621
Uniforms of men on— contracts, fair wages, 1604-8
Income tax delinquents, 3119
Indemnity of members and salaries of ministers, 4075, 4431
Indian Act Amdt. 4029-39
M. six months' hoist, 4179
Industrial Disputes Investigation, 1900-15, 1971-4, 1977-85, 2190-7, 2248-9
Interim Supply Bill
Opposition's intention as to advances in future, 3215-7
Irrigation, 3700-2
Jellicoe, Admiral Lord, visit of and report, 11, 344
India, 1290
New Zealand and Australia, 1159
Kamouraska, by-elections, 948
Labour Dept. estimates, 3821, 4512. *See also under this title*, Eight-hour day
Labour, Minister of, 4512
League of Nations, 464
Ames, Sir Herbert, statement by, 3971
Canada's status, 360-7
Labour
Canada's status in relation to, 356
International Labour office, 355-7
Liberal Party's tariff policy, 2537
Little Sands, 4580
Magdalen Islands, 1601
Maple products, 797, 1254
Marshall, the late David, M.P., 10
Militia, 3710
Active militia—allowances, 3657-8
Annual drill, 3674-5
Cadet service, 3702
Contingencies, 3715-6
Dominion arsenals, 3720
Amdt. to reduce vote, 3721-2, neg. 3722-3
Military properties, maintenance, 3726
Ordnance land, 3728
Permanent force
Barracks, 4579
M. to reduce vote, 4548-9
Reply to Ministerial statement by Mr. Guthrie, 3645
Narrows, the, 3159
Naval Service
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4408-9

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Naval Service—*Con.*
Additional appropriation—*Con.*
M. to strike out, 4313-6
After-war conditions, 3511
Correspondence and negotiations, 4408, 4503
Dept
Estimates, consideration of—agreement as to debate, 4409
Debate should be deferred until Supplementaries, 3520
Increase of, 3506-8, 3512-3
Halifax and Esquimalt, 4390
Policy of government, 707
Pre-war lines, 3511
Submarines, acceptance of, 3512-3
Opium and Drug Bill, 1640-8
Control—statement of historical development, 559, 1761
Habit forming drugs, use of, 562
Orders in Council
Coal Operations Director, 3185, 3360
Ottawa city, agreement with, 579, 988-92, 1047
Parliament, two sessions in one year, 4457
Parliament buildings, 4
Peace treaty
Bulgaria, with, 464, 1057-60
Hungary and Turkey, 3983-4
Parliament, authority of, 3984
Pensions and Re-establishment, Com. recommendations, special facilities for legislation founded on, 3957
Petroleum and naphtha inspection, 1916
Prime Minister,
Absence of, 138
Health of, denial of statement by Mr. A. Thompson, 80
Return of, 2126, 2454
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 2103-4, 1601, 1621
Railway, 891-2
Purchasing Commissioner, 1469-70, 1477, 1483, 4580-1
Resignations of cabinet ministers, 386
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Barracks, 4572
M. to reduce vote, 4574
Change of name of Force, 398
Expenses, 3203-8
Provincial authorities, and, 3196
Royal military college, 3152-3
St. Julien, battle of, 1357
Scientific Research, 2174
Services during the war—personal statement, 1405
Session of Parliament,
Progress of, 2779

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Shipbuilding
Contracts, 651, 892-4, 906, 909-10
Expenditure, meeting of, 915-7
Programme, 662-9
Soldiers
Cash gratuities, 1083
Great War Veterans' Association charges, 3223
Settlement, 1684
Speaker's Chair, 3225
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
"Excise and Sales" tax, 3318-23
Licenses, 3607
Stock in trade, 3604
Speer, Rev. Dr., statement by, 3492
Statistics, including census, 1880
Steel and Shipping merger, 1959-60
Supplementary estimates, inquiry as to, Supply and Budget, 918
Civil Government, 859
Com. of, arrangements for, 1597, 1615
Interim vote, 754-5
Technical education, 1762
Timiskaming election, 1995
Trade Commissions, 1885-6
War memorial, 3228
Washington, Canadian representative at, 448, 2178, 2454-63, 4540-3
Amdt. to reduce vote, 4540

King's Bench, Court of, jurisdiction, 3295-6

Kingsmill, Admiral Sir Charles, 707

Kingston
By-election, 459
Harbour improvements, 458
Income tax inspector, ques. 2181

Kingsville public building, 3153

Kinmel Camp, 709

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Budget, 3051. Increase revenues by lowering the tariff—farmers and packers, 3051; critics of Progressive party—attacks on Mr. Crerar—Canada should have greater population—immigration policy, 3053
Canadian National Railways, western extensions, 3388
Road and structural material, 3808
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3201
Stock-raising—sunflower ensilage, 2388

Kouchibouguac, 4578

Labour. *See also* International Labour Conference; League of Nations; Eight-hour day; Grand Trunk; Industrial Disputes; Bulgarian Treaty

Labour—*Con.*
Capital and, 16, 22
Employment offices, 4512-3
International Labour Conference, 3359
Joint industrial councils, 4512
National industrial conference, 4512
Washington Conference, 371

Labrie Brothers. *See* Habeas Corpus

Lachine Canal, work on, 3423, 3561
Bridge, 3778, 4236

Lafortune, Mr. David A. (Jacques Cartier)
Indemnity of members, 3228
Lachine canal bridge, 3778, 4236
St. Anne bridge, 3775

Lake of the Woods, 3985

Lalor, Mr. Francis R. (Haldimand)
Luxury taxes in United States, 2528-9
Oleomargarine, 1782-4
Special War Revenue
Automobiles, 3598
Bank overdrafts, 3798-3800
Jewellery, 3583
Sales tax, 3609-17
Silk goods, 3573

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie and Napierville)
Budget, 2766. Balance sheet, items entered as assets, 2766; Canadian National Railways, deficit — prosperity and prices, 2767; expenditure criticised, 2768; war and conscription, 2769; burden of taxation—low revenue tariff favoured, 2770; war profiteers, 2771
Indemnity of members and salaries of ministers, 4444, 4450-5
Amdt. in Com. negatived, 4457-8
Judges' salaries, 4417-25, 4333
2r. of Bill objected to, 4341
Militia, 3650
Potato bag, 4562

Land Surveyors, ques. 1115, ques. 2006

Land Tax. *See* Taxation

Lands. *See* Dominion Lands; Indians
Canadian Northern, in Quebec, ques. 1626, ques. 2008
West, in, ques. 1118

Langton, Brig.-Gen. J. G., ques. 541, ques. 811

Language Questions, 87, 110, 209. *See also* Dominion Franchise; Education, Criminal Code Amdt. (French Version)

Language Questions—*Con.*
Auditor General's report, ques. 1627
Bilingual stamps, ques. 314
Blue books, ques, 992, ques. 1004
Calendar, House of Commons, ques. 2005
Customs forms, 3859
Debates reporters, 1425
Editorial Committee, 4322. *See also* Printing
Election proclamation, 1828. *See also this title under* Dominion Franchise
Farmers' Account Book, ques. 315
House of Commons, in, 697, 1039, 4587
Income tax forms, 1084, 1573
Lennox Mr. Justice and non-English speaking witness, 1231
Pensions report, 2016
Publications in French, ques. 541
Replies in English to letters in French, 1045
Schools, in, 285

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Quebec East)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 264. Proposed general election, 264; by-elections, 265; Union Government and public opinion, 266; mandate of Parliament, 268; cleavage between progress and reaction, 269; illness of Prime Minister, 270; Unionist party differences—Liberal party's attitude, 271; Franchise Act and redistribution, 272; Imperial Conference, 273
Air Service, 4555-6
British Columbia Indians, 793-5
Budget Speech, inquiry for copies of, 2626
Business Profits war tax, 3113
Public utilities, 3229-34
Civil Service classification, 555-6
Coal Operations Director Bill, 3370
Easter adjournment, 752
Electricity, competition and taxation, 3113-7
European distress, 4546
Exchequer Court, 2201-3
Federal Bureau of Education, 1383, 1401
Franchise Bill
Advance and proxy voting, 1163
Aliens—certificate, 2062-3, 2100-1, 2219-21
Assistant Chief Electoral officer, 1513
Canada Temperance Act, 2053-4
Chief Electoral officer, 4266-7
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 1072-3
Contributions, 782-3
Debate on, arrangements for, 1837
Disqualification
Charitable aid, those receiving, 1813-4
Indians, 2055

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Interpretation—"Standard time," 1989
Polling divisions, 1518-21
Recall, the, 2036
Returning officers — public officials,
Voters' lists, 2418-30
Married Women's names, 1827, 2418-22
Gaspesia—railway extensions—memorial of Quebec Board of Trade, 4216-7
House of Commons
Notices of motion, 1628
Saturday and morning sittings, 2782
Staff, 4414, 4563
French translators, 1043
Journals, 1039
Immigration Act, 3426
Imperial Conference, 114
Indemnity of members and salaries of ministers, 4437
Income tax, 3242
Newspaper report, 4172
Indian Act Amdt. Bill, 4137, 4173-7
Industrial legislation, 1790
Lennox, Mr. Justice, 1232
Militia, 3670
Annual drill, 3677
Moving pictures—Canadian National pictorial, 4544
National Transcontinental Railway, rentals, ques. 1461
Naval Service—additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4317-9
Parliament Building, 1424
Prime Minister's return, 2126
Quebec riots of 1918, 1209
Resignation for Kamouraska, 1
St. James by-election, 787
Soldier settlement, 1685
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—Quebec Board of trade and, 3457
Vessel rates, proposed regulation of, 1734
Washington, Canadian Minister at, 2449
Winnipeg strikers, ques. 2181

Lapointe, Mr. L. A., M. P., death of, 1

Last Mountain River, Dam, 3788-9

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Fiset, Dr., Michel, ques. 317, 4530
Income tax, exemptions on account of children, 3298
Lennox, Mr. Justice, 1231
Militia, 3678
Orleans Island, public works, ques. 810
Parcel post supervisor, 4530
Parliament buildings, 1429
Pilotage, 1839

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E.—*Con.*
Quebec riots of 1918, 1212
St. Jean wharf, ques. 317
St. Lawrence navigation, 3295
Ste. Famille wharf, ques. 317, ques. 810
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill — Musical instruments, 3628-9
Telephone contracts, ques. 1627

Leader of the Opposition
Speech on Address commended, 45
War the, and, 222, 1405

League of Nations, 8, 12, 161, 246, 4320.
See also Peace Treaty; Washington.
Ames, Sir Herbert, Financial Director of Secretariat, general statement by, 3961
Armenia, 855, 1465, 3979
Belgium, 3978
Brazil, 3978
Canada and the United States, 500
Canada's contribution to defray expenses, ques. 316, ques. 410, ques. 589, ques. 618, 3981, 4544
Canada's status under, 144, 214, 567. *See also* Canada's status
Canadian interests and representation, 567, 3982
Commercial treaties, 3973
Council of Nine, 3974
Disarmament, 3976
Eight-hour day, 449
Enforcement of decisions, 3975
German territory, occupation by France, 1046
Great Powers
If they withdrew, 3973
Those not now members, 3983
Greece, 3978
India, 361
Labour—Washington Conference, decisions, 371
Lenroot reservations, 496
Military contribution, 492, 502
Next assembly, 3977
Peace, 938
Persia, 3968, 3975
Public and private sessions, 3973
Russia, Poland, Ukrainia, 3968, 3978
Saar Basin, 3963, 3974
Secret treaties, 3973
Self-determination, 3978
Spain, 3978
Typhus epidemic, 4545
United States
Failure of to join, ques. 1118
Representation of, 3977

Leduc, Mr. J. Alfred (Westmount-St. Henry)
Butter prices, ques. 807
Grand Trunk entrance to Montreal, ques. 413
Hoarding foodstuffs, ques. 807
Lachine canal work, 3423, 3561
St. Pierre river floods, ques. 1115, ques. 4019
Westmount-St. Henri gatekeepers, ques. 998

Leger, Mr. Auguste T. (Kent, N.B.)
C. G. S. "Simcoe," ques. 413
Dredging, New Brunswick, 3781
Franchise Bill
Election expenses, 1932
Peace and good order, 1106
Polls, hours to be open, 1920-1
Proclamation—two languages, 1081, 1828-32, 2270-3
Returning officers, 1575
Voters' lists, provincial, 2332
Grand Trunk Railway, 1500-2
Inquiry for papers, 3769
Lightkeepers' remuneration, 1281, 2110
Milk tests, 2406
Oleomargarine, 1873
St. John armoury, ques. 994
Telegraphs and Telephones, 4576

Legislation. Royal Commission on, ques. 4502

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Maisonneuve) (Gaspé)
Administration of Justice
Labrie Brothers, case of, 3227, 3295, 3558-60, 3840
Bankruptcy Bill, 3256-63
Board of Commerce
Chairman, resignation of, 3863
Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4486-96
British mails, 4531
Budget, 2786. The new taxes, 2787; economy needed—naval expenditure rumours, 2788; British safety valves—Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George, 2789; The Onlooker and leading members of the Government, 2790; repressive measures criticized, 2791; Liberal party and tariff, 2792; Mr. M. Clark and the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2794; party government—national unity, 2795
Buffalo herd, 3283
Canadian National Railways and Gaspesia, 4213-6
Caughnawaga, 3266

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Civil Service
Reorganization, ques. 3861
Griffenhagen and Associates, 3863, 4521-2, 3491
Holidays, 4261
Coal operations director, 3175
Coal Supply—M. to adjourn to discuss, 3686-8
Colonial Investment and Loan, 3859
Criminal Code Amdt. (French version) 3082
Customs
Appointments, etc., 3858-9
Forms, in French, 3859
DeCelles, Mr. 2968
Divorce Bills, charges, 4321, 4413
Dominion arsenals, 3717-20
Dorval military property, 3731
Dry docks, 4567-74
Editorial Board, 4559. *See also, under this title* Printing
European distress, 4546
Fish inspection, 4586
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2223-4
Proclamation, language of publication, 1832, 2299-2302
Returning officers—public officials, 1799-1801
French treaty, 3425, ques. 3684, 4274, ques. 4323
Goods arrived—date of delivery, 4505
Fuel Supply—special powers for Railway Commission, 4325-30. *See also under this title,* Coal
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition—arbitration, ex-President Taft, 3490
Habeas Corpus. *See, under this title,* Administration
Hartney, Mr. E. P., 4566
House of Commons
Attendance of members, 4458
Staff—classification and organization, 4563-4
Income tax, 3237
Advertisements, 3240
Exemptions on account of children, 3298
Indemnity of members, 3310-1
Indemnities of members and salaries of ministers, 4442, 4458
Indian Act Amdt., 4137
Industrial Disputes, 2193-9
Judges' salaries and pensions, 4422
Labrie Brothers. *See under this title,* Administration
Magdalen Islands, 4282-4
Relief ships to, 1742

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Mail service, increase in, 4526
Military Service branch, 4517
Naval Service, 3513
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4309
Navigation, Pictou—Baie de Chaleur—St. Lawrence, 2186-9, 3492-3
Newspaper postage rates, 3349
Zone system, 3351
Nile Voyageurs, 3857
Northern Canada, resources, 3283-4
Peace Conference Labour Bureau, 4507
Pecuniary Claims Convention, 3857-8
Penitentiary Act Amdt., 3410
Permanent force, commissions to N.C.O's, ques. 3619
Point of order—relevancy, 3743
Post Office
Department, 3735-43
Estimates, 4521-2
Reorganization, 3739
Rural mail carriers, 4522
Post Office and Customs Departments
Rumoured investigation of, 3491
Printing, Joint Com. on, 4257, 4322, 4505
Purchasing Commission, 4581
Quebec-Gaspé service, 4282
Reindeer herds, 3284
Returned soldiers' needs, 3212
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3197, 3206
St. John harbour, 3492-3, 4567-74
Shipping federation, 2266
Sick and distressed mariners, 2260-2
Special War Revenue, 3444
Chewing gum, 3594
Returned soldiers, exemption of, Amdt. proposed, 3446-7
Supply, Com. of, Saturday, order for, 3840
Tobacco, 3819
Washington, Canadian Minister at, 2464
Correspondence, 3080-1
West Indies, 2892-3, 3161

Lennox, Mr. Justice, alleged statement by, 1232

Lesage, Mr. J. E. (Hochelaga)
Proprietary Medicines, ques. 1036
War Tax stamps, ques. 807

Letter Carriers. *See* Post Office

Levis Drill Hall, ques. 1360, 3727

Library of Parliament, 211, 1426
Joint Com appointed, 307
Librarian, 114. *See also* DeCelles

Lighthouses and Lightkeepers, 1281-2, 2110, ques. 1897
British Columbia, 1616
Charlevoix-Montmorency, ques. 319
Lighthouse Board, 2117
St. Lawrence river, 3295. *For individual lights see their titles*

Lindsay arsenal, 3717

Linen. *See* Flax

Liquor. *See also* Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue; Prohibition
Duties, 2487
Shipments to United States, 2107, 2118

Little Sands, 4580

Live Stock
Cattle embargo, ques. 340
Feeding of. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs
Shipments, inspection, 1614

Lloyd's. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Loan Companies Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 855; 2r., 1776; Com., 1777; 3r., 1779

Loans, ques. 810. *See also* Victory Loans
Not another popular, ques., 810

Loans to Foreign Countries, Summary, ques. 318. *See also* Finance

Lobsters. *See* Fisheries

Lockeport
Froude's Point service, 4514, 4284-5
Railway connection, proposed, 3085, 3376, 4218

Loggie, Mr. William S. (Northumberland, N.B.)
Budget, 3033. New Parliament building—customs reductions, 3033; tariff revision—manufactured food products—adequate revenue, 3034; commercial and industrial competition — cottons, 3036; stabilizing the general tariff—export taxes, 3036; Mr. Fielding's amdt., 3037; Liberal tariff plank—the farmers and free agricultural implements, 3038; Budget approved, 3039
Franchise Bill—proclamation, 2267
Income tax returns, 3255-6
Newcastle-Tracadie, proposed railway, 4217
Opium and Drug Bill, 1754
Sick and distressed mariners, 3105

Loggie, Mr. William S.—*Con.*
Special War Revenue
Boots, 3565
Collection, method of, 3336-8, 3484
Dresses, 3586
Gloves, 3568
Jewellers, 3579-80
Lace and braid, 3573-4
Collars, 3574
Licenses, 3583, 3607
Penalties, 3302
Refunds, 3608
"Sales taxes" returned soldier amdt., 3452, 3610, 3336
Silk goods, 3563-4, 3572-3
Snowshoes, 3571
Stockings, silk, 3567
Taxes, effect of, 3485
Telegraphs and telephones, 4578

London, Canadian Mission in, ques., 410

Long, Mr. Charles E. (North Battleford)
Canadian Northern Railway extensions, 3391

Lorette, Hurons of. *See* Indians

Lotbiniere and Megantic Railway, ques. 590, 950, 4578, 4585

Louiseville, postmaster, ques., 1739

Lunenburg, acting registrar of shipping, 2108

Luxury Taxes, 2486. *See also* Special War Revenue

Macallum, Professor, 3806

Mack, Mr., Lunenburg, N.S., 2108-9

Mackenzie Avenue, Ottawa, ques. 999

Mackenzie, Sir William, private car, ques. 1628; ques. 2572

Mackenzie and Mann, 2379, 4184
Inverness coal, 4238

Mackie, Mr. Henry A. (East Edmonton)
Bird, Mr. Eustace G., ques. 1625
Canadian National Railways, rates, 4189
Carvill, Mr. George, case of, 4226
Child labour, 368
Civil Service
Dismissals and appointments, ques. 320
Holidays, 4058
Edmonton post office, 4518
Deputy postmaster, ques. 1739
Money parcel lost, ques. 412, 923
Eight-hour day, 337, 367, 379
Empire Day adjournment, 2575

Mackie, Mr. Henry A.
Federal Bureau of Education, 1374
Franchise Bill, 749
Aliens—certificate, 2091, 2096
Ballot boxes, 1097-8
By-elections, simultaneous, 1091
Chief Electoral Officer—Biggar, Mr. O. M., appointment of, 4269
Conveyance of electors, 787
Deposit, 1094
Notices, 778
Oaths, 780
Recall, the, 2028
Returning officers, 1522, 1532-3, 1577, 1582
Public officials, 1795-6, 1806
Voters' lists, 2426-36
Indemnity of members, 4074, 4448-9
Industrial disputes, 1910-11
Judges' salaries, ques. 1035, 4339, 4422
League of Nations, 3978
Marriage Act Amdt, 1787-8
Naturalization
"Disloyal," 3917-9
Galicians, 3922
Naval Service, additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4404
New party movement, 125
Oil from tar sands, 332-3
Oliver-St. Paul de Metis Railway, 344, 871
Privilege—comment on absence from House, 2968-9
Returned soldiers, provision for
M. for special Com. 513
Soldiers' widows and children, ques. 920
Saturday and morning sittings, 2781-2
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4005
Speech read—point of order, 2966
Washington labour conference, 371

Mackie, Mr. Herbert J. (North Renfrew)
Indemnity of members and salaries of ministers, 4446
Rural mail carriers, 4524

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Halifax)
Canadian Wheat Board, 4111
Civil Service Act Amdt. 3133-9
Judges' salaries, 4421-2
Resignation as Minister, 448
Scientific Research, 2169

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 129. Union Government — Prime Minister and Parliamentary government, 129; proposed general election, 130

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Business Profits tax—public utilities, 3229-34
Canadian National Railways
Public ownership—duplications—colonization lines—community centres—situation in Toronto—public ownership in United States coming, 4195-9
Canadian Wheat Board, 4351
Civil Service, technical officers, 4514
Coal—alienation of lands, 3811
Estimates and their discussion, 4589
Federal laws, enforcement of, 4506
Fuel supply, 4506
Special powers to Railway Commission 4331
Grank Trunk Railway acquisition, 1439-42
Judges' salaries, 4335-41
Labour representatives, 4513-4
Newsprint shortage, 2968
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3947
Railway Commission, jurisdiction over telephones, 2413
Rural mail, 4525
Soldier Settlement—housebuilding, 1687
Steel and shipping merger, 1955-60
Toronto Union station, 3225-6

MacNutt, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 174. Proposed general election —census and representation, figures, 174; income tax and land value tax—the Farmers' party, 175; Liberals and free trade, 176
Budget, 2884. New party and its names—its platform on the tariff—former Liberals supporting the Budget, 2884; Mr. Stacey and duty on apples—Opposition tariff policy, 2885; effect of Budget on public revenues and on prices, 2887; income tax, land value tax, 2888; no tariff at all but land value tax and if necessary other direct taxes, 2889
Canadian Pacific Railway freight rates, ques. 2010
Franchise Bill, advance polls, 3876
Indemnity of members, 4081
Wheat participation certificates, ques. 802; ques. 802

McCoig, Mr. A. B. (Kent, Ont.)
Agricultural machinery, standardizing, 2079
Apple barrel, 2018
Budget, 2626. Manufacturers and tariff—United Farmers, 2627; effects of policy on stock-raising, 2628; profiteering

McCoig, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
and Board of Commerce, 2629; prices, 2630; luxury taxes—taxation of war profits, 2631
Canadian Wheat Board, ques. 799, 3561, 4109
Chaplin, Mr., criticism by, 2816
Erieau port, 2115, 2118
Franchise Bill—voters' lists, 2350
Income tax
Part payment with return, 3254
Residence or investment outside Canada, 3251
Indemnity of members, 4083
Indians, enfranchisement, 4037
Opium and Drug Bill, 1705
Postmen, rumoured strike of, 3623
Purchasing Commission, 1472
Returned soldiers, provision for, 514
Special War Revenue
Bank overdrafts, 3624-5
Chandeliers, 3578
Sporting goods, 3571
Stock transfers, 3626

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1497
Stocks, 1571
Strike of 1910, 1570
Indemnity of members, 4454
Parliament Buildings, 1422-1434
Railways, purchase of by Government, 1454
Railway rates, 1498
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4013

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Colchester)
Budget, 2936. Budget should be circulated in condensed and popular form, 2936; supposed prosperity, prices, inflation, 2937; gold reserve—taxes and revenue, 2938; expenditures, public debt, 2939; sinking fund—effects of war extravagance, 2940; Government example needed — greater efficiency and economy in Civil Service, 2941
Income tax—corporations, 3239

McDonald, Mr. Angus (Timiskaming)
Budget, 3039. Failure to catch Speaker's eye—Timiskaming by-election — Mrs. Rose Henderson—One Big Union, 3039; in honour of Canada's soldier heroes, 3041
Canadian Northern Railway, North Bay through, ques. 3619
Election and introduction, 1684, 1787
Industrial disputes, 1909-11, 1975-7
Personal position on labour questions, 1977

McGibbon, Mr. Peter (Muskoka)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 215. Exchange situation, 216; Great Britain's industrial efficiency, German competition, 218; protection, income tax, taxation of foodstuffs, 218; duties on boots and shoes, agricultural implements, free goods, 219; tax on farm lands, development of resources —Franchise Act, 220; proposed general election, 221
Civil Service, 4059
Franchise Bill
Agents, 1098
Conveying voters, 786, 1062
Disqualification, charitable aid, those receiving, 1818
Income tax—Charities, 3246, 3314
Indians
Gibson, reserve, 3277
Tuberculosis amongst, 3277
Military training and cadet service, 3710
Newspaper postage rates, 3349, 3354
Northern Canada—oil properties, 3281
Oleomargarine, 1870
Opium and Drug Bill, 1746-50, 1753-6
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3937
Race track betting, 3429
Returned soldiers, 514
Scientific Research, 2164
Special War Revenue,
Automobiles, 3599
Boats and canoes, 3589-92
Proprietary medicines, 3602

McGibbon, Mr. Peter Robert (Argenteuil)
Parliament Buildings, 1434

McGregor, Mr. Alexander (Pictou)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech (Seconder) 18. Illness and absence of Prime Minister, 18; returned soldiers, 19; after-war conditions—class divisions, 20; iron and steel industry in war and peace, 21; labour and capital, 22
Pictou Harbour, 2185
Voters' lists, 2361-2

McIsaac, Mr. James (Kings, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 221. Parliament buildings, 221; contents of Speech from the Throne—Union Government—leader of the Opposition and the war, 222; illness of Prime Minister—proposed general election, 223; reply to Mr. McKenzie, 224
Agriculture, 2395

McIsaac, Mr. James—*Con.*
Budget, 2864. Congratulations to Minister of Finance—trade and production, 2864; national debt, 2865; revenue and expenditure—new taxes, 2866; Mr. Fielding's amdt. and address, 2867; fiscal policy of Liberal party, 2868; tariff investigation and amendment, 2869; national policy, 2870
Canadian National Railways
Prince Edward Island car ferry—standardization of railway — winter navigation—Georgetown harbour and terminals—invitation to Prince Edward Island, 4208-12
Car ferry, 2103
Franchise Bill
"Ecclesiastics," 1078
Polls, hours to be open, 1926
Voters' lists, provincial, 2360
Grading export butter and cheese, 606
Icebreakers, 2103
Lightkeeper's salaries, 2111
Masters and mates, examiner, 1610
North Lake harbour, 3159
School of navigation, 1612
Sick sailors, 3553-4
Soldier settlement, 2152

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 46, 47. Congratulations, 47; new leader of the Opposition, 48; Montreal Gazette's and Hon. Robert Rogers' opinion of the Government, 50; Minister's absence from the House, 51; health of Prime Minister—extension of parliamentary term, 52; technical education — shipbuilding—production—returned soldiers-civil service reform, 53; Liberal policy—late Liberal leader, 54; exchange rate and foreign trade, 55
Admiralty Act, 3086
Appeals in sumary convictions, 3418-9
Arrest and summoning of persons outside the province, 3417-8
Banff National Park, 3770-6
Bankruptcy Bill, 3258-65
Betting machine, 3416
Board of Commerce
Constitutional question, 3685
Porter, Mr. Arthur S., dismissal of, 568
Budget, 2580. Tariff and tariff commission, 2580; the Budget, its purpose, 2581; revenue and expenditure, 2582; luxury taxes and prices, 2583; foreign credits, 2584; governmental interference in

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
trade, 2585; government and by-elections, 2585; parties and the tariff, 2587; Liberals' and Farmers' tariff resolutions, 2588
Canada Grain Act, administration, 1877
Canadian National Railways
Appointments, how made, 3140
Canadian National Railway Company, 345
Extensions, 3376, 3384-9, 3393-4
Victoria County, 4241
North Sydney terminal, 4251
Reply to general summary of Minister of Railways, 872
Taxation of, 3393-4
Withholding of information, 1657-8
Canadian Wheat Board, 4114
Cape Breton
Need of railways, 875
Newfoundland steamship service, 4285
Civil Service
Bonus, 1270-2, 1276, 1280, 1284, 3147
Cheques, preparation of, 1285-7
Classification, 553
Insurance, 1780
Retirement fund, 460, 3836
Salaries, 3541
Temporary employees, 3133-5
Outside Canada, 3129
War record, civil servants with, 3131
Coal and iron resources, 327
Coal mining—prevention of explosions, 3814
Coal Operations Director, 3693
Orders in Council, 3186
Orders of, 3191
Cold storage for bait, 2408
Commercial Feeding stuffs, 3409
Criminal Code
Change of venue, 3421-2
Courts of appeal, 3423
Prisoner, re-election by, 3419-20
Currency Act Amdt., 460
Dominion lands, 1049-50
United States soldiers and, 1233
Dredging, 3786
Exchange rate, 55, 460
Exchequer Court, 2202-4
Experimental and demonstration farms, 2384-5
Firearms licenses, 3410, 3413
Fish inspection, 1053-4
Fisheries treaty with United States, 1290, 3161
Food and Drugs Bill, 957, 961-77, 1258-9, 1262
Prosecutions, 1263-9

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Food inspectors, 3540
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1942, 1999
Lists, 3914
Aliens—certificate, 2101, 2204
Bribery, treating, undue influence, personation, 1156-8
Burden of proof, 1161, 1825
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 1071
Contributions, 1169
Corrupt practices, 1160
Deputy returning officers, 1074
Disqualification
Charitable aid, those receiving, 1818
Citizenships and franchise, 1824
Election officers, 1075-8
False statement made to affect election, 1066-7
Interpretation
"Lists of voters," 1989
"Voter," 1993-4
Orders in Council, repeal of 776-7
Payment of voters' expenses, 1064
Poll books, etc., returning officer, 1078-80
Preparation of voters' lists—complaint of unfairness, 3905
Proclamation—language of publication, 1832
Registrars, rural, attendance of, 3908-9
Returning officers, 1161, 1589-90
Voters' lists
Provincial, 1989, 2329, 2341-6, 2348, 2361-4
Voting notwithstanding disqualification. 1161, 1825
Writ of election, 1166
Franking privilege, 3358
Gas and electricity inspection, 1887
Government annuities, 462-3
Government steamers—wages, 1609-11
Grand Trunk Railway, 1291, 1299-1300, 1486, 1489, 1506-7
Branch lines, 1313-6, 1321
Stock, 1321
Strike of 1910 and pensions, 1130, 1551, 1568
Halifax-Cape Breton service, 4281
Halifax explosion, 3698-9
Harbour dues, 2189
Highlander's plaid and clasp, 445
Housing expenditure, 3550
Hungarian treaty, 1060
Icebreakers, 1600, 2106
Imperial conference, 359

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Income tax
Assessment methods, 3254
Charities, 3247, 3314
Delinquents, 3120, 3123-4
Exemptions, 3127
"Householders," 3249
Indians,
British Columbia, 951-5
Economic and religious situation, 3268
Education of, 3277
Enfranchisement, 4038-40
Nova Scotia, 3272-3
Tuberculosis amongst, 3275
Industrial disputes, 1901-4, 1912, 1972-3, 2199-2200
Isle Madame fishery officers, ques. 3294
Irrigation, 3698-9
League of Nations
Britain's treaty-making power and, 349
Washington Labour Conference, 355
Liberal leadership, and, 898, 913, 1277
Liquor sales—jurisdiction, 3498
Live stock shipments inspection, 1615
Loan Companies, 1778-9
Lotbiniere and Megantic Railway, 950
Marine hospitals, 3552-3
Masters and mates, 406, 562-4, 573-4, 979-87
Examiners, 1611
Militia
Cadet service, 3703
Headquarters officers, ques. 344
Mines Dept., explosives, 3804
Moving pictures of Canada, 1884
Naturalization, 3918
Naval Service, badges, 446
Necessaries, prices of, 327
Newfoundland, 4276, 4278-9, 4281
Cattle trade—veterinary, 2410
North Sydney
Harbour and breakwater, 2186, 3493-94
Terminal facilities, 875, 4241
Oleomargarine, 1875-7
Opium and Drug Bill, 1643-4, 1761, 1900
Ottawa city, agreement with, 578, 581, 989-91
Parliamentary restaurant, 3095-6
Patent Record, 1886
Peace Treaty, 1058-60
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3947
Fisheries and returned men, 3948
Pensioner resident outside of Canada, 4044-5
Vocational training, 3949
Widowed mother, 4044
Pictou harbour, 2186
Pilotage, 1967
Questions not answered, 949

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Railway Act Amdt. (Provincial jurisdiction) 3635
Railways, Govt. vs. private ownership, 872
Registration of shipping, 1614
Returned soldiers' insurance, 4054-5
Returned soldiers, 525
Soldier settlement, 527, 1695
Fishermen, aid to, 1691, 3948
St. John harbour—pilots, 2120
St. Lawrence dredging, 1617-20
Schools of navigation, 1612-3
Scottish Canadian Insurance Corporation, 583
Shipbuilding
Contracts, 911
Prices, 912
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3999, 4009-16, 4137, 4157, 4166
Sick and distressed mariners, 2266-7
Special War Revenue
Candy, 3593
Collection, method of, 3482
Debate on Bill, arrangements for, 3456
Excise and sales taxes
Returned soldier amdt. (Mr. Lemieux) 3452-3
Sporting goods, 3571-2
Spirits, illicit distillation, 3817
Statutes, suggested revision and consolidation, 3821, 4053
Steamboat inspection, 1051, 1767-76
Steamers "Champlain" and "Lady Grey," ques. 3619
Steel and shipping merger, 1965
Supply, interim, vote, 756
Supreme Court Act, 2315-16
Sydney harbour
South Bar lighthouse, 2116
Sydney Quarantine station, 3148
Sydney-Whycocomagh service, 4287
Terminal elevators, 1878-9
Ticket-of-leave system, 398
Treaty of Peace, ratification, 476
Wednesday evening sittings, 1045
Wharves and wharfage, 2123, 2189
Wheeler, Mr. S—rust proof wheat, 2388
Yukon and British Columbia, 3282

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R. (Brome)
Air service, 4555
Alien immigrants, 833
Asbestos, 4513
Banff National park, 3772
Board of Commerce—Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4474-8, 4494
Bright, John, on hours of labour, 326
Budget, 2518-20. Gross and net debt—taxation methods, 2521; inflation and rates of duty, 2522; deficit, and suggestions of economy, 2523; military preparations, 2523; public works, 2524; subsidies, 2525; taxation, methods, 2526; luxury taxes, 2528; tariff investigation, 2529; protection or free trade, 2530; United States free list—"Reduction Rimes," 2533

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R.—*Con.*
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Civil Service insurance, and, 1780
Canadian Mission in London, ques. 410
Canadian National Railways
Nomenclature and legislation, 3390
Taxation of, 3394
Withholding information, 1672-4, 1680
Coal Operations Director, 3694
Coinage
Deficient, 461
Silver—international standard, 400
Debates, difficulty of hearing, 1418
Eastern Townships, scenic beauty, 3538
Exchequer Court, 2204
Export regulations, 3622
Food and Drugs Bill, 955-9, 966-70
Franchise Bill, 738
Compulsory voting, 1062
Contributions—amdt. 1171, 1192-6
Paid propaganda, amdt. to 3r., 4374
Polling divisions, 1516, 1518-9
Proclamation, language of publication, 2284-5
Returning officers, 1524-5
Telegraph, communications by, 1068
Franking privilege, 3762-8
Grand Trunk Railway, 1313, 1325-8
Appeal from ruling of Chairman, 1327
House of Commons, pages, 3098-9
Indemnity of members, 4452
International Joint Commission—Sir William Hearst — Non-representation of Quebec, 3986
Irrigation, 3695-3701
Judges' salaries, 4419
Labour, Minister of, 4513
League of Nations, 3983
Expenses, Canada's contribution, ques. 410
Loan Companies, 1778
Militarism, 3706-7
Militia, Cadet service, 3704-8, 3706
Mines Department and Geological Survey, 4513
Missisquoi Bay, 3538
Naval Service badges, 444
News Service, 4333
Opium and Drug Bill, 1758

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R.—*Con.*
Palmer, Mr. K. H., ques. 1001
Parliament Building, 1418, 1429-30
Peace, 230-1
Peace Treaty, Ratification, 478, 3984
Pensions
French reservist from Canada, 4048
Widowed mothers, resident outside of Canada, 4045-6
Post Office Dept, postal rates, etc., 3738, 3756-8
Press censorship, ques. 541
Purchasing Commission, 1476
Race track betting, 3427-8, 3432
Regina Library, 396
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 396-7
Shipbuilding, 638, 666-7, 907-9
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3989-92, 4154-61
Special War Revenue, 3791
Administration — book of instructions suggested, 3791
Caps, 3566
"Excise and sales" and luxury taxes, 3466-7
Changes, date of coming into effect, 3607
Clocks and watches, 3574
Currency, foreign, depreciated, 3615
Fountain pens, 3577
Fuel, 3609
Glassware, cut, 3569
Imports and manufactures, 3566
Jewellery, 3582-4
Musical instruments, 3596
Neckwear, 3790
Proprietary medicines, 3603-4
Refunds, 3607
Socks, 3566
Sporting goods, 3570-1
Umbrellas, 3568
Underwear, 3568
Wedding rings, 3797
Steamboat inspection, 1770-75
Steamboat subsidies, 4515
T. Eaton Life Assurance Company, 669
Washington, Canadian representative at,

McMasterville, Explosive works at, 2247

McNichol, Mr. J. L. ques. 994

McQuarrie, Mr. W. G. (New Westminster)
Judges' salaries, 3853
Returned soldiers, 537

Magdalen Islands, 649, 1601, 4586
Visit of "Canadian Sealer," 649
Relief ships to, 1742
Steamship services, 4276-87

Magill, Dr., 4124-5, 4342-7

Maharg, Mr. John A. (Maple Creek)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 299. Farmers' movement, 299; reply to Sir Thomas White, 300; reply to Mr. McGibbon (Muskoka)—returned soldiers, 301; taxation of war profits, 302; tariff protection—proposed new Liberal and Conservative party, 303
Alien immigrants, 827, 839
Budget, 2632. Luxury taxes, 2632; Liberal party's tariff policy—Great Britain under free trade, 2633; Wheat Board and the farmers, 2635; farmers and purchase of American implements, 2636
Campaign funds, 1224
Canadian Wheat Board, 4131-5, 4346, 4351, 4355
Franchise Bill
Contributions, 783, 1189, 1191, 4373
Election expenses, 1154
Grand Trunk Railway, 1458
Indemnity of members, 4090
Opium and Drug Bill, 1634-7, 1641-2
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 395
Pensions, 615
Shipbuilding, inland waters, vessels for, 913
Soldier Settlement, cattle branding, 1700
Universal military training, 942

Mail Carriers, ques. 343. *See also* Civil Service; Post Office; Rural Mail

Manion, Mr. Robert J. (Fort William and Rainy River)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 211. Ontario and Quebec—Parliamentary librarian — Parliament Building, 211; proposed general election, 212; franchise, pensions, shipping, civil service, development, 212; tariff, 213; League of Nations, Canada's status, 214
Agricultural and industrial populations, ques. 1002
Budget. 2544. Tariff, 2544; free trade or moderate tariff, 2545; markets, 2547; foreign commerce, 2548; how to estimate prosperity and progress, 2550, 2634; railways, agriculture, pulpwood, minerals, 2552; foreign competition, 2554; tariff revision, 2554
Canadian Wheat Board, 4111
Chisholm, Col. H. A., ques. 3359
Coal Operations Director, 3179
Dairying—cheese, 2406

Manion, Mr. Robert J.—*Con.*
Food and Drugs Bill, 1636, 1642
Fort Frances public buildings, 3151-2
Franchise Bill
Advance and proxy voting, 1165
Contributions, 1190-1
Disqualification—charitable aid, those receiving, 1815, 1818-9
"Ecclesiastics," 1078
Non-residents and non-electors, 786
Voters' lists, 2429-30
Income tax—aliens in Canada, 3250
National resources development, M. in favour, 1017
Oleomargarine, 1864
Opium and Drug Bill, 1759
Returned Soldiers, M. for Special Com. 519
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 390
Shipbuilding—foreign trade, 906
Special War Revenue
Ethyl alcohol, 3604
Furniture, 3575
Medicines, 3627, 3631
Sporting Goods, 3571
War medals, ques. 1003, 1046, ques. 1120

Mann, Sir Donald, private car, ques. 2183

Mantezono. *See* Labrie

Manufacturers. *See also debates on* Address; Budget
Aid in appeals, 321
United States competition, 2857
Vessel rates, 1728

Maple Products Adulteration Bill. 1r., 582; 2r., 796; com, 796, 1254; 3r., 1256; Senate amdts., 2366, 4020

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Banff National park, 3777
Bonaventure
Experimental farms, ques. 414
Pensions, ques. 993
Postmasters, ques. 507
Public Works engineer, ques. 411
Wharves, ques. 411
Bonaventure and Gaspe, dairy products and fish, ques. 587
Bridges and the provinces, 3771-3
Campbellton-Cross Point
Bridge, ques. 3490
Ferry, ques. 342, ques. 411, ques. 588, ques. 1789, ques. 2415
Canadian National Railways—cars, 864
Chambly fort, 3725
Civil Service retirement, 3833
Dredging, 3783-7

Marcil, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Franchise Bill
Election expenses, 1932
Polls, hours to be open, 1921-2
Gascons wharf, ques. 411
International Joint Commission, 3986
League of Nations, 3982
Matapedia
Bridge and highway, 3780, ques. 411
Station, freights, ques. 587
Mines Dept., 3803
Explosives, 3804
Montreal barracks, 3724-7
Montreal-Quebec-Gaspe service, ques. 587
Newsprint shortage, 2968
Peat, 3806
Public works, resident engineers, 3787
Quebec and Western Railway, ques. 411, ques. 412
Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic Railway, ques. 411, ques. 412, ques. 507
Registered postal rate, 3732-5
Restigouche bridge, ques. 411
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3998
Special War Revenue
Lace, 3793
Prices, how arrived at, 3790
Spirits and beer, 3817-8
Tache, Mr. Chas. Eugene, ques. 3490
Tobacco, 3818-9

Marcile, Mr. J. E. (Bagot)
Acton Vale post office, ques. 1899
Bagot
Electoral list, ques. 2011
Postal inspection, ques. 2721
Flynn, Capt. Percy, ques. 2415
Franchise Bill, 1991-2
Military Service defaulters, ques. 507
Picard, Mr. Elzear, ques. 993
Ste. Rosalie-Bagot spur line, ques. 2009
Theodore d'Acton post office, ques. 2011

Margeson, Mr. J. W., ques. 1036

Marine. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canada Shipping Act. *For vessels, see that title*
Buoys, 2116
Department
Classification, 2113
Members of Parliament, treatment of, 2121
Services, restored to, 3507
Hospitals, 3552. *See also* Canada Shipping Act (Sick and Distressed Mariners)
Liquor shipments and, 2107
Wrecking plants, 1615, 2103
Wrecks, investigations, 1612

Marine and Fisheries
Com. appointed, 307

Maritime Provinces, Harbour Commissions, 3492-3

Marriage Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1787

Marriage Licenses, 3415

Marshall, Mr. David, M. P., death of, 1, 10

Martin, Mr. Peter F. (Halifax)
Fisheries
Benefits from government policy, 3535
Estimates, 3521
Halifax explosion, 3699
Voters' lists, 2337

Masonic Records in Parliament Tower, ques. 2894

Masters and Mates. *See that title under* Canada Shipping Act

Matapedia
Highway, ques. 411, 3780
Station, ques. 587

Matches—use of phosphorus, 356

Mayrand, Mr. Hormisdas (Maskinongé)
Louiseville postmaster, ques. 1739

Meat and Canned Goods Inspection, 2411

Medicines—*See* Foods and Drugs; Opium and Drugs; Inland Revenue; Proprietary; Special War Revenue

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 152; Farmers' movement a class movement, 153; franchise and conscription of aliens; reply to Mr. Caldwell—Canada's national status, 156; monetary exchange and trade, 157; proposed general election—Cabinet representation—illness of Prime Minister, 158; Union Government's mandate—government by commission, 159; vacancies, 160
Alien immigrants, 831, 2238-40
Alpine Club, 3288
Banff National park, 3771-2
Board of Commerce, Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4492-4500
British Columbia Indians, 386, 787-95, 950-5, 1047, 3273. *See also under this title,* Indian Act.

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Budget, 2683. "Advances unaccounted for," 2683; luxury taxes, 2684; income tax in Canada, in Great Britain and in New Zealand, 2685-2707; tariff—England as an example, 2686; balance of trade, Great Britain and the United States, 2687; people below the poverty line, 2688; effect of free trade on movement of population, 2689; British industry and free trade, 2690; United States an alleged free trade country, 2690; agricultural population in Great Britain and in Canada, 2690; Great Britain and Germany in the field of manufacture, 2691; British reports on industries—iron, steel, tinplate, 2692; electrical trades, engineering trades, 2695; cotton trade, textile industries, 2696; Liberal party and tariff, 2697; Farmers' party tariff plank, 2699; duty on agricultural implements, 2701; Mr. Fielding and "adequate protection," 2702; tariff and foodstuffs, 2703; answers to questions invited—Liberal and agrarian party platforms, 2704; Mr. Crerar and direct taxation—tax on unearned increment of land, 2706; tariff should remain in force pending revision, 2708
Canadian Forestry Association, 3285
Canadian National Railways and Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Information properly withheld, 1664, 1668-70
Canadian Wheat Board, 4115-24, 4136, 4346
Capital punishment, 1152
Coal Operations Director, 3690
Fuel situation, 3175, 3182-92
Orders in Council, 3186-9
Ratification of, 3361, 3365-75
Orders of Director, 3189-92
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. 704, 1048-50
Homesteading privileges to United States Soldiers, 1113, 1233-4
Dominion Water Powers Branch, 3289-93
Employment offices, 2313-4, 3087, 4512-3
Minister, powers of, 3092
Orders in Council, effect of, 3088-91
Explosive works at Beloeil, 2314
Franchise Bill, 756-9
Aliens—certificate, 2238-40
Grand Trunk Railway
Stocks, value of, 1562-3, 1572
Strike of 1910, 1556-64
Hurons of Lorette, 1152

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Indian Act Amdt. Bill, 386, 795-6, 4029-40, 4137, 4174
Indian lands (British Columbia) 386
Indians, 3265-80
Agents—salary and bonus, 3273
British Columbia, 3273
Caughnawaga, 3266-7
Education, 3277-80
Game laws and, 3280
Gordon's Reserve—school, 3270-1, 3278
Health and medical attendance, 3275
—Tuberculosis, 3276
Hurons of Lorette, 1152
Missionary work amongst, 3268
New Brunswick, 3273
Nova Scotia, 3273
Prairie Provinces and Northwest, 3267
Prince Edward Island, 3273
Reserves, surrender of, 3274
Self-sustaining, 3268
Sioux, 3267
Six Nations—education, 3280
Ungava—distress amongst — reindeer herds to be established, 3276
Yukon, 3274
Industrial Disputes, 1900-15, 1971-5, 1981-5, 2190-2200, 2248
International boundary surveys, 3293
Irrigation Act Amdt., 3358, 3694-3702
Joint Industrial Councils, 4512
Labour Dept. salaries, 4506
Lake Winnipeg and Elk Island, 3287
Macallum, Professor, 3806
Mill, John Stuart, and protection, 2907
Mines Dept. 3801-15, 4513
Coal, 3810
Dominion and provinces, 3803
Explosives, 3804
Explosions, avoidance of, 3814
Investigation of deposits, leases, etc., 3808
Lignite, 3805
Oil, 331, 3808-10
Overlapping, 3802
Peat, 3806
Resignations, salaries, etc., 3801-3805
Resources, alienation of, 3810
Road and structural material, 3808
National defence, 4302-4
National Industrial Conference, 4512
National parks, 3283, 3771
Naturalization—franchise and, 770-1
Natural resources of Western Provinces, 3293
Naval Service, 4302-4, 4315
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000 4393-7

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Northern Canada's area, resources and administration, 3280-4
Northwest Game Act Amdt. 2892
Oil—Canada's position and resources, 331
Peace Conference Labour Bureau, 4507
Permanent Force, 3210-1
Provincial affairs and federal aid, 833
Reindeer—caribou, 3276, 3284
St. John River water-powers, 3290-3
Seed grain advances, 3286-8
Soldier Settlement, 1289, 1685-1702, 2127-50, 3218-24
Administration—criticism, 3223
Defaults, 3223
Fishermen, 3219
Irrigated lands, 3223
Loans, employment for districts, 3220
Ministerial explanation, 3192-4
Provincial free grants and, 3223
Repayments, 3218
Solicitors' fees, 3218
Staff, salaries, 3221-3
Training and allowances, 3224
Surveys, 3293
Tariff, personal position on—Mr. Crerar's criticism, 2900
Tar sands, 333
Technical Education, 1761
Yukon administration, 3281-2
British Columbia and, 3282
Yukon Placer Mining Act, 2892, 3106, 4264

Members of Parliament. *See also* House of Commons
Attendance of in House, 2782-6

Members' Indemnity. *See* **House of Commons**

Members' Stenographers, salaries of, ques. 2311

Menace, the, ques. 1899

Mennonites, emigration to United States, 2127, 2179, 2248

Mercantile Marine. *See* Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine; Canada Shipping Act

Metabetchouan postmaster, ques. 1120, 2876

Meteorological Service, 2125

Methylated Spirits for industrial power, 324, 3820-1

Mewburn, Hon. Sidney C. (East Hamilton)
Battlefields Committee, 2078
Resignation as Minister, 447

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 214. Popular unrest—proposed general election, 215
American loans, ques. 313
Begin, Cardinal, insult to, 1574
Edmundston post office, ques. 2722
Franchise Bill
Oaths, administration of, 779
Proclamation, language of publication, 1828-32
Returning officers, 1591
Newspaper postage rates, 3349
Railway cars, 1114
Roy, Mr. Gustave, ques. 1898
St. John river—International Commission, ques. 1623
Special War Revenue—boots, 3565
Theriault and St. Quentin, N.B., 3080
Wheat exports and imports, ques. 313, ques. 590

Middlebro, Mr. W. S. (North Grey)
Food and Drugs Bill, 960
Franchise Bill
Contributions—Amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 1193-4
Polling divisions, 1517
Returning officers, 1580-1
Highways, payments to Ontario, 1046
House of Commons staff, 1038
Income tax—charities, 3246

Middlings. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs; Grain

Militarism. *See* Cadet

Military College, 3152

Military districts in Quebec, ques. 1035

Military Police, ques. 804; ques. 805

Military Service Act
Agricultural representatives, 3399
Collections by Mr. Cimon, ques. 1461; ques. 1462
Defaulters
Chicoutimi, ques. 409
Fines, ques. 507, ques. 543
Military Service branch, 4516

Military Training, 923. *See also* Militia; Cadet Service

Military Uniforms
Colleges, etc., for, ques. 413

Militia and Defence
Active militia—allowances, 3654
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to reduce, 3657; neg. 3673
Air Service, 4553
Annual drill, 3674
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to reduce, 3675; neg. 3679
Arsenals Dominion
Lindsay, 3717
Quebec—employees, ques. 1898
Associations, grants to, 3725
Cadet service, 3702
Contingencies, 3714
Customs dues, 3716
Demobilization, 4549
Department
Classification, ques. 3358, 4019
Headquarters officers who did not see service in France, ques. 506
London employees, ques. 671
Permanent appointments, ques. 2079
Printing and stationery, 4549
Engineer services and works, 3723
Headquarters staff, ques. 344, ques. 1511, 4548
Levis drill hall, ques. 1360
Military instructors for educational institutions, ques. 413
Military Service Branch, 4516
Ministerial statement, 3636
Military properties, maintenance, 3726
Ordnance, arms, lands, etc., 3727
Permanent Force, 4548
Barracks, 4579
Commissions to N.C.O.'s, ques. 3619
Flynn, Capt. Percy, ques. 2415
Quebec's ancient fortifications, 421
Rifle ranges—Connaught, ques. 671
Long Branch, 3728
Staff, 4548
Training areas, 4549
Transport and freight, 4549
Uniforms for colleges, ques. 413
Use of exhibition buildings by, ques. 2009
Warlike stores, 4549

Militia Pensions Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 1r., 3959; 2r., 4020; Com. 4020; 3r., 4021

Millers. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs; Grain

Miners' Disputes. *See under* Coal Operations

Mines and Minerals. *See also* Natural Resources; Yukon Placer
Asbestos, 4513
Coal. *See that title*
Com. appointed, 307

Mines and Minerals—*Con.*
Copper, 4513
Department, 3801. *See also* Geological Survey
Employees, resignation, ques. 672, 3802, 4512
Labour in, 370
Machinery, imported, ques. 1625
Oil, 331, 3281, 3808-10
Unused mineral deposits, 3810

Ministers of the Crown. *See also* Cabinet
Absence of, from Seat of Govt. 39
Attendance in Parliament, 51
Disqualification as candidate for House of Commons, 1086
Resignations of, 386, 447
Salaries, 3228, 4379

Minneapolis stockyards, 3166-7

Mint. *See also* Coinage; Ottawa Mint Act
The Royal, Ottawa Branch, 565

Missisquoi Bay, Net fishing, 3535-8

Molloy, Mr. J. P. (Provencher)
Elevators, ques. 1358
Franchise Bill
Polling divisions, 1518
Returning officers, 1595
Notices of motion, inquiry, 1628

Monroe Doctrine, 4294, 4310, 4404

"Montcalm," Icebreaker, 1060. *See also* Icebreakers

Montmagny, Colonization lots in, ques. 1229

Montreal
Corn Exchange, vessel rates, 1727
Harbour, wharves, ques. 674
Immigrants, landing at, 3226-8

Montreal and Hull Highway, 1113

Morden, Col., 1948

Morphy, Mr. Hugh B. (North Perth)
Active militia—allowances, 3659
British North America Act Amdt. 811
Canadians in Imperial service—Capt. Barron, 857
Cattle trade, 2373
Dairy industry, 2403-4
Difficulty in hearing debates, 463
Eight-hour day, 452-5
Franchise Bill
Chief Electoral officer—Mr. Biggar, K.C., 4267
Conveying voters, 1061

Morphy, Mr. Hugh B.—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Counting and reporting vote, 1109
False statement made to affect election, 1066
Interpretation, "Candidate" 1943-4
Liquor on polling day, 1108-9
Peace and good order, 1106
Polls, hours to be open, 1924-5
Proclamation—language of publication, 1829-30, 2274, 2285, 2293-6, 2304-6
Provincial lists, 3898
Returning officers
Oath of, 1166
Public officials, 1797
Voters' lists, 2425-6
Franking privilege, 3764-7
Grand Trunk Railway
Strike of 1910, and pensions, 1128, 1133, 1537-9, 1566, 4509-11
Government annuities, 463
House of Commons staff, 4565
Industrial disputes, 2197
Intercolonial Railway, 1443
League of Nations
Armenia, 3979
Enforcement of decisions, 3976
Provinces of Canada, position of, 452
Secret treaties, 3973-4
Second meeting, 3978
United States, 3981-2
Lignite, 3805
Militia—Dominion arsenals, 3718-9
National defence, 4302-3
Newspaper postage, 3753
Oil—leases, etc., 3809
Peat, 3807
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, provincial authorities and, 3196
Rulings and statements as Chairman
Chair to be addressed, 4481
Decorum, 4481
Judiciary, reference to, 4483
Shipbuilding advances Bill, 4149, 4163
Soldier Settlement, 1688, 2153
Steel ammunition charges, 3718-9
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 586

Morrison's Limited, ques. 997

Motions, Inquiries concerning, 1628

Motor Cars. *See* Automobiles

Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Moving Pictures
Canada film service, 1882
Canadian National Pictorial, 4544
Tax on, removal of, 2487, ques. 3489

Mowat, Mr. Herbert M. (Parkdale)
Active militia—allowances, 3658-9
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 56. Proposed general election—by-election in Assiniboia, 56; Hon. Mr. Blondin—French Canadian Cabinet representation, 57; Liberal party and war policy, 58; Union party and Liberal members—conscription and party, 59
Budget, 2576. Congratulations to Finance Minister—tariff, 2576; agricultural implement prices—tariff and manufacturing concerns from United States, 2577; Mr. Fielding and tariff, 2578; militia expenditure and military preparedness, 2579; Imperialism, 2580
Canada Security Assurance Company, 1103
Canadian Expeditionary Force, ques. 1200
Civil Service retirement, 4067, 4464
Divorce Bills, remission of charges, 4413
Franchise Bill
Ballot—black border, 1168
Compulsory voting, 1064
Contributions — Assiniboia expenses, 1174-8
Election officers, 3868
Non-residents and non-electors, 785
Judges' salaries and pensions, 4426
Naval service, 3510
Badges, 441
Oleomargarine, 1873-4
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4152
Special War Revenue
Food, explanation desired, 3632-3
T. Eaton Life Assurance Company, 669
Toronto military property, 3728, 3730
Universal military training, M. in favour of, 923

Municipal Employees, Industrial Disputes Investigation Act and, 1902

Munitions Resources Commission, 2892

Murdock, Mr. *See* Board of Commerce

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 231. Reply to Mr. Rowell—Religious orders from France, 231; secretarial fund, 238; Mr. Rowell's income tax, 240; expenditures on conferences, publicity, etc., 241; Department of Health—Mounted Police, 242; Mr. Rowell and his colleagues, 245; Peace Treaty and League of Nations—eight-hour day, 246; circular of Orange order, 249; proposed general election, 254

Murphy, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Board of Commerce, Robson, Judge, resignation of, 11, 114
Budget, inquiry as to, 1047
Dominion Lands Act (United States Soldiers) 1234
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1999
Interpretation, 1986-8, 1987, 1988
Pass on railway, 1065
Telegraph, communications by, 1069
Grand Trunk Railway, 1242-3, 1250
Greek wheat contract, ques. 509
National debt, ques. 309
Naval defence policy, ques. 309
Newsprint Supply, 2893
Parliament Building, ques. 311; ques. 311 Cost, etc., 311
Parliamentary Com., ques. 311
P. Lyall Company, 3156
Point of order—comment on document quoted, 234-6
Prime Minister, illness and absence of, 9
Shipbuilding—contracts and prices, 901-2
Vatican Mission, ques. 310

Murray Bay-Tadoussac Service, 652

Mutual Insurance Companies, taxation of, ques. 2012, 2080

Myers, Mr. E. T. W. (Kindersley)
Canada Grain Act, 3823
Flax fibre grants, ques. 806
Wheat trade, 3823-4

National Battlefields Commission, 421

National Council of Women, oleomargarine and, 1841

National Debt, ques. 309. *See also* Finance
Loans in the United States, ques. 313

National Defence, 4302

National Industrial Conference, 4512

National Parks, 3769

National Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National

Natural Resources.
M. (Mr. Manion) in favour of development, 1017
Prairie provinces, of, ques. 995, 1047, ques. 1461, 3049, 3293
Royal Commission on, ques. 4502

Naturalization, 817. *See also* Aliens; Dominion Franchise, aliens, qualification of electors
Imperial citizenship, and, ques. 996
Papers, fraudulent, ques 4096

Naturalization Act, 1914, Amdt. Bill. 1r., 3682; 2r., com., 3914; 3r., 3922; Senate amdts. 4416

Naval Defence, ques. 309. *See also* Naval Service
Admiral Jellicoe's report, 308
Statement by Minister of the Naval Service, 3498

Naval Service
Additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4380
Badges, 437, ques. 506
Canadian officers, 4299
Civil Service Insurance and, 1779
Coast defence of Canada, United States and, 4294, 4298
Construction, programme of nations, 4301
Correspondence with Imperial Government, 4408, 4413, 4503
Demobilization, 4299
Estimates, how considered, 4380, 4411
Halifax and Esquimalt depots, 4296-7, 4307, 4390, 4394
Naval college, graduates, 4562
Naval conference of 1921, 4300
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," 4292-3. *See also that title*
Salaries of Dept., 4409
Ship construction, material, ques. 1114
Statement by Minister, 707

Navigation, aid and protection of, 2115
Schools of, 1612
St. Lawrence River—Ile d'Orleans, 3295

Navigation Rates. *See* Railway Act Amdt.

Navy, ques. 540. *See also debates under* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Naval Service
Jellicoe, Admiral, 11. *See also that title*
Ships from Great Britain, 4413

Navy League of Canada, ques. 802

Nesbitt, Mr. E. W. (North Oxford)
Chairman, Committee of the Whole, Rulings as, 1326
Unanimous consent for statement in Supply, 2379
Civil Service retirement, 3833
Colonial Investment and Loan, 3859
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3403
Demonstration farms, 2396

Nesbitt, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Eight-hour day, 376
Food and Drugs Bill, 958, 963, 1257-8
Franchise Bill, 1066
Fuel, transportation cost, 330
House of Commons staff, 4565-6
Income tax
Beneficiaries, 3243
Charities, 3247, 3312
Deficits and losses, 3240-1
Five per cent added, 3251-2
Indemnity of members, 3242
Returns, 3253-4
Stock dividends, 3239-40
Judges' salaries, 3851
Natural resources, oil leases, 3810-3
Naval service badges, 445-6
Newspaper postage rates, 3348
Pensions, 433
Widowed mother resident outside Canada, 4045
Returned soldiers, 528
Insurance, 4054-5
Report of Committee, 1082
Rural mail carriers, 4522
Senate staff, 4060
Soldier settlement, 2129-30, 2138-43
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Automobiles, 3599
Collection, method of, 3344-5
Prices, effect on, 3330
Steel and shipping merger, 1952-3
Western Assurance Company, 3860

Neuville Station, ques. 2721

Newfoundland
Cape Race light, 2117
Trade with, 4241, 4242, 4276-7

New Parliament Buildings. *See* Parliament Buildings

New York—Canadian publicity branch at, 1882

Newspaper Postage. *See* Post Office Act Amdt.

Newspapers. *See also* Newsprint; Post Office Act Amdt.; Press
Payments to for printing, ques. 1114
Propaganda, and, 4375

Newsprint
Control, ques. 588, ques. 2720
Controller, resignation of, ques. 315, ques. 589
Embargo, ques. 994
Exportation and embargo, 1358, ques. 1114

Newsprint—*Con.*
Legislation, inquiry as to, 3227
Statement of Finance Minister, 2967
Supply, 2893

News Service, ques. 414, 4532

Nichols, Mr. M. E., ques. 1118

Nicholson, Mr. George B. (East Algoma)
Board of Commerce, Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4483
Budget, 2796. Liberals and free trade, 2796; congratulations to Minister of Finance—luxury tax—Mr. Fielding's amendment, 2797; contradictory tariff policies of members of Opposition, 2798; forty years' tariff policy of Government side, 2799; articles that would be duty-free under proposed King-Crerar government, 2801; personal position on fiscal questions, 2802; tariff and cost of living, 2803; Hon. E. C. Drury and others on cost of food production—development of natural resources, 2804; British fiscal policy—Mr. Crerar criticised, 2805; Timiskaming by-election and One Big Union, 2807; class prejudice and Bolshevism, 2808
Franchise Bill
Advance and proxy voting, 1163
Aliens—certificate, 2075, 2094
Deposit, 1094
Grand Trunk strike of 1910, and pensions, 1132
Income tax, 3476
Aliens in Canada, 3250-1
Errors in returns, 3302
Five per cent added, 3252
"Householders," 3249, 3315
Indemnity of members, 4093
Indians—Gordon's Reserve school, 3271
Industrial disputes, 1976-80, 2193-8
Military training, 3711
Militia, Cadet service, 3711
Newspaper postage, 3758
Opium and Drug Bill, 1755
Race track betting, 3429
Returned soldiers, 534
Pensions, 535
Widowed mother, 4042, 4052
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Boats, canoes, etc., 3590-1
Changes—when to come into effect, 3608
Collection, method of, 3474
Machinery for collection, 3324

Nile Voyageurs, 3857

"Niobe" and "Rainbow," 4293, 4297, 4401. *See also* Ballantyne, Hon. Mr., Naval Affairs

North Bay, 3160
Canadian Northern right-of-way and, ques. 3619

North Lake, 3159

North Sydney Harbour, 875, 2186, 3493-4

Northwest Game Act Amdt. 1r., 2892; 2r., com., 3r., 3105-6

Northwest Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Northwest Territories, administration of, 3280

Notices of Motion, inquiry as to, 2012

Notices, publication of in Canada Gazette, ques. 2179

Nova Scotia Steel Company. *See* Pictou Harbour

Noxious Weeds, 3171. *See also* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Oaths of Office Bill, 1

Oats, 565. *See* Canada Grain Act

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., ques. 3618. *See also* Board of Commerce

Oil
Canada's resources, 331. *See also* Mines

Old Age. *See* Government annuities

Oleomargarine, ques. 543, 1010, ques. 1117
Butter, and, food values, ques. 2720
Imports, 597, 604, 606, 612
Regulations, ques. 1627

Oleomargarine Act Amendment Bill. Res. 1405, 1781, 1840; 1r., 1877; 2r., 1968; com., 1968; 3r., 1971

Oliver-St. Paul de Métis Railway, 344, 871

O'Meara, Mr., 792-3, 4038

One Big Union, ques. 409, 2807, 2897, 3039

Ontario
Highways—contribution to, 1046
Immigration, and, 1012

Opium, 24, 141
Convention (International). *See* debate on Opium and Drug Bill

Opium and Drug Bill. Res. 557; 1r., 562; 2r., 1621, 1629; com. 1632, 1744; 3r., 1900; Senate amdts., 3081

Orange order, 249, 285

Oranges and Figs grown in the open in British Columbia, 1016

Orders in Council. *See also* War Measures; Coal operations
Employment offices, 3087
Legislation and Government by, 31, 38, 177, 2018, 2020-1

Orientals
Canada, in, 825
Vote, and, *See* Dominion Franchise

Orleans, Island of, public works, ques. 810

Ostend, Allies Conference at, 2476, 2574

Ottawa
Agreement with Corporation, 557. *See also* Ottawa Agreement Bill
Connaught Rifle Range, 3728
Daly building, rental of, ques. 1200
Mackenzie Avenue, ques. 999
Public buildings, 3154
New, ques. 1002
Wellington street—public building, ques. 1002

Ottawa Agreement Bill. Res. 576, 557, 1r., 581; 2r., com., 988; 3r., 1047

Ottawa Improvement Commission. *See debates under* Ottawa Agreement

Ottawa Mint Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 615; 1r., 616; 2., com., 3r., 798

Otter, Sir William Dillon, ques. 673

Overdrafts, bank. *See* Special War Revenue

Oxford County, Ont., products, 1010

Pacaud, Mr. L. T. (Megantic)
Budget, 3020. The public burdens, 3020; tariff for revenue—programme of the Farmers' party, 3021; cost of living and development of natural resources—line of demarcation between the parties, 3022
Rural mail—Mr. Joseph Houle, ques. 2313

Palmer, Mr. K. H., ques. 1001

Paper, Manufacture of. *See debates on* Scientific Research
Newsprint. *See that title*

Papineau, Mr. Louis J. (Beauharnois)
Board of Commerce, M. 3863
Canadian Northern, total liability, ques. 2011

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)
Budget, 2740. Mr. Meighen and the new party—tariff revision, 2740; the consumer and taxes—the new taxes, 2741; address in Montreal, 2742; textile industries and protection, 2743; effect of new taxes upon population, 2744
Canadian Mercantile Marine, insurance, ques. 1511
Canadian National Railways
Deficit, 888-9
Fire insurance, ques. 1623
Withholding of information, 1663
Experimental and demonstration farms, 2382-4, 2388
Franchise Bill, 731
Advance polls, 1999-2001
Aliens certificate, 2063-70, 2225-6, 2230-2, 2238-9
Amdt. moved, 2226; neg. 2242
Election expenses, 1153
False statements made to affect election, 1065
Indians, 2056-7
Name not on list—oaths, 3878
Personation, etc., 1159
Plugging, 2350
Polling stations, additional, 1826
Provincial lists, 2350, 3883, 3889-93
Voters' lists, addition and elimination of names, 3911-2
Writ, nomination, election, delay, 1092
Grand Trunk Railway, strike of 1910, and pensions, 1553-6
Naturalization, 3916
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3938
Purchasing Commission, 1474
Roumanian orders, insurance, ques. 1739
Soldier settlement, 1684, 3192-3

Parent, Mr. George (Quebec West)
Barracks, 3725
Board of Commerce, ques. 408
Business profits tax, public utilities, 3230
By-election lists, ques. 310
Canadian National Railways, 3377
Census of 1911, ques., 2009
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill—M. for 3r., 3423
Food and Drugs Bill, 972-6
Franchise Bill
False statement to affect election, 1067
Payment of voters' expenses, 1065
Undue influence — "spiritual injury," 1158

Parent, Mr. George—*Con.*
Fuel situation, 331
Grand Trunk Railway — administration, 4173
Immigrants landing at Montreal and Quebec, 3226-8
Income tax, stocks below par, 3238
International boundary surveys, 3293
League of Nations, French occupation of German territory, 1046
Magdalen Islands, 649
Mail delivery—Monday holidays, 3354, 4522
Naturalization—certificate, 3917-8
Neuville station, ques. 2721
Peace, declaration of, ques. 801
Peace Treaties, 1059
Pilots, pensions, 4579-80
Public debt and revenue, ques. 592, 753
Quebec riots of 1918, 1202
Correspondence from sufferers, 1203-8
Shipbuilding, 649, 668
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4165-8
Special War Revenue Act Amdt.
Automobiles, 3598
Beer used to make vinegar, 3604
Furniture, 3575
Jewellery, 3580
Skis, 3570-1
Water-powers, surveys, etc., 3289-92

Pari-Mutuel machines, 3415

Parliament, Sessions of
Extra session, 1919, cost of, ques. 543
Time of, 756

Parliament Buildings, 12, 76, 96, 106, 143, 221, 282, ques. 705
Commons chamber floor, ques. 2894
Cost, contractors, architects, ques. 311
Door contract, ques. 320
Fittings and Furniture, 1433, 3155
Gargoyles, 1433, 1493
Heating, plant, ques. 2896
King, the, message from, 1
Material supplied, ques. 311, ques. 705
Post Office, ques. 3294
Scaffolding, ques. 3079
Speeches on the occasion of their occupation, 2
Tower, alleged masonic records in, ques. 2894
Vote for in Supply, 1416

Parliamentary Counsel, 4587. *See also,* Dominion Franchise Bill

Parliamentary Library, 211, 1426
Librarian, 114. *See also* DeCelles, Mr.

Parliamentary Procedure. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker; Douglas, Mr. J. M.; Morphy, Mr.; Nesbitt, Mr.; Steele, Mr.
Bill disposed of—question not to be raised during same session, 3426
Unanimous consent refused, 3423, 3821
3r., Industrial Disputes Bill, 2200

Parliamentary Restaurant, 47, 3094
Joint Committee, 437
Official list for, 2842-3

Parliamentary Secretaries, ques. 1036

Patent Medicines *See* Proprietary

Patent Record, 1886

Patents of Invention Bill 1r, 505

P. Burns Company, 582

Peace. *See also* League of Nations; Peace Conference; Peace Treaty
Declaration of, ques 801
Time and proclamation of, 231

Peace Conference
Economic Condition of the world, declaration on, 1888
Eight-hour day and, 335
Labour bureau, 4506-7

Peace Treaty, 12, 16, 96, 124
A potential cause of war, 927
Bulgaria, with, ques. 316, 463. *See also* Peace Treaty Bill
Res. and ministerial statement, 346
Senate concurrence, 1054
France—protection against Germany, 1059
Hungary and Turkey, 3983, 1060
Translation of, 3084

Peace Treaty Bill (Bulgaria) 1r., 949; 2r., com., 1057; 3r., 1061

Peat, 3806
Alfred plant, ques. 671

Peck, Lieut.-Col. Cyrus W., V.C., (Skeena)
Artillery, Canadian, in war, 3662
Empire Day adjournment, 2574
Fisheries, ques. 505
British Columbia salmon—trap fishing—parcelling out of fisheries—cannery licenses—hatcheries—Chief Inspector—monopoly opposed, 3525-33
Development, 854
Japanese and, 844-5, 3532
Fisheries
Naval Service and, 3532
Salmon hatcheries, 849-50, 3525

Peck, Lieut.-Col. Cyrus W., V.C.—*Con.*
Indians, British Columbia, 792-5, 3273
Agents, salaries, 3273
Enfranchisement, 4038-40
Militia—Active militia, allowances, 3662-8
Pensions, 434
Com. report—on m. to adopt, 3932
Amdt. 3933, 3952; withdrawn, 3956
M. for Special Com., 513
Resignation from Com., 2081
Returned men and fishing industry, 3932, 3938-40, 3956
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 390
Saar Valley Commission, 344
Senate, cost of, ques. 1118
Surveys, 3293
Uniforms, unlawful wearing of, 3417
Water-powers of British Columbia, ques. 1118
Winnipeg Grain Exchange, ques. 2005

Pecuniary Claims Convention, 3857

Pedlow, Mr. Isaac E. (South Renfrew)
Agriculture, problems and progress of, 2391-5
Armenians, 855
Audibility of debates, 461
Board of Commerce, 4494
Correspondence, 3426
O'Connor, Mr., reported resignation of, 1684
Civil servants with war record, 3129-30
Civil Service
Re-organization, 3741
Retirement, 4462-6
Demonstration farms, 2391
Food and Drugs Bill, 964-71, 1258-62
Prosecutions, 1263-4
Franchise Bill
Advance voting, and voting by mail, 1163-5
Contributions, 1196
Election officers, 1077
Telegraph, communications by, 1068-9
Income tax
Accounting period, 3306-8
Indemnity of members, 3243, 3306
Suggestions, 3124, 3128
Ireland, condition of, 856
Maple products, 1256
Mennonites, 2127, 2179
Mines Dept., resignations, 3804
Opium and Drug Bill, 1638-9, 1748, 1751-2
Pictou harbour, 2186
Postage stamps, used for inland revenue, 3737
Quorum, 964
Renfrew post office, 3151

Pedlow, Mr. Isaac E.—*Con.*
Slidemaster, retirement of, 446
Soldier settlement, 2131
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 3326
Candy, etc., 3592
Clocks and watches, 3574
Clothes, 3563-4
Collection, method of, 3470
Commodity tax, 3319, 3330
Importations, 3795
Jewellery, 3581
Lace, manufacture of, 3791-2
Licenses, 3606-7
Manufacturer who is also retailer, 3468
Overcoats, 3586
Prices, 3340
Purses, shopping bags, 3568
Pyjamas, 3567
Retail Merchants' Association, 3342
Returned soldier, amdt. (Mr. Lemieux) 3452
Sales taxes, 3612
Silk, 3563
Silk clothing, 3790
Silk waists, 3631-2
Socks, etc., 3567, 3791
Sporting goods, 3570
Stamp taxes, 3800-1
Stock transfers, 3626
Taxes, how paid, 3587-8
United States taxes, 3472

Pelletier, Mr. F. J. (Matane)
Cole, Mr. W. B., ques. 2893
Illustration farms, 2382-4, 2388
Industrial disputes, 1983
Masters and mates, 986
Oil, 3811-2
Sparrow, Dr. C. J., ques. 1897

Penitentiary Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 2842; 2r., 3409; Com., 3409; 3r., 3410

Penitentiaries. *See also* Justice; Labrie Brothers
Alberta, ques. 2777, 3855
Appointments pending, 568
Manitoba, ques. 2574
Portsmouth, vacancies in chief positions, 568
Purchasing agent, 3840, 3854
Saskatchewan, ques. 2574
Stoneham, case, 568

Pensions, ques. 993, ques. 994. *See also* Pensions and Re-establishment; Pensions Act
Board of Commissioners, 614
Employees, ques. 2895
Soldier organizations and, ques. 1116
Margeson, Mr. J. W., ques. 1036

Pensions—*Con.*
District offices, closing of, 710, 857
St. John, N.B., 1742
Militia. *See* Militia Pensions Act
Royal Canadian Mounted Police. *See that title*
Taxation of, 1895
Widow and children, ques. 920
Widowed mothers, res. (Mr. Power) 427. *See also* Pensions Act

Pensions and Re-establishment—Special Com.
Appointment of Com., resolutions in favour
Andrews, Mr., 511
Rowell, Mr., 614; agreed to, Com. appointed, 615, 799
Reports, 1199, 3801
Adoption of final report
Res., (Mr. Cronyn) in favour, 3922, agreed to, 3957
Amdt. (Mr. Peck) subsidies to fishermen, 3932-3; withdrawn, 3956
Printing, 3822, 4321
Recommendations not embodied in Bill, how to be carried into effect; inquiry answered by Prime Minister, 4504
Resignations
Lang, Mr., (reported) 1085
Peck, Mr., 2081

Pensions Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 3864; 3959; 1r., 3961; 2r., Com., 4041; 3r., 4053
Additional pension, 4048
Drafting, 4041
Pensioner resident outside Canada, 4044-52
Widowed mother, 4041-50

Permanent Force. *See* Militia

Peterborough
Government Employees, ques. 542
Postmaster, ques., 342

Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Amdt. Bill. Res. 1573, 1762; 1r., 1762; 2r., com., 3r., 1916

Phosphorus, 356

Picard, Mr. Elzear, ques. 993

Pictou, East River lock, ques. 1119

Pictou Harbour Bill. Res. 1945, 2184; 1r., 2190; 2r., 3491; com., 3491; 3r., 3494

Pigs, Feeding of. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Pilotage, 1839, 2119, 4579. *See also* Canada Shipping Act
St. John, 2119

Placer Mining. *See* Yukon

Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Political Campaign Funds, 1063-4. *See also* Dominion Franchise; Assiniboia
M. (Mr. Burnham) prohibiting, 1216

Pollution of boundary waters, 3552

Ponton, Mr. G., ques. 341

Popular Unrest, 22, 63, 816, 1145

Population
Agricultural and industrial, 191, ques. 1002
And taxation, 3297

Port Arthur
Board of Trade—vessel rates, resolution, 1733
Canadian National Railway terminals, ques. 2012
Fort William, and, elevators, ques. 1358

Port Hood, 3159

Port Maitland, 4579

Portage la Prairie public building, 3156

Portal Immigration hall, ques. 674

Porter, Mr. Arthur S., dismissal of, 568

Ports, tax on ships arriving in, 2253

Postal Inspection—Bagot Co., ques., 2721

Postmaster General—Senate, member of, 3734. *See also* Blondin, Hon. Mr.

Post Office. *See also* Civil Service; Mail Carriers;
For individual post offices see their titles
Bilingual stamps, ques. 314
Department
Estimates, supplementary, 4518
Letter carriers, 1231, 1276
Classification, 345, 1231, 3424
Salaries and threatened strike, 2670, 3424, 3623-4
Toronto, 345
Magazines, postage rate on, ques. 1898
Money parcel ($50,000) lost, ques. 412
Offices in cities, province of Quebec, ques. 413
Parcel post—Dr. Michel Fiset, 2015
Parliament, hours of, ques. 3294
Rural mail carriers, ques. 414, ques. 506, ques. 591, 1233, 1282-3, 4522. *See also* Rural Mail

Post Office Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 2184; 3346; 1r., 3358; 2r., com., 3732; 3r., 3768. Senate amdts. 4263
Free matter, 3761
Newspapers and periodicals, 3745
Registration fee, 3732

Post Office and Customs Depts.
Rumoured investigation by United States firm, 3491, 3623

Potatoes.
Bags, 4562
Exportation of, ques. 1360

Poultry, Feeding of. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Power, Mr. Charles G. (South Quebec)
Board of Commerce, M. for abolition, 1146, 1150
Canadian Alpine Club, 3288
Canadian Currency on United States lines of Canadian National Railways, ques. 341
Canadian Forestry Association, 3285
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 644-5
"Canadian Recruit," wreck of, 648
"Canadian Sealer," Magdalen Islands trip, 649
Steamers. *See also, under this title,* Icebreakers
Crews, uniforms, ques. 1003
"Lady Grey" ques. 1361
Canadian National Railways, cargo for ships, 915
Champlain market, 2015
Court martial procedure, ques. 1359
Federal Bureau of Education, 1388
Firearms licenses, 3411-2
Franchise Bill, 777
Aliens—certificate, 2239
Bribery, treating, undue influence, personation, 1157-9
Canada Temperance Act, 2053-4
Disqualification, returned soldiers exempted from, 1811, 1820-4
"Elector," how defined, 1916-8
Executory contracts void, 781
Interpretation, 1991
"Candidate," 1944
Judges, revising officers, 722
Language of voter, 1997
Non-residents and non-electors, 786
Notices—handbills, 1169
Polling stations, additional, 1826-7
Polls, hours to be open, 1923-4
Returning officers, 1583-4, 1596

Power, Mr. Charles G.—*Con.*
Franchise Bill—*Con.*
Voters' lists, use of for advertising, 2319-20
French speeches in House, translation of, 702
Grain trade, 661
Grosse Isle, ques. 1003
Gulf of St. Lawrence Trading Company, 4285
Icebreakers, 1602-5. *See also, under this title,* Steamers
"Montcalm," 1606-7
Uniforms of men on, 1603-4
Indemnity of members, 1281, 4087
Indians—Sioux, 3267
Magdalen Islands-Belle Isle, 1605
Militia Department
Classification of employees, ques. 3358
Permanent appointments, ques. 2079
Newsprint, 3227
Peace treaties—Anatolia and Smyrna, 3984
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3946
Drafting of Bill, 4041
Offices, rumoured closing of, 710
Taxation of pensions, 1895
Widowed mother, 427, 436, 4041, 4051
Amdt. ruled out of order, 4052
Profiteering, etc., 1146
Quebec
Ancient fortifications, 421, 427
Arsenal employees, ques. 1898
Bridge, ques. 1116, ques. 1229
Marine storehouse, ques. 316
Port, grain trade, 858
Riots of 1918, 1210
Returned soldiers, res. (Mr. Andrews) for Special Com., 523
Shipbuilding, 661, 915
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, ques. 2311
Soldier Settlement, 2141-7, 2151, 3222-3
Vocational training and, 3223
Spirit Lake, 2398-9
Stewart farm, 3223

Prairie Provinces
Natural Resources, ques. 995, 1047, ques. 1461, 3049, 3292

Press, The, 4532. *See also* Newsprint; Post Office; Censorship
Murray, Mr. G. M. and the, 2753

Press Conference. *See* Imperial

Press Gallery Reporters, 3747, 3750, 4411, 4503

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. (Terrebonne)
Automobiles, smuggled, ques. 807, ques. 1001

Prevost, Mr. Jules E.—*Con.*
Board of Commerce, ques. 996
Budget, 2771. Government and commissions, 2771; profits and cost of living—Board of Commerce, 2772; increases in expenditure—Liberal party and tariff revision, 2773; manufacturing industries Union Government, 2774; govts. made for the people, 2775
Civil Service Classification, ques. 2413
Customs war tax, ques. 1001
Dominion revenues, ques. 1001

Price Brothers. *See* Board of Commerce; Newsprint

Prime Minister, absence, illness, return, 137. *See also* Borden, Sir Robert
Denial by Leader of Opposition of statement attributed to him, 80
Effect of absence on parliamentary government, 129
Head of Department, 4456
Illness, 63, 158
Portfolio, and, 4456
Return, inquiry concerning, 2126
Enters the House, 2316

Prime Ministers of Great Britain and Canada, correspondence, 3685

Pringle, Mr. R. A., resignation as Newsprint Controller, ques. 315, ques. 589. *See also* Newsprint

Printing
Dept. of Public, reorganization, 2968
Southam Press, ques. 4096

Printing Bureau, 84, ques. 320, 3742. *See also* Civil Service
Alleged Sunday work at, 4020
Commission of newspaper men and, ques. 1114
Dismissals, ques. 672
Wolff, Mr.—ques. 2005
Employees
Nationality of, ques. 2005
Retirement of, 545
Linotypes, ques. 670

Printing, Joint Committee, 2625
French-speaking member of Editorial Board necessary, 4503
Reports, 4257, 4321, 4504

Printing Plants, departmental, ques. 1738

Prisoners
Parolled, ques. 2005
Political, general amnesty to, 1790

Private Bills
Committee, 305, 2311
Discussed
Canada Security Assurance Company, 1103
Colonial Investment and Loan Company, 3859
Northwest Route, Limited, 3861
Scottish Canadian Assurance Corporation, 583
T. Eaton Life Insurance Company, 669
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 585
Western Assurance Company, 3860

Privileges and Elections, Com., 305

Privy Council
Board of Commerce and, 3685
Jurisdiction of, 2389. *See* Supreme Court Act Amdt.

Profiteering, by farmers, alleged, 3401

Prohibition, 44, 71, 102
As a principle, 1218, 1225, 1228
Canada Temperance Act, ques. 807
Taxes on liquors. *See* Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue

Promissory Notes, tax on. *See* Special War Revenue

Proportional Representation, 15, ques. 803

Proprietary Medicines. *See also* Food and Drugs; Opium and Drug; Special War Revenue
Taxes on, ques. 1036, 2487, 3542

Prorogation, 4589

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
Arrest or summoning of person outside province, 3417-8
Civil Service classification, 547
Desjardins, Mr. Alphonse, 3093
Eight-hour day, 337
Food and Drugs Bill, 1266-8
Franchise Bill
Assistant Chief Electoral Officer, 1514
Chief Electoral Officer, 1512
Contributions, 781
Disqualification of candidates, 1088
Election expenses, 1154
Five-year term for Parliament, 1091
Ontario lists, 3882
Polls—fourteenth day, etc, 1101
Proclamations, 1082
Language of publication, 1080, 1829, 2267
Stamp to be made, 1078
House of Commons staff, 1038

Proulx, Mr. Edmond—*Con.*
Income tax, 3122-7
Indemnity of members, 3096, 3853-4, 4448
M. to strike out clauses, 4459
Judges' salaries, 3852-4, 4337, 4421
M. for six months' hoist of Bill, 4417
Maple products, 1254
Parliament Buildings, 1418-21- 1434
Parliamentary restaurant, 3096
Race track betting, 3430-2
Rural mail, 1283, 4524-5
Salaries of Ministers, 4430
Soldier settlement, 2129-35
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 3577
Dresses, 3586-7
Excise and sales taxes, 3453
Musical instruments, 3629
Silk waists, 3632

Provincial Salaries and Indemnities, Taxation of, ques. 3490

Public Accounts Committee, 306-7, 1838, 4321

Public Debt, ques. 592, 753. *See also* Finance

Public Information Dept., ques. 1000, ques. 1740, 2639, 2999
Nichols, Mr. M. E., ques., 1118

Public Ownership, 93, 204. *See also debates under* Canadian National Railways; Grand Trunk
Business profits tax. *See that title*
Electricity, 3113-7
Railways, of, 100

Public Works, 1417. *For individual works see their titles*
Agreement with Ottawa city, 557
Architectural and Engineering Branch, ques. 587
Canals. *See that title*
Department, 1416
Minister, 557
Tache, Mr. C. E., superannuation, ques. 3490

Pulp and Paper. *See also* Customs Act; Newsprint
Pulpwood, 148, 2552

Purchasing Commission, 44, 257, ques. 591, 3718, 3854-5, 4580
Res. to establish Purchasing Board, 1231, 1467

Pure Foods Bill, 3396

Putman, Mr., and Civil Service Commission, ques. 2414

Quarantine, 3554
Grosse Isle, ques. 1003
Sydney, 3148

Quebec (City)
Arsenal, employees, ques. 1898, ques. 3862
Board of Trade and Retail Merchants' Association—proposed taxes, 3457-8
Vessel rates, 1734
Champlain market, 2015
Fortifications, ancient, 421
Mail deliveries, ques. 591
Marine storehouse, ques. 316
Riots of 1918, M. (Mr. Parent) for papers, 1202

Quebec (Port) 650, 654-5, 661
Government Ships, cargoes for, 915
Grain shipments, 858
Harbour Commission, steam dredge, ques. 999
Immigrants landing at, 3226-8

Quebec (Province)
Canadian Northern lands in, ques. 2008
"Hour" of, 61, 67, 90, 143, 206
Military districts in, ques. 1035
People stay on the land, 94
Post offices in cities, ques. 413
Resources—timber, water-powers, 693
Tolerance, 90
Union government and, 83

Quebec and Saguenay Railway, ques. 506, ques. 1120; ques. 3619
Construction and operation, ques. 672
Freight rates, ques. 589
St. Irénée, 3423

Quebec and Western Railway, ques. 411; ques. 412

Quebec Bridge, ques. 1116; ques. 1229

Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway, ques. 673, 4585

Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic Railway, ques. 411; ques. 412; ques. 507

Questions and Answers. *See also* House of Commons
Inquiry as to, 949, 2126
Oral answers to, 1623
Not answered, 753, 949
Canadian Government Merchant Marine—information withheld, 1649
Portion deleted, 1045

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns, 320, 344, 415, 510, 543, 591, 707, 811, 1004, 1037, 1121, 1201, 1231, 1362, 1464, 1511, 1628, 1741, 1788, 1899, 2012, 2080, 2183, 2313, 2417, 2519,, 4096
Status of, 1743

Race Track Betting. *See* Criminal Code Legislation—Statement of Rev. Dr. Speer, 3490, 3557

Radial Railways—Ontario and Hydro-electric, 4172

Railway Act Amendment Bills.
1. Fuel Supply. Res. 4324; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4331. Senate amdts. 4506
2. Inland and Coastwise Shipping. 1r., 160; 2r., 1707; debate adjourned, 1738
3. Provincial Jurisdiction. 1r., 2412; 2r., 3086; com., 3634; 3r., 3636

Railway Commission.
Business done from date of establishment, statement of, 1707
Fort William elevators, 565
Vessels and, 160, ques., 2414, ques., 2777

Railways. *See also* Canadian Railway War Board. *For individual railways see their titles.*
Cars, shortage, ques. 319, 1312
Canadian cars in United States, 880, ques. 997, 1114
Official, use of by Ministers, ques. 409
Transcontinental, ques. 999
Rates, 200, ques. 1036
Parliament and, 4188
Reports of, inquiry concerning, 1290
United States, freight from for Canada prepaid, 1789, 1893

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, 880, 2378
Com. appointed, 305

"Rainbow." *See* Ballantyne, Hon. Mr.; Naval Defence; "Niobe"

Rape, attempted, 2841

Recall, the, 1180, 2023. *See also* Dominion Franchise Bill
Amdt. (Mr. Tweedie) 2025; neg. 2052
Dominion Council of Agriculture, platform on, 2052

Re-cleaned Screenings, ques. 507, 1009. *See also* Commercial Feeding Stuffs; Elevators

Reconstruction, 24. *See also* Demobilization; Pensions; Soldiers Civil Re-establishment; Soldier Settlement

Redman, Mr. Daniel Lee (East Calgary)
Badges for returned men, 443
Eight-hour day, 381
Natural Resources development, 1026
Pensions—widowed mothers, 429
Recall, the, 2026

Re-establishment. *See also* Demobilization Pension; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Soldier Settlement
Federal emergency fund, ques. 998
Special Com.; Res. (Mr. Rowell) moved, 614; agreed to, 615

Registration Fee. *See* Post Office Act

Registration of Shipping, 1614, 2108

Reid, Hon. John D. (Minister of Railways and Canals and acting Minister of Public Works)
Banff National park, 3770, 3777
Bridges
Burlington Canal, 3777
Government policy concerning, 3773-9
Canadian freight and United States railways, 1789
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 652
Canadian National Railways
Appointments—how made, 3139-40
Branches and extensions, East and West
Politics and, 4194, 4222
East
Gaspé, 4247-9
Inverness, 4249
Lockeport, 4247-9
Newcastle-Tracdie, 4247-9
Nova Scotia, 3378
Westville-St. John, 4248
West, 3376-82, 3385-7, 4212, 4232
Brudenheim, 885, 4250
Distances, 3390
Land ownership, 3387
Willow Bunch — Wood Mountain, 3380-1, 3388
"Canadian Government Railways" defined, 4219
Canadian National Railway Company, 345
Canadian Northern Railway, 3377, 3390
Coal purchases, 2381
Contracts, details, 4251-6
Damage claims, 887
Deficits, 880, 886, 888
Demurrage "bunched cars," 4230
Directorate, 4190

Reid, Hon. John D.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Equipment, 4191
Estimates discussion of, 4249-50
Grand Trunk loans, 881. *See also, under this title,* Grand Trunk
Hudson Bay Railway, 4233
Insurance, 4257
Intercolonial
Moncton office, 4268
Operation, 4247
Pension fund, 4248
Mackenzie and Mann, interest in subsidiaries, 4191
Maine Central connection, 3376
Management, 4189
Ministerial statement, 859
Prince Edward Island Railway, 891-2
Car ferry, 4246
Standardization of railway, 4247
Public ownership, 4190
Rates, 4187
Reports of operations, 3086
Stations—shelters, 891
Subsidiaries, 3389
Supplies, contracts for, 4193
Taxation of, 3393
Ties—list of contracts, 4251
Townsites, 4191
Withholding of information justified, 1652-7, 1674, 1684
Canadian National Railways Bill, 2842, 3085, 3376-94, 4187-95
Cars. *See under this title,* Railways
Capilano bridge, 3778
Carvill, Mr. George, 4226-8
Civil Service Commission, 3139
Contracts signed by Government before submission to House, 1048
Dredging, 3781-90
Nova Scotia, 3786
Drill halls, 3148
Dry docks, 4567-72, 4573
Experimental farms, 3156-8
Farm labour, 1227
Flags for public buildings, 3158
Fort Frances public building, 3152
Fort William elevators—coarse grain shipments, 565
Graham's Run, 3159
Granby public building, 3150
Grand Etang bridge, 3780
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition, 1113, 1311-8, 1435-60, 1486-1510
Administration, 4173
Branch lines, 1314-8
Correspondence, 1235-53
Hinton, Mr. W. P., 1311-2
Loan, 4579

Reid, Hon. John D.—*Con.*
Grand Trunk Railway acquisition—*Con.*
London-Trafalgar square office, 1251
Montreal-Toronto line, 1491
Shareholders, list of, 3426-7
Strike of 1910, 1542
Grosse Isle, 3151
Hamilton
Postal station, 3152
Post office, 3151
Hanna, Mr. D. B.
Cahill, Mr., and, 2380
Canada Steamships, Limited, and, 1743
Highways Act, contribution to Ontario, 1047
Hull and Montreal highways, 1113
Hydro-Electric and Ontario Radial railway, 4172
Isle Verte, 3160
Kamloops public building, 3156
Kingsville public building, 3153
Lachine lock bridge, 4236
Lotbinière and Megantic Railway, 950, 4585
Militia, Permanent force, barracks, 4579
Narrows, the, 3159
National parks, 3769-70
North Bay, shore protection, 3160
North Lake harbour, 3159
Oliver-St. Paul de Metis Railway, 344, 871
Ottawa buildings, fittings and furniture, 3154
Ottawa city, agreement with, 577-81, 988-92
Ottawa River conservation, 3779
Parliament Buildings, 1418-34, 3153
Port Hood wharf, 3159
Port Maitland, 4579
Portage la Prairie public building, 3156
Postage stamps for inland revenue, 3737
Post Office Dept., 3736-7
Public buildings, none new, 3147-8
Public works, resident engineers, 3787
Purchasing Commission, 4580-2
Question—complaint of unsatisfactory answer, 1047
Questions, inquiry as to, 2126, 2416
Railway Act Amdt. (Provincial Jurisdiction) 2412-13, 3634-6
Railway Mail Service, 4212
Railway rates, 864
Railways. *See also, under this title,* Canadian National; Grand Trunk
Car shortage, 881-5, 1114
Proposed discussion in Railway Com., 885
Reports of, 1290
Taxation of profits, 865
Renfrew post office, 3151
Royal Military College, 3152-3

Reid, Hon. John D.—*Con.*
St. Anne bridge, 3773-4
St. John
Harbour, 4567
Public buildings, 3148-9
Scammel, Mr. J. D., 3785
Shenacadie wharf, 3159
Shipbuilding, 652
Spirit River wheat shipments, 566
Steel cabinets, 3155
Sydney Quarantine station, 3148
Toronto
Postal station, 3155-6
Union station, 3226
Vancouver public buildings, 3156
Williams Head quarantine, 3156

Reid, Mr. John F. (Mackenzie)
Bridges, 3770
Budget, 2744. Mr. Edwards and United Grain Growers, 2744; Mr. Elkin and tariff, 2745; business methods of United Grain Growers—export market a necessity, 2746; duties collected in Canada and in the United States—railways in Canada and in Great Britain, 2747; Mr. Stevens and the farmers, 2748; Mr. Stacey and duty on apples, 2749; difficulties faced by Minister of Finance—income, luxury and excise taxes, 2750; life insurance for returned soldiers—railways—immigration, 2751; Hudson Bay railway—Mr. G. M. Murray and the press, 2753
Campaign funds, 1226
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines, 3384
Western extensions, 4232
Civil Service bonus, 1281
Commercial feeding stuffs, 3174
Duties on textile imports, ques. 1899
Experimental farms, 2398
Firearms licenses, 3414-5
Food and Drugs Bill, 1635
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2100
Disqualification
Charitable support, those receiving, 1817
Election expenses, 1932
Recall, the, 2041
"Rural polling division," 1993
Grand Trunk Railway, 1459
Newspaper postage, 3751
Returned soldiers, tubercular, ques. 2005
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4153
Soldier Settlement, 1687-8, 2130, 2137-8
Cattle branding, 1700

Reid, Mr. John F.—*Con.*
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Firearms, 3793
Proprietary medicines, 3794
Wheat meal, 3795
Steamship subsidies, 4282
Vessel rates, proposed regulation of, 1721, 1734-5

Religious Orders from France, 231, 261

Repatriation Committee. *See* Pensions

Reports tabled, 1199, 1229, 1289, 1357, 1405, 1460, 1573, 1738, 2311, 2571, 2625, 2840, 3225, 4258, 4502

Restaurant Parliamentary. *See* Parliamentary

Restigouche, Interprovincial bridge, ques. 411

Retail Merchants' Association of Canada
Special War Revenue, 3342
Vessel rates, 1717

Retirement. *See* Civil Service

Returned Soldiers, 46, 68. *See also* Pensions; Re-establishment; Soldier Settlement; Civil Service; Dominion Lands
Badges, 437-47
Cash Gratuities, ministerial statement, 1082
Federal emergency fund, ques. 2182
Fishery officers at Isle Madame, ques. 3294
Fishing industry and, 531, 855. *See also* Fisheries
Franchise—exemption from disqualification, 1811, 1820
Life insurance, 519, 524. *See also* State Insurance
Militia Department appointments, ques. 2079, ques. 3358
Saar Valley Commission and, 344
Special War Revenue—taxation and, amdt. (Mr. Lemieux) 3446
Tubercular, treatment of, ques. 2005
Unauthorized wearing of buttons, 4020
University students, 519
Vocational training, 534
War veterans, petitions from, 505
Work for at Victoria—shipbuilding, 4584

Returns
Delayed, 459
Inquiry for, 618, 857, 3226, 4258, 3769

Revenue Bills
1. Business Profits War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. Bill. Res. 3111; 1r., 3117; 2r., com., 3229; 3r., 3237
2. Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill. Res., 3110; 1r., 3111; 2r., com., 3174; 3r., 3229
3. Income War Tax, 1917, Amdt. Bill. Res. 3117; 1r., 3128; 2r., com., 3237, 3296, 4288; 3r., 4289
4. Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 3494; 1r., 3498; 2r., com., 3815; 3r., 3821. Senate amdts. 4263
5. Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 3316; 3434; 3561; 1r., 3634; 2r., com., 3790; 3r., 4289. Senate amdts. 4505

Revenue and Expenditure. *See* Budget and debates thereon

Rhodes, Hon. Edgar N. (Cumberland) *See* Speaker

Richardson, Mr. Robert L. (Springfield)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 200. Freight rates, 200; Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways, effect of rate increases, 201; Grand Trunk Pacific, 202; public ownership of railways, 204; Union Government, Quebec and her "hour," 206; Hon. Mr. Crerar, 207; Liberals and the tariff, 208
Board of Commerce, 1947
Correspondence, 3427
Murdock, Mr., letter of, 4488
Canadian National Railways, 4199-4204; public ownership — Transcontinental freight rates increase—no political influence, 4199-4202
Rates, 1448
Conner, Mr. James, dismissal of, 415, 419
Electricity, public ownership, 3117
Franchise Bill—advance polls, 1934
Franking privilege, 3767
French speeches, translation of, 702
Grand Trunk Railway, 1447, 1499
Income tax, charities, 3313
Morning sittings, 2723
National parks and game preserves, 3287
Newspaper postage, 3746-60
Press, the, and, 3752-3
Newsprint, price, 2828
Railway rates, 1499
Rural mail, 4524
Steel and shipping merger, 1945-8, 1966
Vote—late in entering Chamber, 4180

Rifle Ranges. *See* Militia

Rimouski
British mails and, 4530-2

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand (St. James)
Budget, 2756. Fresh mandate from the people—election of 1917—by-elections, 2756; race prejudice and class party—cost of living—farmers and prices, 2757; profiteering, 2758; the new taxes, 2759; United States luxury tax how imposed—criticism of public expenditure, 2760; St. James by-election—Mr. Meighen's address, 2761; Liberal party and tariff—good understanding with English-speaking citizens desired, 2762; Quebec a tolerant province—the prosperity desired, 2763
Cressé, Mr. L. G. A., ques, 4502
Customs duties—basis of estimates, ques. 1788
Election and introduction, 1357
Franchise Bill
Poll, hours to be open, 1926
Proclamation—language of publication, 2278, 2282, 2291-2
French treaty, ques. 1788
German and Austrian imports, ques. 2416, ques. 3359
Imports into Canada, ques. 2182
Insurance companies, mutual, taxation of, 2012, 2080
Naval Service, additional appropriation of $1,700,000, 4391-2
Newspaper postage, 3750-1
Press gallery, 3750
Roumania and Greece, advances to, ques. 3488
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Beer, 3605
Excise and sales tax, 3335
Medals, gold, 3585
Musical instruments, 3595-6, 3628
Proprietary medicines, 3601

Rivière du Loup
Drill hall, 3726-7
Shops, ques. 315, ques. 801
Engine repairs, ques. 3079

Robb, Mr. James A. (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Alcohol, 3816-7
Apple barrels, 2018-21
Banff national park, 3769
Bankruptcy Bill, 3257
Budget debate, arrangements for, 2839-40, 2951
Business profits tax, 3234-7

Robb, Mr. James A.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Extensions, 3388
Land ownership in, 3387
Mails, 3377
Canadian Wheat Board, 4120-5, 4134, 4342-57
Oats, effect on, 4357
Car shortage, 880-3
Coal operations director, 3179, 3367
Commercial feeding stuffs, 1290, 3164-5, 3405-7
Federal Bureau of Education, 1396
Fiset, Dr. Michel, 2015
Food adulteration, 3557
Fort William elevators, 565
Franchise Bill, election expenses, 1155
Grading export cheese and butter, 605
Grain and grain products in freight cars, ques., 1035
Grand Trunk Railway, 1311-2
Branch lines, 1316-20
Hinton, Mr. W. P., 1311
Icebreakers, 1599
Immigrants from United States, ques. 1463
Income tax
Charities, 3241-6
Mistakes made in good faith, 3302-3
Penalties, 3254
Residence or investments outside Canada, 3249-51
Indian affairs estimates, 3265-6
Indians—enfranchisement, 4029-37
Live stock shipments inspection, 1614-5
Malt, 3818
Oleomargarine, 1782, 1970
Purchasing Board, 1468-70
Railway mail service, 4212
Retirement of members of public service, 3836
Returned soldiers' insurance, 4055
St. Lawrence route, insurance, 4515
Seed Grain advances, 3286-7
Shipbuilding
Cattle shippers, and, 910
"Where is the money to come from?" 915
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 3574
Bank overdrafts, 3799
Duties paid before changes, 3624
Real estate sales, 3796
Taxes, how paid, 3587
Steel and Shipping Merger, 1966
Sugar embargo, 3226
Welland canal, ques. 1200
Western parks roads, 3283

Robson, Judge H. A. *See* Board of Commerce

Ross, Mr. Duncan C. (West Middlesex)
Automobile imports and excise, ques. 591
Chartered banks, ques. 591
Egg imports and exports, ques. 1898
Food and Drugs, 968, 975
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 3873-4
Aliens—certificate, 2222-3, 2229-31
Ballot and counterfoil, 1105
Deputy returning officers, lists of, 1096-7
Disqualification — charitable support, those receiving, 1819
Forms, 3871-3
Liquor at elections, 1108
Ontario law and lists, 3880-92
Polling divisions, 1519
Returning officers, 1525-8
Voters' lists, provincial, 2419-27, 2438
Amdt., suggested, 2321
Voting on certificate, 1098-1100
Income tax, losses, 3241
Indians
Medical attendance, 3275-6
Munsees reserve, 3277
Rural credits, ques. 589
Soldier Settlement, 3193-4

Ross Rifle Factory, ques. 1898, ques. 2721, 3722
Sale to Enterprise Foundry, ques. 2415

Roumania,
Advances to, ques. 318, 3027
Bonds, interest on, ques. 3488
Purchases by, ques. 2414
Insurance on, ques. 1739
Ports of shipment, ques. 343
Shipments, ques. 312

Round Robin, 2967

Rowell, Hon. N. W. (President of the Privy Council and Minister of Public Health)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 254. Reply to Mr. Murphy, 254; Lake Superior Corporation, 256; War Purchasing Commission — appointments of members to Senate, 257; Secretarial fund, 258; allegation of evading tax, 260; religious orders from France, 261; Mr. Rowell and his colleagues, 262; Women's Conference, 262; Health Department—Union Government, 263
British mails, 4532
Budget, 2997. Answer to Mr. Mackenzie King—Sir Thomas White's administration of finances—congratulations to Minister of Finance, 2997; public debt—expenditure, 2998; Department

Rowell, Hon. N. W.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
of Public Information and the Daily Record, 2999; Canadian Official Record, Bureau of Information, New York, 3000; "advances unaccounted for," 3001; Civil Service appointments, number of, 3005; decreasing staffs in the Civil Service, 3006; expenditure and income estimated, 3007; public debt, inflation, 3008; Government's record in the war—Canada in a higher position than ever before—Mr. Fielding's amdt. 3009; Liberal Unionists' tariff record—tariff reduction, 3010; general election and franchise, 3011; Union Government's progressive measures—a tariff policy fair to all, 3012
Bulgaria. *See; under this title,* Peace Treaty
Business of the House, private members' business, 539
Canada's national status, 498. *See also, under this title,* League of Nations; Peace Treaty
Empire, in, 359
British connection maintained, 365
Canadian National Railways, mail contracts, 4530
Censorship, 396
Civil Service
Bonus, 1270-6, 3147, 3228
Classification, 548, 556, 1112, 3769, 3984
In force 1 April, 1919, 3142-7
Inside Service, 4019, 4172
Vote to pay increased salaries, 4546
Reduction of pay, 3137
Temporary employees, 3128-33
War record, civil servants with, 3129-31
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 1112, 3146
Senate amdts. 4056-60
Third reading, discussion, 3147
Colonial and Imperial Conference, 359
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 617
Bill withdrawn, 1290-1
Daughters of Canada, case of, 397
Distressed mariners, 2251-9, 2260-7, 3102-5, 4056
Edmonton post office, theft from, 923, 4520
Eight-hour day, 449-54
European distress, 4546
Food adulteration, 3557
Food and Drugs Bill, 582, 956-79, 1256-69, 1465
Food inspectors, Nova Scotia, 3539-40
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2073-5, 2220-3, 2229-30
Disqualification of candidates, 1087
Government annuities, 4528

Rowell, Hon. N. W.—*Con.*
Health department, 263, 3539-57
Honey adulteration, 582, 798, 2314-5
House of Commons staff, 4414, 4567
Housing, 3543-52
Construction, 3546
Immigration—medical inspection, 3555
Information service, 4543-4
International Joint Commission, 3986
International Labour Conference, 798
Labour Conference at Washington, 356
League of Nations, 349
Ames, Sir Herbert, statement by, 3971-84
Assembly, the, 351
Budget of, Canada's contribution, 3982, 4544
Canada's interests and representation, 498, 3982
Decisions, enforcement of, 3975-6
Disarmament, 3976
French occupation of German territory, 1046
Labour, 354
Peace, maintenance of, 351
Phosphorus for matches, 356
Self-governing Dominions' status, 350
United States Senate reservations, 357
Letter-carriers' salaries, 345, 1276, 2670, 4529
Threatened strike—Government's attitude, 1231-2, 3424, 3623
Maple products, 582, 796-7, 1254-6, 2366, 4020
Marine hospitals, 3552-4
Naval Service, additional appropriation, $1,700,000, 4388
News Service, 4532
Opium and Drug Bill, 557, 1621-2, 1629-49, 1702-7, 1745-61, 1900, 3081
Parcel post supervisor, 4530
Peace Treaty. *See also, under this title,* League of Nations
Bulgaria, 498, 1057-61
France—protection against Germany, 1059
Hungary and Turkey, 1059-60, 3983-4
Pensions and Re-establishment, 435
Special Com., 614, 752
Pensions district offices, rumoured closing of, 710, 857
Pollution of boundary waters, 3552
Postal employees' salaries, 2670, 4526-30. *See also, under this title,* Letter Carriers
Postmen. *See, under this title,* Letter Carriers
Printing Bureau
Economies in, 3006
Sunday work, 4020
Proprietary medicines, 3542

Rowell, Hon. N. W.—*Con.*
Purchasing Board, 1470-1, 1481-4
Quarantine—Tracadie, 3554
Regina library, 396
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 10, 387, 4021, 4547-8, 4575
Buildings, 3214, 4573
Distribution of force, 3207-8, 3214
Duties of the force, 3195
Expense—Details, 3204-6
Division of with Provincial Governments, 3203
Increased, 3209
H.R.H. Prince of Wales, Honorary Commandant, 398
Name, change of, 398
Pensions, 388, 391, 398, 3202
Permanent Militia Force and, 3209
Provincial Police and, 3195-6
Strikes and, 3200
Ticket-of-leave system and, 399
Rural mail carriers, 1233, 4525-6
St. John pension office, 1742
Services of Dominion troops overseas, resolution of British House of Commons, 1159
Shipbuilding, expenditure, how to be met, 918
Supply and the Budget, 918
Toronto Postal employees, threatened strike, 3424
Venereal diseases, 3556
Washington, Canadian representation at, 4536-41
M. (Mr. Fielding) in amdt. to supply, 2444, 2474

Roy, Mr. Gustave, ques. 1898, ques. 1899

Roy, Hon. Mr., and International Labour Conference, 3359

Royal Assent, 1165, 2259, 3634-5

Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 242, 4547
Barracks, 3214, 4572
Change of name of force, 398
Duncan, Mr. Walter and, ques. 1117, ques. 2720
H.R.H. Prince of Wales, Honorary Commandant, 398
Ministerial explanation in Supply, 3194-6, 3200-15
Pensions, 388, 397
Special Com. not to consider, 615

Royal Canadian Mounted Police Bills
1. Commissioner. Res. 387; 1r., 10; 2r., com., 395; 3r., 459
2. Pensions. Res. 3864, 3958; 1r., 3959; 2r., com., 3r., 4021

Royal Commission on Natural Resources, Trade and Legislation, ques. 4502

Royal Military College, 3152

Rural Credits, ques. 589

Rural Mail Carriers, ques. 414, ques. 591, 1233, 1282-3, 4522. *See also,* Post Office
Pontbriand-Robertsonville, ques. 2313
Routes, ques. 506

Russia
Icebreakers, sold to, 1599, 1602, 2106-7
Military expedition to, ques. 995
Trade with, 4322

Ruthenian-Greek Rite. *See* Juvenile Delinquent Act

St. Camille-Cabano proposed railway, ques. 589

St. Hermas postal service, ques. 412

St. James By-Election, 707

St. Jean D'Orleans Wharf, ques. 317

St. Joachim Postmaster, ques. 1121

St. John, N.B
Armoury, ques. 994
District pension office, 1742
Exhibition buildings, use by militia, ques. 2009
Harbour, 2189, 2985, 3492-93, 4567, 4573
Obstruction, 2118
Pilots, 2119
Public buildings, 3149

St. John River
Report of International Commission, ques. 1623
Water powers, ques. 674, 3290

St. John and Quebec Railway, ques. 508, ques. 1036

St. Julien, Battle of, Commemoration, 1357, 1510

St. Lawrence River
I'le d'Orleans, 3295
North shore municipalities, ques. 922, ques. 1116
Post offices, ques. 1116
Power development on, ques. 1120
Engineers, ques. 1230
Route and channel
Dredging, 1616
Ice conditions and icebreakers, 230, ques. 317, 856-8
Insurance, 4515

St. Lawrence River—*Con.*
Route and Channel—*Con.*
Navigation season, 916
Steamship service, 652

St. Louis, Mr. Horace and translation of Revised Statutes, 3082

St. Malo shops, ques. 3079, ques. 3618

St. Peter River
Floods, 889, ques. 1115
Work on, ques. 4019

St. Quentin and Theriault, N.B., catastrophe, 3080

St. Regis Indians, ques. 799

St. Romuald, ques. 2005

St. Valier Wharf, ques. 1231

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. *See* Labrie

Ste. Anne Soldiers' hospital, ques. 588

Ste. Anne de Beaupre Wharf, ques. 506

Ste. Anne de Bellevue Military Hospital, ques. 1115

Ste. Famille Wharf, ques. 317, ques. 810

Ste. Rosalie-Bagot spur line, ques. 2009

Saar Valley Commission, 344, 3963, 3974. *See also* League of Nations

Saguenay River
Buoys, ques. 1000
Dredging, ques. 673

Sailors. *See* Canada Shipping Act

Salaries Act and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 4379; 1r., 4380; 2r., 4427; com., 4456; 3r., 4459

Sales Tax. *See* Special War Revenue

San Remo Conference, 1465

Savard, Mr. Edmond (Chicoutimi-Saguenay)
Bersimis-Rimouski Service, ques. 1463
Budget, 2870. Union Government—congratulations to Minister of Finance, 2871; the new taxes and cost of living—profiteering — Canada's liabilities, 2872; tariff revision—unfair treatment of Chicoutimi and Saguenay by Government, 2873; St. Catharine-Tadoussac mail, 2874; Metabetchouan postmastership, 2876; Liberal fiscal policy approved, 2879

Savard, Mr. Edmond—*Con.*
Chicoutimi, military expedition to, ques. 409
Hebertville-St. Joseph d'Alma, mail, ques. 1000
Inspector of weights and measures, ques. 4096
Malbaie-Tadoussac service, ques. 674
Metabetchouan postmaster, ques. 1120
North Point lighthouse, ques. 1361
Post offices in Quebec cities, ques. 413
Saguenay River
Buoys, ques. 1000
Dredging, ques. 673
St. Lawrence North Shore municipalities, 922, ques. 1116
Soldiers serving in Bermuda, ques. 1461
Telegraph operators, government, ques. 2182

Scammell, Mr. J. K., 3784

Scenic attractions, 3538-9

Schelking, Baron, ques. 3618

Scientific Research, 14, 43, 324
Committee, Special, 617, 2154

Scott, Mr. F. S. (South Waterloo)
Canadian National Railways, withholding of information, 1676
Income tax—charities, 3313
Race track betting, 3430

Scrap Iron and Steel, sale of, ques. 1739

Screenings, ques. 704. *See also* Commercial Feeding Stuffs; Elevators; Grain
Accumulation at elevators, 3395
Export to United States, 3167

Secret Diplomacy. *See Debates under* League of Nations; Peace Treaties

Seduction. *See* Criminal Code

Seed Branch, 2411

Seed Grain
Advances, ques. 321, ques. 2519
Alberta, ques. 674
Purchasing Commission, ques. 1117

Séguin, Mr. Paul A. (L'Assomption-Montcalm)
Budget, 3075. Extravagant expenditure, 3075; so-called luxury taxes—neglect of agriculture—Imperial navy, 3076; lighten people's burden—Mr. Fielding's amdt. 3077
Income tax—provincial salaries, ques. 3490

Seguin, Mr. Paul A.—*Con.*
Leaf tobacco, ques. 996
Military instructors for educational institutions, ques. 413
Military uniforms for educational institutions, ques. 413
Naval Service, 4406

Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. *See* Indemnity of Members.

Senate
Appointment of members of Commons to, 257
Cost of, ques. 1118
Immigration Act Amdt. rejected by, 3426
Provincial legislators and, 1087
Senator also Legislative Councillor, 209
Staff, 4056-9

Serbia, reported credit to, 567. *See also* League of Nations; Peace Treaty

Sevigny, Hon. Albert, 114, 210

Sex Hygiene, 942

Sexsmith, Mr. John Albert (East Peterborough)
Apple barrels, 2018-9
Canadian National Railways, standard time, ques. 588
Demonstration farms, 2390, 2396
Eight-hour day, 379
Food and Drugs Bill, 1260-1
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 1935, 1941
Assiniboia expenses, 1179, 1184
Conveying voters, 1063
Deposit, 1094-6
Polling place—parties present, 1102
Voters' lists, 2424-6, 2433
Oleomargarine, 1874-5, 1970

Shaw, Mr. Hugh M. (Macleod)
Canadian Northern Railway bonds guaranteed by Alberta, ques. 2180

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Franchise Bill—liquor on polling day, 1108
Income tax—disputed returns, 3119-20
Letter carriers' salaries, 1231, 3424
Mines Dept., salaries, 3802-3
Special War Revenue Bill, point of order, 3318

Shenacadie Wharf, 3159

Shipbuilding, 44, 53. *See also* Shipbuilding Credits; Canada Shipping Act
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 622, 659

Shipbuilding—*Con.*
Contracts, ques. 314, 662, 892, 919
Govt. operation, Montreal shipping men's opinion, 908
Govt. shipyard at Sorel, 1620, ques. 2180
Inland waters, vessels for, 913
Material for, importation of, ques. 1114
Returned men and, 909
Ship plates, 623
Duty on, ques. 706
Statement by Minister, 618
Steel contracts, ques. 2573
Subsidies, 913
Supply—vote of $20,000,000, 892
Victoria Shipowners (Limited), 4583

Shipbuilding Credits Bill. Res., 3863, 3987; 1r., 4017; 2r., 4137; com., 4155; 3r., 4173
Conditions under which assistance may be given, 4155
Limitation of amount (amdt. Mr. McMaster) 4166
Parliament, report to, 4166-7
Preamble, 4155, 4167
Registration and ownership, 4157, 4167 (amdt. Mr. Duff) 4165
Size of ships, 4159
Wooden ships (amdt. Mr. Duff) 4161

Shipping. *See also* Canada Shipping Act; Steel and Shipping Registration of, 1614

Shipping Federation. *See* Canada Shipping Act

Ships. *See also* Vessels; Naval Service; Shipbuilding; Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Foreign, taxation of. *See* Canada Shipping Act
Great Britain, from, acceptance of, inquiry for correspondence, 4413. *See also* Naval Defence; Naval Service

Shipwrecked Mariners. *See* Canada Shipping Act

Shipyard. *See* Shipbuilding

Shorts. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs

Sick and Distressed Mariners. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine Hospitals

Sifton, Rt. Hon. A. L. (Secretary of State and Minister of Mines)
Canada Temperance Act, 4559
Censorship, 4556
Editorial Board, 4559
War trophies, 4557

Simpson, Mr. Thomas E. (West Algoma)
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Confectionery, 3593
Sales tax, 3794
Voters' lists, 2424

Sinclair, Mr. John E. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Canadian National Railways—Prince Edward Island car ferry—standardization of railway—Georgetown-Pictou route—labour conditions — Prince Edward Island representative on Board of Management, 4243-6
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3174
Franchise Bill, voters' lists, provincial, 2359-60
Govt. steamers, wages, 1598-9
Graham's Run, 3159
Hickey's wharf, 706
Icebreaker and car ferry, 1602
Judges' salaries, 3854
Maple products, 797
Newfoundland, 4280
North Lake harbour, 3159
Soldier Settlement, 2132
Wrecks, 1612

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Antigonish and Guysborough)
Advances not accounted for, 2641, 3652-3
Alcohol tax—effect on science, 3496
Antigonish and North Sydney public works, ques. 543, ques. 1004
Army boots and shoes, ques. 506, ques. 1229
Auditor General's report, 4274
Banks, chartered, Government receipts from, ques. 1001
British Columbia Indians, 788-90, 951-3
British preference, ques. 811
Budget, 2636. Cessation of borrowing, 2636; checking waste and extravagance—Union party, 2637; how expenditure might be reduced, 2639; Dept. of Public Information, 2639; Militia advances unaccounted for, 2641; many appointments to the Civil Service, 2642; Liberal tariff platform — parliamentary govt., 2643
Buoy service, 2116-7
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Coal, ques. 1623
Earnings, ques. 1359
Freight rates, ques. 2009
Information withheld, complaint of, 1649
Shareholders, ques, 2011
Canadian National Railways
Deficit, 889-90
Eastern Nova Scotia and, 3377-8
Ships and, 897, 904

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Taxation of, 3394
Western extensions, 3387-8
Canadian News Service at Washington, ques. 414
Canadian Northern Railway, arbitration, ques. 2008, ques. 3488
Canadian Railway War Board, ques. 508
Canadian Wheat Board, 4345-50
Central Vermont Railway, ques. 1035
Chartered Banks, money received from, ques. 1001
Civil Service, 3132-40
Appointments, ques. 311
Classification, 3144
Employees, number of, 2642, 3145-6
Insurance, 1780
Temporary employees, ques. 415, 3132-40
Coal Operations Director Bill, 3367
Cold storage, 2407
Dominion lands, ques. 1118
Dredging, 3783
Exchequer Court, 2201
Extension of trade, 1881, 1884-5
Fisheries
Overseers and guardians, 3522-3
United States, treaty with, ques. 1002
Food inspectors, 3539-40
Franchise Bill
By-elections, simultaneous, 1093
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 1070
Constables, 3907
Election officers, 1075
Fees, etc., 1111
False statement made to affect election, 1066-7
Interpretation, 1991-2
Oaths, administration of, 780
Poll books, etc., to returning officer, 1079
Proclamation, 1081
Recount by judge, 1110
Returning officers, 1575
Voters' lists
Addition and elimination of names, 3909-13
Preparation—partisanship complained of, 3906
Provincial, 2328-30, 2338, 2360, 3883-4, 3894
Transfer of voters, 3904
Voting on certificate, 1100-1
Government steamers—purchases for, 1610
Government vouchers, loss of at sea, ques. 3489
Guysborough harbour, 2124
Halifax grain elevator, ques. 1116
Health Dept.—variety of its business, 3541

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Honey adulteration, 2315
Housing, 3547
Expenditure
Demobilization vote, and, 3544-5
Ontario, adjustments with, 3551
Imperial Munitions Board, ques. 1002
Income tax, part payment with return, 3254
Indemnity of members, 4448
Inquiry for returns, 857, 4259
Intercolonial Provident Fund, ques. 509
Judges' salaries, 4340
Lightkeepers' salaries, 2113-4
Loan Companies Act, 1779
Lobsters
Hatcheries employees, ques. 4096
Illegal fishing, ques. 410
Marine hospitals, 3553
Market price of Government bonds, ques. 1462
Masters and mates, 981
Militia, 3674
Annual drill, 3681
Contingencies, 3716
Customs brokers, 3716
Rifle associations, 3725
Morrisons' Ltd. ques. 997
Newspaper postage rates, 3348
Nichols, Mr. M. E., ques. 1118
Ottawa city, agreement with, 990
Paper Currency, gold standard, ques. 309
Pensions and Re-establishment, 3941
Pensioner resident outside of Canada, 4044
Widowed mother, dependent parents, 4043
Pictou,
East river lock, ques. 1119
Harbour, 2187
Pilotage, 1839, 1968, 2119-20
Postal rates, 3736-7
Public Information Dept., ques. 1000, ques. 1740
Railway rates, 1036
Registration of shipping, 1614, 2109
Retirement of members of public service, 3827, 3833
Returns, delayed, 459
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3211
Pensions, 398
St. Lawrence dredging, 1617-20
Schools of navigation, 1612-3
Seed grain advances, ques. 2519, 3286-7
Shipbuilding, Govt.
Assets and liabilities, 896
Contracts and prices, 894, ques. 2573
Trade, tariffs and, 897

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3989-92, 4006, 4009-15, 4157-8, 4166
Sick and distressed mariners, 2254-5, 2264-6
Soldier Settlement
Fishermen and, 1690, 3218-9
Staff of dept. 3221
Special War Revenue—candy, 3594
Steamers
"A. J. McKee," ques. 587, 910
"Recruit," ques. 1199
"Voyageur," insurance, ques. 2776
"33," ques. 410
Steamboat inspection, 1051, 1763-4, 2125
Terminal elevators, 1878-9
Turk—expulsion of from Europe, ques. 409
Unforeseen expenses, 1616
Vancouver, B.C., ques. 3620
Victoria, B.C., dry dock, ques. 3619
Winter fishing, 1609
Yukon Placer Mining Act, 3108-9

Skeena River Hatchery, ques. 412

Slidemaster, 1279

Slums, 816

Smith, Mr. J. E., Ques. 2722

Smith, Mr. William (South Ontario)
Demonstration stations, 1016
Franchise Bill, provincial lists, 3892
Rural mail carriers, 4523
United Grain Growers and the farmers, 2745

Smyrna and Anatolia, 3984

Soldier Organizations and Pension Board employees, ques. 1116

Soldiers. *See also* Returned Soldiers
Canadian prisoners, ques. 1462
Services of Dominion overseas, resolution of British House of Commons, 1159
Votes—effect in general election, 140
Widows and children of, ques. 920. *See also* Pensions

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. *See also* Demobilization; Reconstruction
Dept. 513, 520, 524, ques. 2311
Officials travelling, ques. 2311
Prospective ending of, 4456
Report in French ready for distribution, 2126
Report of Com. not printed in French as ordered, 2016
Smith, Mr. J. E., ques. 2722

Soldier Settlement, 275, 516, 521, 524, 527, 534, 1684, 2127, 3218
Colonization lots in Montmagny, ques. 1229
Ministerial explanation in Supply, 3192

Soldier Settlement Act, 1919, Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1289; 2r., 1685; com., 1685; 3r., 1839

Sorel
Government employees at, ques. 1199
Shipyard, 1620, ques. 2180
Superintendent, ques. 343
Vandal, Mr. Calixte, ques. 1740

Soulanges Canal Road, ques. 999

Southam Press Limited, ques. 4096

Sovietism. *See* Bolshevism

Sparrow, Dr. C. J., ques. 1896

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)
Rulings and Statements of
Amendments, consequential, 2315
Bills
Com., ref. back to—unanimous consent, 4264
Divorce, charges, 4321, 4413
Introducible only by resolution—ref. to trade, 2079
Introduction—not in "Notices of Motion," 1216
Not printed in French, 1152
Resolution adopted, but notice of motion for first reading possibly required, 1229
Senate amendments taken seriatim, 4059
2r
Declared carried, debate closed, 395
Member may speak only once, 3833
Principle only to be discussed, 3827
Same day as 1r., 4341
3r
Amdt. by House without ref. again to Com. 1537
Consequential amdts. 2315
Same day as Com. stage, 2204
Budget debate
Amdt. not to limit debate, 2518
Debate on Thursday and Friday, 2576
Com. suggested for convenience in asking questions—League of Nations, 3971
Comment on documents criticising members, 235
Debate closed by mover, 436, 446, 1137, 1966, 2316, 3102
Exception, by unanimous consent, 2784

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Debate closed by mover—*Con.*
Rule inapplicable, 2315
Mover of amdt. 3956
3r. of Bill, 2251
Debates, Official Report of
Insertion of documents not read, 363, 364, 1416, 1890, 3932
Question standing as order for return, 1743
Decorum,
Conversation, 2316, 4367
Cowardice, imputation of, 66-7
Noise—building operations, 345
Estimates, item in, debate on, 2467
Hartney, Mr. E. P., 4566
House of Commons
French language, status of, 1039-44
Honour of impugned by statement outside—Rev. Dr Speer, 3491, 3557
Officials and Staff
Organization and classification, 859, 1037-45, 3092-9, 4504, 4563-7
Pages, 3099
Side lobbies, admission of strangers to, 1629
Hypothetical against direct statement, 259
Imputation against a member, 234, 2846
Inquiry for report ordered in French, 2126
Interruptions, 457, 480, 734, 737, 1653, 1709-10
Board of Commerce, 4496-7
Language
"A void in their craniums," 737
"Deliberate falsehood," 2749
"Falsehood," 259
"Mean," 529
"Meanly and untruthfully alleging," 233
"Representatives....the stigma they have left upon themselves," 547
Retracted but afterwards referred to, 774
"Shameless" and words of like character, 235
"Spoke with a brief for the great Massey-Harris corporation," 2627
"Uttered a falsehood deliberately," 2845-6
Members
Asking for answer to question, 2179
Giving way by courtesy, 759
How to be referred to, 50, 528
Mover limited in reply, 1966

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Members—*Con.*
Not having the floor, not to be interrogated, 528
Right to speak exhausted, 1561, 1572, 1676, 2315, 2702, 4060
Speaking, may not interrogate another, 2631-2
Speaking, may submit questions, 2702-4
To speak only once on a motion, 1466, 1656-7
Motions
Negative, amdt., 4061
Non-debatable
Adjourning debate, 1017, 2840, 4062
Those moved by unanimous consent, 2626
Those taken up under arrangement of no debate, 2014
Notice not given—unanimous consent necessary, 2023, 2177, 2575, 2626
Consent refused, M. stands as notice, 2575
Public expenditure, calling for, 3933
Seconder absent, 418
Successive to adjourn debate, 2840
To adjourn for purpose of discussing matter of urgent, etc.
Steel and shipping merger, 1945-6
Coal shortage, 3685-6
Unnecessary
Authorizing Com. to sit, it not having reported finally, 2776
Withdrawn on understanding of reference, 437
Non-debatable subjects
Com., matters pending before, 3652-3
Report, presentation of, 4257-8
Subjects already debated, 3686
Notice of motion covering question in Votes and Proceedings, 2723
Notice of motion, undesirability of general debate—unanimous consent for Leader of the Opposition, 2178
Orders of the Day
Debate limited, 33, 230, 231, 710, 856, 1045, 1573, 1896, 2179, 2248, 2968, 3228, 3296
Application must be general, 3424
Appropriateness of matter, 1574, 2476, 1742, 3561, 3423, 3769
Argument, 3427
Labrie Brothers, case of, 3560-1
Letter carriers, 1232
Ministerial statements, 708-9
In the nature of making out a case, 3425

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Orders of the Day—*Con.*
Debate limited—*Con.*
Replying, latitude allowed in, 3425
Question to be summarized, 3295
Question only partly answered, 753
Question to the House disallowed, 1743
Stoneham, Finlay, case of, 568
Unanimous consent refused, debate not permissible, 2082
Parliamentary restaurant, 3094-6
Previous debate, 1217, 1675, 4417, 4431-2
Coal question, 3686
Privilege
Non-personal reflections, excluded from, 1231
Question may not be raised when another member has the floor, 529, 2838
Ref. to proceedings of Com. which has not reported, 2081
Questions
Answer of Government to be accepted, 753, 1743
Not to be altered by another member; notice to be given, 510
Passed as orders for returns, 1743
At option of Government, 511
Permission not needed to place on Order Paper, 1047
Portion deleted, 1045
Reference to answering—appropriate occasion, 1047, 2416
Standing for Member's revision, 2413
To Chairman of a Committee, and without notice, 2843
Quotations containing language forbidden under the rules, 234-6
Reading of Speeches, 2966
Recognizing members—Mr. Jacobs, Mr. McDonald, 3026, 3039
Relevancy, 734-5, 750-1, 1573, 1954, 3177, 4060
Address, debate on—Budget debate should not be anticipated, 129
Civil Service and patronage, 547
Debate on motion to adjourn for the purpose of discussing, etc., should be strictly relevant, 1951
Judges' salaries and indemnity of members, 4417
Limits of debate, 2468
Naturalization and franchise, 771
Pensions report—general election, 3946
Report not printed in French as ordered, 2016
Speer, Rev. Dr., statement of, 3491, 3557

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Supply—Committee of
Thursday procedure, 3686
Saturday procedure, 3840, 4275
Unanimous consent, 181, 617, 2078, 2625, 3956, 4060, 4321. *See also, under this title,* Debates, Official Report of, insertion, etc.
Adjournment to fixed time, moved without notice, 304
Customs Act, 3620
M. (Mr. Lemieux) Coal Supply, 3686
Mr. Mackenzie King on Canadian representative at Washington, 2178
Speech of mover not close of debate, 2784
Statement concerning Com. not otherwise permitted, 2081-2
Unauthorized distribution of documents in House, 1744
Vote—member late, 4180
Wednesday evening sittings, 1045

Speaker's Chair
Offer of gift from the Lords and Commons of the United Kingdom, 3224

Speech from the Throne debated. *See* Address

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 3316; 3334; 3561; 1r., 3634; 2r., com., 3790; 3r., 4289; Senate amendments, 4505
Arrangements for debate, 3617, 3631, 3454
Consideration in detail, 3487-8
Changes proposed, 3345
When effective, 3335, 3607, 3629
Clauses and subjects
"Consumer," definition of, 3795
Effect on prices, 3329, 3340
Importations, 3795
Licenses, 3579, 3600, 4290
Jewellers, 3579
Manufacturer, small, 3797
Manufacturer's agent, 3609
Merchandise not delivered on May 19, 3613
Penalties, 4290
Refunds, 3629, 3607
Retail Merchants' Association, 3342
Revenue from estimated sources, 3332-3
Sales, one or two per cent tax; res., 3608
Stamp taxes and stamps, 3626-7, 3800, 4290
Stocks in trade, 3604
Taxes, how paid, 3587

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sources of Revenue Discussed
Acetylene gas, 3796
Airplanes, 3592
Automobiles, 3597, 3793
Baby foods, 3473
Bank overdrafts, 3624-5, 3798
Beer, 3605
Used to make vinegar, 3604
Binder twine, 3610, 3623
Biscuits, 3460
Boats, canoes, yachts, etc., 3588
Boots, 3563-5, 3585
Breakfast foods, 3795
Bric-a-brac 3576
Candy and confectionery 3592
Carpets and rugs, 3577, 3585
Cattle feed, 3473
Chandeliers, 3578, 3597
Chewing gum, 3594
Cigarholders, etc., 3576
Clocks and watches, 3574
Clothes, 3563
Made to order, 4290
Coats, fur, 3791-3
Collars and collarettes of lace, 3574, 3792
Containers, 3615, 3632
Curtains, 3578
Dresses, except silk, 3586-7
Electrical supplies, 3460
Embroideries, 3573
Firearms, 3594, 3793
Food, 3616, 3795
Fountain pens, pocket knives, etc., 3577, 4289
Furniture, 3574
Furs, 3400, 3569, 3791-2
Gas and electric light fixtures, 3596
Glassware, 3569
Gloves, 3568
Hats and caps, 3438, 3453, 3574, 3562, 3565-6, 3790, 4290
Hosiery, 3791
Jams and marmalade, 3796
Jewellery, 3338, 3578
Licenses, 3579
Departmental stores, 3583, 3617
Medals, 3585
Wedding rings, 3584, 3797
Kimonas, petticoats and waists, 3790
Lace, 3573, 3791-3
Collars, 3574, 3792
Liquor and preparations containing alcohol, 3600
Liquor cabinets, etc, 3793
Meats, 3473
Moving pictures, 3627
Musical instruments, 3460-1, 3595-7, 3628

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sources of revenue discussed—*Con.*
Neckwear, 3790
Nightgowns, 3567
Oriental rugs, 3577
Overcoats, cloth, 3586
Pedlars, 3574
Plated ware, 3572
Playing cards, 3599
Promissory notes, 3624
Proprietary medicines, 3600, 3627, 3794
Purses and pocketbooks, 3568
Real estate sales, 3796
Ribbons (including typewriter ribbons) 3473, 3574
Sales tax, 2487, 3608, 3794
Silk
Clothing, 3790
Dresses, etc., 3562, 3632
Fabrics, 3572
Split peas, etc., 3795
Spirits and medicated wines, 3793
Sporting goods, 3569, 3572
Socks and stockings (silk)
Men's and boys, 3566
Women's, 3567
Stock transfers, 3624, 3800
Suits, women's, 3587
Tobacco pipes, 4289
Toiletware, 3576
Tooth washes, 3794
Umbrellas, 3568
Underwear, 3453-4, 3791, 3568
Wedding rings, 3584, 3797
Wheat meal, 3795-6

Speer, Rev. Dr. and Race Track Legislation, 3490, 3557

Spence, Rev. Ben., 1218, 1227

Spinney, Mr. Edgar K. (Yarmouth and Clare)
Budget, 2711. Congratulations to Finance Minister—Canada's war service, 2711; business profits tax, 2712; Canada's agriculture and fisheries, 2713; Mr. Fielding's amdt., 2714
Port Maitland, 4579

Spirit Lake, 566, 2398

Springs. *See* Irrigation Act Amdt.

Stacey, Mr. F. B. (Fraser Valley)
Alien immigrants, 823
Budget, 2618. British Columbia farmers, 2618; British Columbia resources—the team spirit—change of attitude on trade question, 2619; orchard industry, 2620; American competition with Canadian fruit growers, 2621; head tax, 2623

Stacey, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
Campaign funds, 1225
Franchise Bill, Orientals, 1823
Hearing in the Chamber, suggested rearrangement of seats, 394
Indians, British Columbia, 4021, 4037
Inspection and Sale—Fruit containers, 2021
Oleomargarine, 1858
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 394-5
Soldier Settlement, 2141

Stamp taxes, 2487

Standing Orders, Com. appointed, 305

State Insurance for Returned Soldiers' Bill. Res., 3864, 3958; 1r., 3958; 2r., com., 4054; 3r., 4056; Senate amdts., 4466

Statistical Department, 1879, 3296

Statutes, proposed revision, 3821

Steamboat Inspection, 2125. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.

Steamers. *See* Vessels

Steamship Companies, proposed Govt. supervision of, 2013

Steamship Services
Canadian National Railway vessels, services, ques. 342
Campbellton-Gaspe, ques. 342
Charlottetown, 4280
Halifax-Cape Breton, 4281
Lockeport-Froude's Point, 4514
Magdalen Islands, 649-52
Malbaie-Tadoussac, ques. 674
Montreal-Quebec-Gaspe, ques. 587
Mulgrave-Canso, 4515
New Zealand, 4277
Newfoundland, 4277, 4281
South Africa, 4280
Victoria-Vancouver West Island, 4280
Victoria-Skagway, 4514

Steel Industry, 623, 629, 648. *See also* Shipbuilding
British Empire Steel Corporation, ques. 2777, 4010
Steel and shipping merger, 1895
Debate on M. to adjourn House, 1945

Steele, Mr. Michael (South Perth)
Alien immigrants, 812, 838
Board of Commerce resignations, 4258
Civil Servants with war record, 3130-1
Franchise Bill, voters' lists, 2440
Magazine postage rates, ques. 1898
Press, the, and postal rates, 3745-50, 3761
Retirement of members of public service, 3834

Steele, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
Rulings and statements as Chairman
Relevancy, 3219-20, 3680, 3713
Scientific research, 2169
Southam Press, Ltd., ques. 4096

Stefansson Expedition, ques. 704, 3284

Stein, Mr. Adolph (Kamouraska)
Criminal Code—petty thefts, 3420
Election and introduction, 949
House of Commons staff, 1041
Income tax
Appeals, 3243
Exemptions on account of children, 3298
Lightkeepers' salaries and bonus, 1282, 2110
Quebec and Saguenay Railway, ques. 3619
Rivière du Loup drill hall, 3726

Stenographers, Members', salaries of, ques, 2311

Sterling, payments to C.E.F., ques. 2008

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver Centre)
Alcohol, tax on, 3495
Bill, introduction of—point of order, 1216
Budget, 2589. Minister of Finance and his critics—revenue and expenditure, 2589; foreign credits—Liberals and Liberal-Unionists, 2590; tariff as discussed by spokesman for the Opposition, 2591; war wealth taxation amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 2593; tariff reform, 2594; Farmers' platform, 2595; farmers and the sale of wheat, 2596; business profits taxes, 2598; elevators—political campaign contributions, 2599; income tax—the Budget and direct taxation, 2601; Wheat Board and wheat trade, elevators, etc., 2602; public debt and natural resources, 2603
Canadian Wheat Board, ques., 3294, 4104, 4112
Civil Service classification, ques. 674
Civil Service retirement, 3838
Debates—difficulty in hearing, 1416
Eight-hour day, 335
Fisheries—British Columbia, 3521
Franchise Bill
Advance polls, 3875
Aliens—certificate, 2089-91, 2094
Polling divisions, 1520
Returning officers, 1534
Grain trade. *See under this title,* Canadian Wheat Board
Indemnity of members, 4089
Military training, 3707-8

Stevens, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
Militia, Cadet service, 3707-8
Naval Service
Badges, ques., 506
Debate on estimates—delay, 4411-2
Parliament Buildings, 1416
Purchasing govt. supplies, ques. 591
Returned soldiers' res. for special Com.—pensions, students, vocational training, 532
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 388, 395
Veterans and Pensions, 397, 3201
Sick and distressed mariners, 2253-4, 2263-4, 3099, 3105
Soldier Settlement—soldiers who remained in Canada, 1686
Special War Revenue
Bank overdrafts, 3798-9
Changes by Finance Minister, 3438, 3448
Water carriage of goods, 1213-6
Regulation of, 1723-7
Young, Mr. F., ques. 2313

Stewart, Mr. J. A. (Lanark)
Opium and Drug Bill, 1632, 1637, 1640, 1645, 1648, 1703, 1744-9, 1754-9
Special War Revenue
Proprietary medicines 3601-6
Sales taxes, 3611

Stewart, Mr. Thomas J. (West Hamilton)
Jams and marmalade, 3796
Letter carriers, 1232
Vessel rates, 1709, 1727

Stewart, Mr. W. J., 3985

Stoneham, Finlay, 567

Strikes. *See also* Grand Trunk; Industrial Disputes
How authorized in certain cases, 1902
Trial of Winnipeg parties, ques. 2181

Subsidies and Bounties—Farmers' party position, 899

Sugar
Embargo on, 3226
Importations, ques. 2009
Price, 1896

Superannuation. *See* Civil Service

Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Supply, Committee of, 880, 1296, 1416, 1598, 1649, 1877, 2103, 2151, 2366, 2382, 2390, 3147, 3192, 3218, 3265, 3507, 3654, 3702, 3769, 3801, 3821, 3840, 3961, 4069, 4181, 4274, 4291, 4380, 4466, 4506

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Debate in, arrangements for, 1597, 1602, 1615
Ordered, 304
Subjects and items debated
Agriculture, 2382
Institute of, 2411
Minister, statement and review by, 2366
Bounties Act administration, 1877
British Columbia lighthouses, 1616
Canada Grain Act administration, 1877
Canada Year Book, 1879
Canadian National Railways, 4181
Civil Government, 859
Civil Service bonus, 1209
Cold storage, 2407
Culling timber, 1877
Customs, 3858
Dairying industry, 2403
Distressed seamen, 1613
Dominion lands and parks, 3283, 3769
Entomological Branch, 2401
Experimental Farms, 2382, 2390, 2412
External affairs, 3973
Fisheries, 3521
Flax, 1886
Gas and Electricity inspection, 1887
Health Dept., 3539
Immigration and Medical inspection, 3555
Indians, 3265
Industrial and Scientific Research, 1886
Interior Dept., 3192
Justice, 3840
Labour Dept., 4506
League of Nations, 3961
Lighthouses, 2110
Live stock, 1614
Marine hospitals, 3552
Marine, unforeseen expenses, 1615
Masters and mates, 1610
Meat and canned foods, 2411
Method of voting, 108. *See also* Estimates
Militia, 3654, 3702
Mines and Geological Survey, 3801
Naval affairs, 3507
Naval service, 4291, 4380
Navigation schools, 1612
Northwest territories, 3280
Ocean and river service, 1598, 2103
Patent record, 1886
Pilotage, 2119
Pollution of boundary waters, 3552
Post office, 4501
Public buildings, Nova Scotia, 3147
Public works, 1416, 3769
Quarantine, 3554
Railways and canals, 880, 2378, 4181

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and items debated—*Con.*
Registration of shipping, 1614
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3194
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1616
Seed Branch, 2411
Shipbuilding, 618
Soldier Settlement, 2127, 2151, 3192
Sorel shipyard, 1620
Statistics—census, 1879
Steamboat inspection, 2125
Steamship subsidies, 4277
Terminal elevators, 1878
Trade, extension of, 1880
Wharves, 2122
Wrecks—investigations, 1612
Wrecking plants, 1615, 2103
Yukon, 3281

Supreme Court, judgment in *re* Board of Commerce, 3685

Supreme Court Act Amdt. 1r., 2003-4; 2r., 2315; com., 2317; 3r., 2389

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Agricultural Gazette, 1085
Budget, 2910. Congratulations to Finance Minister—Sir Robert Borden's return —Mr. Trahan—Canada's part in the war, 2911; Mr. Fielding's amdt. and address, 2912; Mr. Crerar's resignation from the Government, 2913; the recall —Mr. Crerar and farmers' organizations in Ontario, 2914; political organizations on class lines, 2915; farmers' delegation on conscription; Sir Wilfrid Laurier's policy in 1917—the Government and tariff revision, 2916; England and Canada compared as to tariff conditions, 2917; United Grain Growers, Limited, its policy and profits, 2919; elevator screenings, 2920; record of Mr. Crerar and Mr. J. F. Reid—dairy industry and Mr. Crerar's administration, 2921; agriculture in Ontario, abandoned farms, 2922; overcrowding of cities everywhere, 2923; Canada's war record—conscription, 2924; Canada will carry on, 2925
Business Profits tax, public utilities, 3236-7
Butter in cold storage, ques, 543
Campaign funds—Grain Growers, United Farmers, 1227
Canadian Wheat Board, 4125, 4343-4, 4355-6
Civil Service, bonus, 1277, 1282-4
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3167-73, 3395-3409
Analysis, ques. 922

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Eight-hour day, 384
Industry and agriculture, 453
Experimental farm system, ques. 1360
Ontario, 4560
M. for extension, 1005, 1014
Food and Drugs Bill, 965
Food shortage, threatened, 1845
Franchise Bill—Indians, 2056
Grain elevators, ques. 3862
Indemnity of members, 4095
Inspection and Sale Act—containers, 2021
Mining resources—prospectors, 3812
National Council of Women, declaration by, 1841
Oleomargarine, 1840-75
Re-claimed screenings, ques. 507
Registration postal rate, and express companies, 3744
Rural mail carriers, 1233, 1282-4
Soldier Settlement, 2131
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—License, small manufacturer, 3797
Threat to members by outsiders, 1743
United Grain Growers' Limited, ques. 922

Sydney, Quarantine station, 3149

Syrians in Canada, ques. 3862

Tache, Mr. Charles Eugene, ques. 3490

Tache, Mr. J. de L., 4505

Taft, ex-President, and Grand Trunk Railway, 3490

Tariff. *See also* Address; Budget; Customs, Special War Revenue
French Treaty. *See that title*
Prices, 227
Reduction of—amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to Budget, 2510
7½ per cent, ques. 1001
Tobacco, duties on, ques. 1114

Tariff Changes, 2490

Taxation. *See also* Revenue Bills
Business profits, ques. 314
Civil Service income by Ottawa city. *See* Ottawa City Agreement Bill
Customs. *See also* Tariff
7½ per cent, ques. 1001
Direct or indirect, 128, 167
Excess profits, ques. 2012
Govt. railway property, of, 580-1, 3893
Income, 123, 227
Forms in French, 1084, 1573
Incomes over $100,000, ques. 3490
Inspector at Kingston, ques. 2181
Trust and Loan Company of Canada, 586

Taxation—*Con.*
Income and profits, collection, ques. 806
Indemnity of members. *See that title*
Land, 128, 177, 220, 228, 2612, 2883, 2888
Single Tax, 1120, 2651-7, 2706
Luxuries, 2615. *See also* Special War Revenue
Mines, 128, 3810
Mutual Insurance Companies, ques. 2012
Provincial and Federal, 833
Provincial salaries and indemnities, ques. 3490
Railway profits, 865
Real estate transfers, 3796
War profits, 189, 302
War taxes, ques. 1001
War tax stamps, ques. 807
Waterfront privileges, 128
Wealth, 2527

Taxes, municipal payment by Dominion. *See* Ottawa City agreement

Technical Education, 43, 53
Government assistance, ques. 2519

Technical Education Bill. 1r., 1290; 2r., com., 1761; 3r., 1762

Telegraphs and Telephones, 4577
Govt. contracts, ques. 1627
Govt. operators, bonus, ques. 2182
Rates appeal, ques. 2009

Témiscouata Railway, ques. 674

Textiles, duties on imports, ques. 1899. *See also* Customs

Theodore D'Acton Post Office, ques. 2011

Theriault and St. Quentin catastrophe, 3080

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 76. Parliament Buildings, 76; Orders in Council and Yukon—stability of Union Government, 77; industrial prosperity and popular unrest—high cost of living and the remedy, 78; Canada and Canada's achievements—local representation in the Cabinet, position of Hon. Mr. Blondin, 79; proposed general election—Leader of the Opposition on the health of the Prime Minister, 80; hopes for Prime Miniser's restoration to health, 81
Franchise Bill
Disqualification of candidates, 1088
"Rural polling division," 1993

Thompson, Mr. Alfred—*Con.*
Franking privilege, 3357
Opium and Drug Bill, 1631-2
Scientific research, 2160
Stefansson expedition, ques. 704
Yukon Placer Mining Act, 3107-9

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 177. Class representation and class legislation, 177; exchange rate and trade—Canadian Reconstruction Association, 178; proposed general election, 179
Budget, 2614. War revenue, 2614; luxury taxes—critics of Farmers' party, 2615; manufacturers and farmers, 2616; free list asked for by Farmers' party, 2617; manufacturers would benefit by tariff reduction, 2618
Federal Bureau of Education, 1386
Franchise Bill, 746
Advance polls, 1941, 2000-1
Aliens—certificate, 2091-3, 2099
Canada Temperance Act, 2053
Contributions, 1170, 1196
Conveying voters—compulsory voting, 1064
Disqualification — charitable support, those receiving, 1817-8
Election expenses, 1154, 1930-1
Nomination—"Elector," how defined, 1917-8
Recall, the, 2038-40, 2046
Returning officers, 1523
"Rural polling division," 1993
Voters' lists, 2434, 2441
Newspaper postage, 3756-7
Race track betting, 3432
Soldier Settlement, 1698
Cattle branding, 1700-1

Threat to Members, 1743

Three Rivers harbour, 3491

Thrift, 13. *See also* Government Annuities
Need of, Speech from the Throne, reference to, 8

Ticket of Leave, 398, 2015

Timber Culling, 1877

Timiskaming, By-election, 1188, 2898

Timiskaming Lake
Wharves, 2187, 3493

Tobacco. *See also* Inland Revenue and Customs

Tobacco—*Con.*
Duties on, ques. 1114
Leaf, ques. 996

Tobin, Mr. Edmund William (Richmond and Wolfe)
Asbestos postmaster, ques. 320
Auditor General's report, publication in French, ques. 1627
Blondin, Hon. Mr., trips to Europe, 541
Canada Gazette, ques. 2179
Canadian Northern railway lands, ques. 1626, ques. 2008
Chinese in Canada, ques. 805
Connaught Rifle range, ques. 671
Dominion notes and gold standard, ques. 588
Duncan, Mr. Walter, ques. 2720
Finance Dept. employees, ques. 592
Imperial Press Conference, ques. 410
Japanese in Canada, ques. 805
Langton, Brig. Gen. J. G., ques., 541, ques. 811
Medical officers and nurses, ques. 341
Military Police, ques. 804, ques. 805
Militia Dept., London employees, ques. 671
Obligations, Dominion, ques. 998
Parliament Buildings, 1422
Door contract, ques. 320
Post Office, ques. 3294
Ste. Anne soldiers' hospital, ques. 588
Special War Revenue Act
Boots, 3565
Sporting goods, 3572

Tolmie, Hon. S. F. (Minister of Agriculture)
Agriculture, review of, 2366. Increased production, possibilities, 2366; keeping people on the farm, 2371; city man and farmer—home and foreign markets, 2372; Dept. of Agriculture and its branches, 2373; summary of policy, 2376; dairy cows, 2378; labour situation, 2379
Agricultural Gazette, 1085
Animal Contagious Diseases Bill, 1622, 1840
Cold storage, 2407-9
Commercial feeding stuffs, 3163-74, 3403-9
Dairy industry, 2403-6
Cow testing and milk testing, 2406
Election and introduction, 1, 47
Entomology, branch, 2402
Experimental farms, 1013, 2375, 2382-9, 2396-9, 2401, 2404, 2412
Ontario and, 1015
Flax industry, 696
Fox farming, 2409

Tolmie, Hon. S. F.—*Con.*
Fruit Branch, 2410
Grading export butter and cheese, 602-4
Hewitt, the late Dr. Gordon, 2375-6
Inspection and Sale Act (Fruit packages) 1915-6, 2016-23
Apple barrels, 2022
Authority of Governor in Council, 2019
Nova Scotia fruit growers, 2017-8
Penalties, 2020
Size of packages, 2016-7, 3109
International Institute of Agriculture, 2411
Meat and canned food, 2411
Oleomargarine Bill, 1781, 1875-7, 1968-71
Potato Bag, 4562
Seed Branch, 2411
Tobacco growing, 2376, 2383
Victoria
By-election, 4584
Shipbuilding—work for returned soldiers, 4584
Wheat—work of Mr. S. Wheeler, 2388

Toronto
Exhibition Buildings, use of by militia, ques. 2009
Grain elevators, ques. 1897
Harbour improvements, ques. 2181
Income tax payments, ques. 592
Postal employees, threatened strike of. 3424
Postal station "A," 3155
Rifle range, 3728
Telephone rates appeal, ques. 2009
Union station, 3225-6

Toronto Eastern and Toronto Suburban Railways, ques. 1004, ques. 1510, ques. 2080

Tracadie Lazaretto, 3554

Trade
Austria and Germany, from, ques. 2416. ques. 3359
British Preference, 2079
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 621
Extension of, 1880
Foreign, 2477, 2481
France with
Customs tariff convention, ques. 3684
Treaty, 3425, ques. 4323
Royal Commission on, ques. 4502
Russia, with, 4322
West Indies Conference, 3161
Greece and Roumania with, ques. 2414

Trahan, Mr. Arthur (Nicolet)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 87. Liberal party in the war,

Trahan, Mr. Arthur—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
87; Quebec, then and now, 88; farmers' and conscription, 89; Quebec and its "hour"—Quebec and its tolerance, 90; League of Nations—Canadian autonomy, 91; Navy, Lord Jellicoe's visit—tax exempt bonds—Grand Trunk Railway, 92; public ownership of railways—Civil Service classification, 93; agriculture, Quebec people stay on the land—the disease of luxury, 94; radicalism and imperialism, 96
Bankruptcy Bill, 3256
Budget, 2857. Progressive weakness of national credit and its causes—gold reserve, 2857; inflation of credits—prices, 2859; exchange situation and remedies therefor, 2860; Canada and Japan, position as result of the war— deflation, 2861; increased production necessary, 2862; Mr. Fielding's amdt.—Supreme Council for Peace Conference and commercial freedom — Europe's debts to Canada, 2863
Civil Service holidays, 4057-62
Franchise Bill, 776
Corrupt practices—penalties, 1160-1
Election expenses, 1153-4
Polling divisions, 1518
Mackie, Mr. H. A., absence of, 2969
Water-powers surveys, 3292

Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National

Translation Staff. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. (French version); House of Commons

Trent Canal wharves, ques., 586, ques. 1359

Trust Companies Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 855; 2r., com., 3r., 1779

Turgeon, Mr. Onésiphore (Gloucester)
Abey, Mr. H. R., ques. 1000
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 110. French language—New Brunswick cabinet representation. 110; representation and census, 111; proposed general election—land values taxation—exchange and currency, 112; franchise, 114
Biological Board, ques. 2572
Budget, 2649. Congratulations to Minister of Finance—Canada's soldiers, 2649; gross and net debt—new taxes, 2650; Mr. J. H. Sinclair's charges—free trade advocated—Henry George and land values taxation, 2651; Liberal party and free trade, 2652; Farmers' party

Turgeon, Mr. Onésiphore—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
and Liberal party—need of increased production, 2653; Mr. Elkin and tariff; manufacturers would benefit by free trade, 2654; foreign trade, harbours and shipping, 2655; free trade and new sources of revenue, 2656; land values tax and its effects, 2657; repeal of land value taxes in Britain, 2659; "Scientific tariff," 2659
Canadian National Railways
Deficits — rates — management—representation of labour — subdivisions, 4202-8
Rates, 1443
Experimental Farms, 2382
Franchise Bill
Advance polls—fixed day of the week for elections, 1164, 1942
Election officers, fees, etc., 3868
Proclamation—language of publication, 1080, 1828, 1833-7, 2267-70, 2310
Amdt. 1834, neg. 2311
Returning officers, 1530, 1581-2
French speeches in House, 701
Grand Trunk Railway, 1443
Indemnity of members, 4086
Pensions, 432, 3934
Quarantine—Tracadie and D'Arcy Island, 3554
Railway rates and Parliament, 4188
Returned soldiers, 531
Fishing industry, and, 3934
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 3993

Turk, Expulsion of from Europe, ques. 409

Tweedie, Mr. Thomas M. M. (West Calgary)
Banff National park, 3770
Farmers' Co-operative Company, 3995-6
Franchise Bill
Aliens—certificate, 2236-7
Contributions, 1184
Recall, the, 2023, 2029, 2033, 2045-50
Returning officers, 1528, 1533
Voters' lists, 2431-8
Indemnity of members 4090
Militia—active militia, allowance, 3669-71
Opium and Drug Bill, 1645, 1647-9
Personal position, 2049
Retirement of members of public service, 3826-9
Scientific research, 2172
Shipbuilding, Credits Bill, 3996

Typhus Epidemic, 4545

Uniform, unlawful use of, 3417. *See also* Criminal Code

Union Government. *See debates under* Address; Budget

United Grain Growers, Limited, ques. 922

United Shoe Company case, 4479

United States, *See also* League of Nations
Canadian ambassador to, announcement, 2177
Canadian representation in, 4533. *See also* Washington
Coast defence and, 4294, 4298
Export of screenings to. *See* Commercial Feeding Stuffs
Fisheries treaty with, ques. 1002, 1290, 3161
Immigrants from, ques. 1463
League of Nations, and, ques. 1118, 3977
Liquor shipments to, 2107, 2118
Shipping Board and Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, ques. 2009
Soldiers and lands in Canada. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt.

Universal Military Training, 923

Unopposed Motions for Returns, 321, 415, 437, 544, 675, 923, 1004, 1123, 1362, 1464, 1628, 1900, 2015, 2313, 2417, 2722, 2896, 3079, 3294, 3490

Vancouver, B. C.
Dry dock, ques. 316, ques. 3620
Public building, 3156

Vandal, Mr. Calixte, ques. 1740

Vatican Mission, ques. 310

Venereal Diseases, 924, 927, 3556

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (St. Denis)
Board of Commerce, M. for abolition, 1143
Bonus and salaries, ques. 2079; ques. 2311
Eight-hour day, 381
Grand Trunk Railway and strike of 1910, 1564
House of Commons staff, ques. 590
Indemnity of members, 4072-3
Industrial disputes, 1981-2
Musical instruments, tax on, 3595-6
Parliament Buildings, 1424-7
Popular unrest, 1145
Price regulation, 1143
Profiteers—punishment, 1145

Vessel Rates, 1733, ques. 2414, ques. 2572, ques. 2777. *See also* Railway Act Amendment

Vessels. *See also* Shipbuilding
Canadian National Railways, ques. 342
Charge on for sick mariners, 2253
Icebreakers, 230, 1598, 1620
Uniforms of men on, 1603
"Montcalm," 1606
Importation of material used in construction, ques. 1114

Names
"A. J. McKie," ques. 587, 903, 910
"Canada," ques. 1230
"Canadian Inventor," 3226, 3359
"Canadian Pioneer," 902
"Canadian Recruit," ques. 312, ques. 1199, 648
"Champlain," ques. 314, ques. 672, ques. 921, ques. 1121; ques. 3619
"J. D. Hazen," 2105
"Lady Evelyn," ques. 3619
"Lady Grey"—Uniforms for crew, ques. 1003, ques. 1361
"Montcalm," 1606. *See also* Icebreakers
"Niobe" and "Rainbow." *See* Naval Defence
"Simcoe," ques. 413
"Stanley," ques. 312
"Three Rivers," ques. 1897
"Voyageur," ques. 2776
"33," ques. 410
Under Railway Commission, ques. 2777. *See also* Railway Act Amdt.

Victoria
By-election, 4584
Dry dock, ques. 3619
Shipowners (Limited) 4583

Victoria and Carleton, by-election, 121

Victoriaville-Arthabaska Branch Line, ques. 4502

Victory Loans, ques. 803, 2520
Amount of, ques. 2008
Commissions, ques. 320
Committee, ques. 320, ques. 2008
Gold, payments in, 2647-8
Tax exemption, 92. *See also* Loans

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lotbiniére)
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, withholding of information, 1654-5, 1681-3
Canadian National Railways, 1457
Civil Service
Bonus, 1273, 1285
Holidays, 4062
Retirement of members, 4461

Vien, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Electricity, competition in sale of—taxation, 3116
Food and Drugs Bill, 1256, 1266-7
Franchise Bill
Disqualification, charitable aid, those receiving, 1815-8
Proclamation, language of publication, 2286-96
Grand Trunk Railway, 1454-9
Income tax, 3120
Charities, 3246
Stock dividends, 3239-40
Maple products, 1255-6
Opium and Drug Bill, 1703-6
Pilotage, 1839
Post Office salaries, 4527-9
Private Bills—insurance and loan, 3860
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3210-1, 3213-4
Shipbuilding Credits Bill, 4139
Soldier settlement
Defaults, 3223
Staff, 3220-1
Steel and shipping merger, 1953-6

Vimy Battlefield, ques. 1358, 1460

Vladivostok, Japanese occupation of, 1945

Vouchers, Govt. loss of at sea, ques. 3489

Wainwright, Herd of Buffalo, 3283

War
Army boots and shoes, ques. 506
Battlefields Memorial, 1460, 1738, 2078, 2177
Bonus to soldiers, 1082
Canada's record, 46
Canadian Expenditionary Force
Burke, Rev. A. E., Chaplain, ques. 2079
Members, ques. 315
Officers and men stationed in Canada, ques. 1200
Provinces, enlistments by, ques. 408
Sterling, payments in, ques. 2008
Vouchers, Government, loss of at sea, ques. 3489
Canteen profits, 709, ques. 800
Defaulters, Chicoutimi, ques. 409
Equipment, guns, 3661-2
Fishermen, and, 845
Indemnity
Allies conference at Ostend, 2476, 2574
Canada's share, 1084
Germany, payments, ques. 310, ques. 1463
Kinmel camp riots, 709
Medals, ques. 1003, 1046, ques. 1120
Medical officers and nurses, ques. 341

War—*Con.*
Memorial, 1460, 3228
Militia headquarters officers not in France, ques. 506
Pensions. *See that title*
Re-establishment. *See that title*
Trophies, 4557

War Bonds. *See also* Budget
Govt., amount of, 2009

War Bonds Over-Suscription Validation Bill. Res. 4137, 4180; 1r., 4181; 2r., com., 4287; 3r., 4288

War Measures Act, Coal Operations and. *See* Coal

War Purchasing Commission. *See* Purchasing Commission

War Tax Stamps, ques. 807

War Trophies, 4557

Washington, Canadian Representative at, 448, 1742, 3080-1, 4533
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to Supply, 2442-4, neg. 2475
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) to reduce vote, 4540
Announcement, 2177

Washington Labour Conference, 371

Washington, Trade Mission at, 1882

Waste, deplorable, 679

Water Carriage of Goods. *See also* Railway Act Amdt.
M. (Mr. Stevens) 1213
Order for Bill called—dropped, 2311

Water Powers of British Columbia, ques. 1118

Water Rights. *See* Irrigation Act Amdt.

Waugh, Mr.—Saar Valley Commission, 344

Ways and Means, Committee ordered, 304, 1289, 3078, 3110, 3111, 3215

Weeds. *See* Noxious

Weights and Measures, Inspector of, ques. 4096

Westfield Beach Railway, running rights, ques. 508, 4230

West Indies
Canada's trade with, 635, 2542
Conference, 1884, 2892, 3161, 3860
Outrages on blacks, 2845-6

Wharves, 2122. *For individual wharves, see their titles*

Wheat. *See also* Canada Grain Act
Exports to United States, ques. 313
Greece, for, ques. 509, ques. 415
Improved breeds of seed—Mr. S. Wheeler's work, 2387
Marquis, 1013
Participation certificates, 127, ques. 802, ques. 802
Production, 147
Shipments by farmers to United States, ques., 802

Wheat Board. *See* Canada Wheat Board

Wheeler, Mr. S., 2387-8

Whidden, Mr. Howard Primrose (Brandon)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 115; Proposed general election—Reconstruction, 115; Franchise Act—Canada and external affairs—European distress, 116; Little Canadians, 118
Alien immigrants, 829
Canada Temperance Act, ques. 807
Scientific research, 2166

White, Mr. A. V., ques. 1002

White, Mr. James, ques. 2573

White, Hon. Sir Thomas (Leeds)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 182. Personal position—congratulations to leader of the Opposition—proposed general election, 182; mandate of the Govt.—Franchise Act, 183; Union Govt. and its record, 184; the country needs stability of administration, 185; National Liberal-Conservative party—Farmers' movement, 185; Canada's war finance—Hon. Mr. Crerar, 187; tariff for revenue and for protection—his financial administration, 188; taking war profits for public benefit, 189; loans in New York—exchange rate and trade, 190—farmers leaving the land—domestic loans, 191; thrift campaign—tax-free bonds, 192; Canada's financial credit, 193; "Carry On!" 194

White, Mr. W. H. (Victoria, Alberta)
Agriculture and stock raising, 2376-8
Alberta penitentiary, ques. 2777, 3855-7

White, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Brudenheim branch, 871-2, 885, 4250
Equipment, 4250
Canadian Wheat Board, 4130
Car shortage, 882-3
Franchise Bill, 765
Advance polls, 1934, 3875-6
Name not on list—oaths, 3877
Polls, hours to be open, 1920-1
Recall, the, 2050-1
Horse racing 3428
Naturalization, enemy alien origin, 3921-2
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3199-3200
Pensions, 3202
Saskatchewan and Manitoba penitentiaries, ques. 2574
Soldier Settlement, 2132-3
Spirit River wheat shipments, 566

Wigmore, Mr. Rupert W. (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Freight to Canada from United States prepaid, 1893
Opium and Drug Bill, 1753, 1756-8
St. John dry dock, 4573
St. John harbour—pilots, 2118
St. John river—wharves, 2123
St. John-Digby service, 4285-6

Williams Head quarantine, 3156

Wilson, Mr. J. R. (Saskatoon)
Agriculture, 2387
Canadian Wheat Board, 4354
Civil Service bonus—letter carriers, 1276
Coal Operations director, 3180
Commercial Feeding Stuffs, 3165-6
Franchise Bill—conveying voters, 1062
Income tax, charities, 3313
Newsprint, 2967

Wilson, Mr. J. R.—*Con.*
Soldier Settlement—cattle branding, 1699
Special War Revenue, 3574
Jewellers, licenses'—department stores, 3583
Wheeler, Mr. S., 2387

Wine—imports from France, ques. 1627

Winnipeg
Grain exchange, ques. 2005
Meterological station, 2125
Postal station "A," 3156
Strikers, trial of, ques. 2181

Wolff, Mr., and Printing Bureau, ques. 1624

Women in Industry, 369

Women's Conference, 262

Wood Alcohol, 3580

Workmen's Compensation Act and seamen, 2263. *See also* Canada Shipping Act, 2263

Wrecks, Investigations, 1612

Wrecking Plants, subsidies, 1615

Wright, Mr. H. O. (Battleford)
Budget, 2753. Luxury taxes, 2754; duties on farm machinery—farmers and tariff—Mr. Fielding's amdt., 2755
Franchise Bill, advance polls, 3876

Young and Co., Arthur. *See* Arthur Young

Young Men's Christian Association, 1219, 1226

Yukon, administration—salaries, etc., 3281

Yukon Placer Mining Bill. 1r., 2892; 2r., com., 3106; 3r., 3109; Senate amdts. 4264